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We act for Mr W Turnbull of Skellow Grange, who is part landowner of the following sites

- Site ref 164/130 Warning Tongue Lane Doncaster
- Site ref 165/186 Skellow/Carcroft

We are instructed to attend the examination on his behalf and to comment on the issues that affect the development of these sites and associated matters, that have been set out in our original submissions to the Doncaster Local Plan.

Our client supports the allocation of both of the above sites and wishes us to contribute at the examination to assist in finding the plan sound with relevant modifications.

We have addressed the relevant questions in this Matter 5 and set out our comments below.

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?

The Council have explained the site selection methodology and site summaries in documents SDE 46 and 47 and thoroughly explained the process through which the allocations have been tested. The site selection methodology includes a summary of each settlement and the conclusions on each site taking into account the tests that have been applied throughout the document.
Section 9.1.37- deals with site 165 and 186 Carcroft Skellow.

The summary explains that Carcroft Skellow is the largest of the Service towns / Villages and is proposed to receive the largest allocation. The constraints of green belt and flood risk have been identified and only the combined site of 165 and 186 are able to provide a single urban extension of 15.1 hectares. The text goes on to say that the capacity of the site is reduced from a notional 340 to 300, but this is not seen as a necessity, as the site should be developed to maximise the potential of the site to an appropriate density taking into account the surroundings and site development requirements.

Section 9.1.8 deals with Site 164/130 Warning Tongue Lane Doncaster

The summary explains that the site lies to the east side of the main Doncaster urban area and is well contained by the M18 motorway, Warning Tongue Lane and the B 1396 road. The site is unconstrained by green belt and flood risk the site comprises some 11.06 hectares of land and is capable of accommodating a notional 275 dwellings. The site has strong defensible boundaries. The site is not considered to be in the open countryside due to the containment described. The Sustainability Appraisal finds there are mainly positive and neutral effects of the development for housing,
Q5.2. Assuming it is modified to include the figures in CSD6, does the Plan identify sufficient land to ensure that the strategic aim of delivering 18,400 new homes in the Plan period 2015 to 2035 can be achieved? In particular, is there a reasonable prospect of: a) 9,289 new homes being built on allocations with planning permission at 2018? b) 585 new homes being built on other commitments at 2018? c) 6,630 new homes being built on allocations without planning permission at 2018?

We act for the landowners on the above two sites. The landowners are committed to the delivery of Warning Tongue Lane [164/130] and Carcroft Skellow [165/186] and are working either with a named developer or in their own right to bring the sites forward to gain planning permission for development early in the Plan Period.

The supply emanating from the existing permissions is purported to be some 9,289 dwellings a reduction from the submitted local plan figure. There is a degree of doubt over the ability of the existing permissions to deliver the anticipated numbers, given the slippages and changes that can occur particularly in the current time where there is a degree of concern over town centre locations and high-density urban living environments.

The windfalls set out in response to PQ7 identifies three sources of windfalls to add to the supply. It is not clear if some of this allowance is double counted, e.g. from existing small site commitments with planning permission, within defined villages, and the overall windfall allowance.
Q5.3. Should Table 5 of the Plan be modified to include the following, having regard to policies 2, 3 and 11 relating to development on unallocated sites and policy 7 relating to Doncaster Sheffield Airport:
   a) a windfall allowance of 3,400 new homes, or some other figure?
   b) 290 windfalls at Defined Villages?
   c) 197 new homes on windfalls on sites identified in the brownfield register 2019?
   d) New homes at Doncaster Sheffield Airport? Should any such housing completions count towards achieving the aim of delivering 18,400 new homes in the Plan period?

We do not consider that the windfalls should be counted into the supply table. The Council themselves say in answer to PQ 26 that it has not been possible to make an allowance for the windfalls, but see the windfalls as a flexibility allowance in the plan. The NPPF requires there to be compelling evidence that any windfall allowance should be reliable. In the circumstances where the Council themselves are not able to provide “compelling evidence” then the windfalls should not be included.

Q5.4. To be effective, should Table 5 of the Plan and/or other parts of the reasoned justification for policy 6 be modified to set out explicitly what the total housing supply is for the Plan period 2015 to 2035?

Yes the table should be modified to be clear and to reflect the up to date position. The allocations requirement should relate to the remaining 17 years. The supply side should be realistic about the delivery from existing permissions, if the reserve sites are not realistic they should be deleted from the table. Windfalls should not be included as set out in the answer above.

Q5.5. Will the Plan be effective in helping to ensure that at least 10% of the housing requirement is met on sites no larger than one hectare? Is it necessary to modify paragraph 4.81 of the Plan as set out in the Council’s response to PQ31?
Q5.6. Is the proposal in policy 3 to have a variable figure for the five year requirement consistent with national policy? Would it be effective in helping to ensure that the need for homes identified in the Plan can be met? If not, how should the five year requirement be calculated?

We do not consider that the variable figure for the five year land supply is in tune with plan making being aspirational and boosting the housing supply. For it to be in keeping with National Policy the Council would have to have successfully argued that the requirement needs to be expressed in this way, and we consider that this has not been done and refer to our previous answers. The five year requirement should be calculated based on the full housing requirement of the plan i.e. currently 18,400 minus the completions to date being the starting point.

There is no rationale for the approach put forward by the Council to base the 5 year supply on only part of the housing requirement i.e. the 585 figure and ignore the remainder of the requirement and to keep changing the base of the calculation. This is a methodology to by pass the effect of the 5-year housing land calculations and the implications of not having a five-year land supply. It runs counter to the objectives of the NPPF and the consequences of not having a land supply upon the determination of applications.

Q5.7. Is there clear evidence that any of the 3,685 dwellings on sites with planning permission in categories A and B on 1 April 2019 will not be completed by 31 March 2024?

The Council's table PQ 29a sets out the total capacity of the supply at 7,518 dwellings.

This has taken account of a 10% discount to permissions and housing allocations.

We do not agree with the calculation at the end of that table that purports to be the land supply as it is based on a 5-year requirement taking in only the base housing requirement.
It is difficult to compare the tables 29a and 29b as they have aggregated the permissions in a different way. We cannot reconcile the 3,685 dwellings in the question with the table 29b and items a and b.

**Q5.8. Has the Council provided clear evidence that a total of 2,833 dwellings will be completed on sites of 10 or more dwellings with outline planning permission, sites with a grant of planning permission in principle, and allocations without planning permission by 31 March 2024?**

We cannot reconcile the 2,833 dwellings in the question with the items c d e in table PQ 29b, which are showing 2707 dwellings delivered from those sources.

**Q5.9. Is the inclusion of a windfall allowance of 1,000 dwellings in the five year supply from 1 April 2019 justified? Would there be “double counting” with some of the 4,886 dwellings on sites with full or outline planning permission on 1 April 2019?**

We do not consider that the windfall allowance is justified. The Council have set out in answer to PQ 26 that they are unable to make a windfall allowance over the plan period with any certainty and therefore this cannot be justified. We consider there is also an element of double counting between the 5-year windfall allowance, the small sites with planning permission at 2019 and the prior approvals. Small sites with permission and prior approvals are simply windfall permissions and should only be counted once.

**Q5.10. Does Figure 3 in the Plan set out a justified and effective housing trajectory?**

**Q5.11. Does the trajectory demonstrate that the Plan will be effective in ensuring that there will be a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to meet an appropriately calculated five year requirement when the Plan is adopted and thereafter?**

The trajectory as shown in figure 3 should be based on the delivery of 920 dwellings per annum as per the overall housing requirement. It currently shows that after 25/26 there is insufficient supply to meet the five-year requirements.
Q5.12. Is the approach set out in policy 2 part 5 to allowing development adjacent to the Development Limits of the Main Urban Area, Main Towns, and Service Towns and Villages if a five year borough-wide supply of housing land cannot be demonstrated justified and consistent with national policy?

This part of Policy 2 to allow development adjacent to development limits in the first three tiers of the settlement hierarchy is generally supported. It will be triggered if the five year land supply cannot be demonstrated. It is important therefore that previous comments about the land supply and how it is calculated are incorporated in the plan, i.e. that the plan will plan for the higher level of housing needs as expressed in Policy 3 and this is worked through to the 5-year land supply calculations. It is not clear what is meant by “a significant positive contribution to the land supply”. If this is a number of dwellings this should be specific to avoid uncertainty in the future.

The site allocation plans do not at the present time show the proposed allocations as within the development limits of the various settlements. This should be amended on the inset plans to ensure the sites are within the settlement boundary. Otherwise any extension of an existing site which may be acceptable would not qualify because it would not be adjacent to the settlement boundary as required by the text in part 5 of policy 2. The general idea of the Policy is in accordance with the NPPF and the situation where a five year land supply cannot be demonstrated and there is no adverse impact as per Para 11 of the NPPF.