6.1 Are the development requirements for the housing allocations without planning permission set out in Appendix 2 to the Plan justified? Is there sufficient detail to provide clarity to developers, local communities and other interested parties about the nature and scale of development proposed?

Are the Councils suggested changes to Appendix 2 relating to sites ref 133 (Thorne) and 247 (Rossington) necessary to make the Plan sound?

6.1.1 Policy 6 states that the housing allocations without planning permission listed in Tables H2 (A-Q) will be developed in accordance with specified developer requirements set out in Appendix 2 of the plan. Whilst we support the clear demonstration of development requirements relating to allocated sites, we have further concerns regarding the viability and deliverability of these sites given these additional constraints and constrictions. It is clear that this will impact the number of dwellings which can be delivered on sites identified within the Local Plan as allocations without planning permission.

6.1.2 Savills have reviewed Appendix 2 of the Plan and have a number of concerns regarding not only the sites identified to accommodate residential development as outlined within our response to Matter 5, but also regarding the ability of a number of the sites listed to come forward given the significant pressures to site viability which will result from ensuring the site specific criteria.

6.1.3 Appendix 2, as currently presented, is vague and does not provide any information on the ability of sites to come forward, nor does it take into account the implications on site capacity which is certain to occur given the numerous site specific development requirements.

6.1.4 For example, site 111 backs up our own Assessment that there are a number of significant constraints which are likely to mean the site is undevelopable. It is adjacent to a local wildlife site, there is significant potential for archaeological remains. Green corridors and tree buffers are also required meaning a further decrease in net developable area and it confirms access is via Stevens Road. Stevens Road is adjacent to a school and road widths from the stub end do not appear to give rise to a deliverable access. There are many constraints that are listed, giving rise to the questionable nature of allocating the site. Balby is also a poor market area – demonstrated by the dated planning history of the site.

6.1.5 Another example, again in Balby is site 115 which lists how there are likely capacity issues due to the width of the junction of Alverley Lane and the A60. No robust evidence has been provided to demonstrate that this is surmountable. The site capacity should be adjusted accordingly (see Savills Housing Assessment) or the site discounted entirely.
6.1.6 There is also site 147 north of Hatfield Lane, Barnby Dun. It is c.50% in flood zone 3 yet no discount on DMBC’s site capacity has been accounted for. Further, it is unclear if the major road improvements and adoption works required to extend Hatfield Lane and the turning head would be viable – particularly given the lower sales values associated with the area. We have adjusted the site capacity within our assessment accordingly.

6.1.7 The site assessments continue in the same manner and our comments apply to the majority of sites within Appendix 2. For further detailed information on individual site commentary and capacities please refer to our Housing Supply Assessment appended to this document.

6.1.8 In order for the plan to be found sound, Appendix 2 should be properly cross referenced with site assessment criteria utilised in the Site Selection Methodology and set out clear, evidenced based housing capacities outlined within various assessments with certainty in respect of their deliverability and developability.

6.1.9 In our response to Matter 5, we also outlined the disproportionately high development densities assumed across the borough and the misleading impact on site capacity, which will significantly impact the number of dwellings delivered following scrutiny of site specific planning applications, no doubt resulting in a shortfall against housing targets for DMBC.

6.1.10 These site capacities referred to above should be reduced in line with appropriate development densities whilst also being considered in the context of developer requirements for sites outlined in Appendix 2 which are likely to reduce housing numbers even further. For further information please refer to our independent housing supply assessment of major sites enclosed with this submission.

6.1.11 In terms of the remaining questions for matter 6 we do not have fundamental comments to make. We do however note that council’s endorsement of the Grange Farm scheme as an example of good place-making as listed on the council’s Housing Design webpage:

“The following applications are considered good examples of major housing proposals that broadly meet the council’s design policy and guidance. The application files, Design and Access Statements, and plans, can be viewed online by entering the application numbers (highlighted bold below) into the planning applications online search page and clicking on ‘associated documents’:

- 12/02133/FULM Grange Farm hybrid application c600 homes.” (DMBC, 01/06/2020)