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I. Introduction

1.1. This is a Hearing Statement prepared by Spawforths on behalf of Priority Space in respect of:

   Matter 10: Doncaster Sheffield Airport

1.2. Priority Space has significant land interests in the area and has made representations to earlier stages of the Local Plan process.

1.3. The Inspector’s Issues and Questions are included for ease of reference. The following responses should be read in conjunction with Priority Space comments upon the submission version of the Doncaster Local Plan, dated September 2019.

1.4. Priority Space as also expressed a desire to attend and participate in Matter 10 of the Examination in Public.
2. **Matter 10 – Doncaster Sheffield Airport**

Q14.1. Is the support in policy 7 for growth and investment at Doncaster Sheffield Airport to enable its development and expansion justified and consistent with national policy (subject to the Council’s suggested changes to clarify the geographic areas that the various parts of the policy apply to)? In particular:

a) The broad support for the ambitions set out in the airport’s Growth Plan

b) The support in part A for aviation uses and infrastructure required for the safe operation and growth of the operational passenger and freight airport uses in the operational area.

c) The support in part B for aviation related development within the airport operational area.

d) The airside employment and operational uses proposed in part C for site 517.

e) The employment uses supported on allocated sites 748 and 941.

f) The support in part E for further employment development in employment policy areas within the airport policy area.

g) The support in part H for aviation heritage and training at land north of Hayfield Lane in the airport operational area as shown as “community facilities: Vulcan hangar and training centre” on the Policies Map.

2.1. Priority Space has no specific comment in relation to this matter.
Q10.2. Is the identification of 105.5 hectares for a housing-led mixed use urban extension on land to the south west of Hayfield Green and the approach to its release set out in policy 7 parts F and G justified and will it be effective in achieving sustainable development? In particular:

a) 10 hectares (site 940 E1) for a central area of retail, food and drink, hotel and other commercial and community uses.

b) 11 hectares (site 940 E2) for up to 280 dwellings to support initial phases of airport expansion and employment growth.

c) An additional area of approximately 70 hectares (site 940 E3) for a reserve site for up to 920 houses conditional strictly tied to the delivery of jobs (on the airport site or elsewhere in the Borough if specifically and clearly related to the airport) as set out in part G and Appendix 3.

d) Should any housing completions on allocated sites 940 E2 and E3 be counted towards achieving the strategic aim of delivering 18,400 new homes in the Plan period?

2.2. Priority Space considers that the Local Plan should focus more growth and regeneration in the MUA, Main Towns and Defined Villages and that this growth should be of an appropriate type and scale to meet the economic needs and aspirations of the locality.

Part D

2.3. In order to consider whether new homes at Doncaster Sheffield Airport should be included within the supply of housing in Table 5, there is a need to assess how the growth at the airport has been considered as part of the assumptions when determining an appropriate policy on requirement.

2.4. Notwithstanding the concerns set out in Matter 2 with regards to the appropriateness of the requirement, the policy on approach considered by PBA is based on 1% jobs growth. PBA note that the core growth assumed in the draft DSA airport masterplan 2018, amounts to a growth from 1,000 to 5,963 jobs in 2031, an increase of 4,963 jobs. PBA consider that this is consistent with the economic growth forecasts in the policy on scenario (1% growth). The high growth scenario in the airport would therefore amount to additional jobs growth, which
has not been factored into assumptions supporting the jobs led (policy on) scenario, and therefore have not been factored in when calculating the housing requirement.

2.5. Paragraph 4.40 of the PBA report states that the Council could base its uplifted target on the jobs led scenario, it goes on to note that this would not have to be 1,073 resultant from full achievement of the SEP target (1% growth, considered by PBA to be consistent with the core growth airport masterplan scenario), but could adopt a lower number. It is stated that this is because the target is considered as ambitious and the jobs growth and housing demand predicted by the policy might not be realised. The requirement in the Plan is 920 dwellings, thus below the target that reflects the full achievement of SEP ambitions of 1% jobs growth.

2.6. Policy 7 sets out a ratio between jobs growth and housing delivery, establishing the level of jobs growth that would be required to support an additional 1,200 homes at the airport. Based on the Councils methodology 10,910 additional jobs would be required at the airport to support the delivery of 1,200 homes. This level of jobs growth is significantly over and above the core jobs growth assumptions (a growth of 4,963 jobs) that was considered by PBA to be consistent with the 1% jobs growth assumptions that inform the policy on housing growth target. As noted above the housing requirement of 920 dwellings is not based on the full achievement of the SEP growth ambitions (including core growth from the airport).

2.7. Priority Space consider it is inappropriate to include a figure for the new homes at the airport as the jobs growth necessary to deliver an additional 1,200 homes at the airport (10,910 jobs directly related to the airport) does not inform the policy on (jobs growth scenario) requirement.

Q10.3. Is the approach in policy 7 part I to the provision of additional car parking at the airport, and the presumption against off-site car parking, justified and will it be effective in helping to promote sustainable transport?

2.8. Priority Space has no specific comments to make on this issue.
Q10.4. Is the support in policy 7 part J.2 (and policy 13 part A.9) for road access from the M18 to the airport justified and consistent with national policy?

2.9. Priority Space has no specific comments to make on this issue.

Q10.5. Is the support in policy 7 part J.1 (and policy 13 part B.1) for a new railway station at the airport and electrified main line rail connection to the East Coast Main Line (as indicated on the key diagram) justified and consistent with national policy?

2.10. Priority Space has no specific comment in relation to this issue.

Q10.6. Are the requirements in policy 7 relating to a comprehensive airport-wide masterplan exercise (part K); specific development guidelines about safeguarding areas (part L.1) and a strategic delivery plan (part L.2); and green infrastructure (part M) justified and consistent with national policy?

2.11. Priority Space has no specific comment in relation to this.

**Proposed Change**

2.12. To overcome the objection and address soundness matters, the following changes are proposed:

- Review and amend the Spatial Strategy to support development in sustainable locations throughout the District, including Carcroft-Skellow.
Appendix 1: Leeds City Region Statement of Common Ground