WRITTEN STATEMENT OF RESPONDENT: MR CHRISTOPHER OWEN IN RESPECT OF M5: HOUSING SUPPLY

This statement should be read in conjunction with the documents submitted by me on (i) 26 October 2018 with regard to the Informal Consultation: Draft Policies and Proposed Sites (“2018 Representation”); and (ii) 27 September 2019 with regard to the Publication Draft 2019 of the Doncaster Local Plan (“2019 Representation”).

Introduction

I am a layperson with no experience or knowledge of planning issues or examinations such as this. In responding to the Inspector’s questions, I have tried to answer as fully as possible and provide a response to the specific question raised in the context of my objection to the allocation of Site 350/407 as suitable for development in the Local Plan.

I am mindful that the Inspector has stated that any responses should only be in response to questions that relate to original representations and not introduce new arguments or evidence. In this regard, in order to answer the specific questions from the Inspector or aspects thereof, I have had to expand on arguments or evidence made in my original representations. All responses relate to the questions as they apply to Site 350/407. I trust under the circumstances my approach is acceptable.

Q5.1. Was the approach to determining which sites to include as housing allocations in the Plan described in the Site Selection Methodology and Results Report justified and consistent with national policy and guidance?

I have provided a response to Q1.5 with regard to the sustainability appraisal and the site selection methodology and its results in so far as they apply to Site 350/407. As shown in that response, the sustainability appraisal/ Site Selection Methodology placed insufficient weight on the negative impacts identified therein in assessing the Site as suitable for development.

Notwithstanding the above, as noted in the 2019 Representation, the Site is unsuitable for a housing allocation of 170 additional units because of the significant access problems associated with the Site. In Appendix 2, the Local Plan refers to such transport issues associated with development of the Site but does not adequately address these issues at this stage, leaving such assessments to the planning permission stage.

This is contrary to PPG 008 Reference ID: 54-008-20141010 which states that “an assessment of the impacts of the proposed additional land allocations can be initiated once initial potential allocations have been determined. There needs to be a description of the type of development at each of the locations proposed in as much detail as possible at the time. Where this is not possible, a “likely” scenario will need to be employed to set out the potential transport impact.” Had such an assessment been performed as required by PPG, this would show that the Site is not suitable for allocation of 170 units due to the significant access issues which will arise from such a scale of development.
Note: It is also of interest that the developer (Rep no. 05308) which had previously successfully bid to purchase the Site from DMBC and notified its interest in a representation submitted in relation to the Local Plan has now withdrawn its bid and interest in the Site. I do not know the actual reason for the withdrawal (which has been publicly stated to be due to “a computer glitch”\(^1\)). This withdrawal however suggests that the Site Selection Methodology incorrectly identified the Site as suitable for development and further examination by the developer identified this to be the case.

\(^1\) [https://www.doncasterfreepress.co.uk/news/politics/council/controversial-sale-doncaster-greenfield-land-housing-back-2921123](https://www.doncasterfreepress.co.uk/news/politics/council/controversial-sale-doncaster-greenfield-land-housing-back-2921123)