

DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN CONSULTATION REPLIES AND ARMTHORPE PC RESPONSE

| <u>CONSULTEE</u> | <u>COUNCIL RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATION</u> | <u>ACTION</u> |
|--|--|--|
| <p>McATEER ASSOICIATES LTD.</p> <p>We write on behalf of our clients, the Lazarus Group, in respect of the above draft plan. As we have previously stated, my clients support the Parish Council in ensuring the correct level of development for the town is brought forward, and that it is located in the correct location, and deliverable in the life of the Plan. As major landowners in the town they take their position seriously and would ask that the following comments be taken into account.</p> <p>Policy ANP1 The Lazarus Group support the Parish Council’s decision to allocate a range of housing between 700 and 800 dwellings during the period 2011 and 2018. Such an allocation is in accordance with the policies of the adopted Doncaster Core Strategy. The Lazarus Group control the land at Site 1 (The Lings, West Moor Link Road) and are confident that the site is capable of delivering the allocated number of houses in the plan period.</p> | <p>This response by McAteer Associates is in reply to queries by Armthorpe Parish Council about an earlier response on behalf of Lazarus Properties. Lazarus Properties’ fundamental position is unchanged; they agree with the allocation of their land east of Hatfield Lane for housing and employment uses. In discussion with Lazarus Properties and their Agents, the focus has been on clarifying earlier points made by the Armthorpe Parish Council in the Pre-regulation version of the ANP.</p> <p><i>ANP 1: The Parish Council welcomes the support from Lazarus Properties for its decision to allocate a range of housing between 700 and 800 during the plan period 2011 – 2028. (Note 2011 to 2028 and NOT 2011 to 2018 as per 5 March 2014 letter from McAteer Associates.) The land allocation conforms with the Doncaster Core Strategy, is within the control of Lazarus Properties and together</i></p> | <p>No action is required by the Parish Council.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Policy ANP2 The Lazarus Group agree that new housing development should be well integrated with the existing built-up area and surrounding environment.</p> <p>Policy ANP3 The Lazarus Group support the Parish Council's recognition that small unallocated sites can help meet the housing needs of Armthorpe provided they are not in conflict with either policies of the Plan. Such sites provide for the flexibility needed in meeting the housing needs of an area.</p> <p>Policy ANP5 The Lazarus Group agree that housing sites must be of a high quality and makes a positive contribution to achieving a successful place. However, they consider that the design criteria set out in the policy is overly prescriptive and would remove the opportunity for innovative design and layout.</p> <p>In particular, for example, they object to the inclusion of Criterion N in respect of plot boundaries, and can see no planning reason for front boundaries to have 'robust boundary walls, fences, railing or hedges.'</p> | <p><i>with the land to the West of Hatfield Lane to be developed in accordance with O and H's proposals, can deliver the housing required within the plan period.</i></p> <p>ANP 2: Lazarus Properties agree with this policy.</p> <p>ANP 3: Lazarus Properties support the PC view that small, unallocated sites can help Lazarus Properties to meet Armthorpe's housing needs and provide flexibility to that end. <i>The PC welcomes Lazarus Properties' view that small unallocated sites in Armthorpe can help meet Armthorpe's housing needs.</i></p> <p>ANP 5: Lazarus Properties agree to high quality housing sites but consider the design criteria in ANP 5 to be overly prescriptive. <i>However, ANP 5 is fully in line with the Doncaster Core Strategy Policy CS14 and SP22 of the DMPC Sites and Policies DPD.</i></p> | <p>No action is required by the Parish Council.</p> <p>No action is required by the Parish Council.</p> <p>No action is required by the Parish Council.</p> |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Policy ANP6</p> <p>The Lazarus Group consider the wording of the policy is imprecise. Whilst they accept that new developments should not be over bearing on infrastructure, any requirement to upgrade infrastructure should be based on the impact of the particular development. The policy should make it clear that any such requirement placed on a development is to be based fairly on the impact of that development, as required by national planning policy and the CIL Regulations.</p> | <p>ANP 6: Lazarus Properties say the policy wording is imprecise and also that infrastructure upgrades required should be based fairly on the impact of development.</p> <p><i>However policy ANP6 is linked with ANP 10 and 11 which set out specific requirements for the sites East and West of Hatfield Lane and the Parish Council therefore feels that ANP 6 does not require further detail and is, in any event, subject to national planning policy and CIL regulations.</i></p> | <p>No action is required by the Parish Council.</p> |
| <p>Policy ANP10</p> <p>The Lazarus Group support the general requirements of developing their site at The Lings. However, given that this site has been accepted by the Secretary of State as an appropriate urban extension in line with the Doncaster Core Strategy, they object to the inclusion of Criteria 5 and 7 in respect of landscaping. This is considered to be contrary to other requirements of this policy and of Policy ANP2 as the former requires integration whilst the two criteria suggest the development will be viewed in isolation. Such an approach is contrary to national planning policy as well as the Neighbourhood Plan's other policies. It is further noted that such separation is not required for the land west of Hatfield Lane (Site 2).</p> | <p>ANP 10: While supporting The Lings allocation generally, Lazarus Properties feel that employment and housing will be strictly separated by landscaping, contrary to national planning policy.</p> <p><i>However, the Parish Council wish to see landscaping used to separate different land uses, such as Housing and Employment and do not regard ANP 10 as being contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework in that respect.</i></p> <p>Criterion 5 of ANP 10 recognises that the residents of Mercel Avenue</p> | <p>No action to be taken by the Parish Council.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>are sensitive to the loss of the view northwards across open country and an associated risk of being overlooked from the new housing. The Secretary of State's acceptance of "tree planting to the north of the existing dwellings on Mercel Avenue" in an Appeal decision about The Lings in 2012, denotes his agreement with this point. In response, the Parish Council would point out that the details of such tree planting would obviously be left to a Planning Application defining in full the proposed residential development, such an application to be determined by Doncaster MBC as planning authority.</p> <p>Lazarus Properties are more concerned about criterion 7 and their representation quotes from the same Inspector's Report on the Appeal Decision about The Lings. In particular they argue that the Inspector only refers to The Lings as "rising gently from the north-east to the south-west" and as having "several mature trees and hedgerows on the eastern parts of the site and on the frontage to Hatfield Lane and Westmoor Link respectively. The Inspector also goes on to refer to proposed</p> | <p>No action to be taken at this stage by the Parish Council regarding Criterion 7 as such matters will be determined in full during the planning application process.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Policy ANP12</p> <p>The Lazarus Group support the allocation of the land south of West Moor Link as a Major Employment Site (Site 3). The site is ideally located close to the strategic highway network.</p> <p>However, they object to the exclusion of Class B8 Distribution Warehousing from the site. It is respectfully submitted that the Secretary of State has recognised that the delivery of other sites in the Parish and Borough would not meet the needs of the market, and that this site was entirely acceptable for such uses. There can be no planning reason for Class B8 being excluded from this site.</p> | <p>development as a whole relating well to the existing urban form, given the spread of the built up area on two sides of the site. . . . and so on.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council feels there is no disagreement fundamentally between it and Lazarus Properties and it falls to the Planning Application to be determined by DMBC at the planning application stage, to deal with landscaping in detail.</i></p> <p>ANP 12: Lazarus Properties support the employment site at Westmoor Link but as in a previous Neighbourhood Plan submission by them, object to the exclusion of B8 distribution uses.</p> <p><i>However, the Parish Council wishes to encourage Classes B1 and B2 which generally have higher skilled workforces with correspondingly higher incomes than is the case with B8 Warehousing and Distribution. The Parish Council does not therefore wish to include B8 uses within the Major Employment Site.</i></p> <p><i>APC notes the point but feels that because of the nature of the Major</i></p> | <p>No action to be taken by the Parish Council.</p> |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Policy ANP19</p> <p>The Lazarus Group recognise that developer contributions may be necessary to mitigate the impacts of development. However, such contributions must be justified and in accordance with relevant CIL Regulation or advice on S.106 Obligations. They therefore object to the inclusion of points C and D in the policy. Neither has been justified nor are they sufficiently clear in their intent. Such an approach is contrary to national planning policy.</p> <p>Policy ANP22</p> <p>The Lazarus Group support the Council in seeking to encourage small retail units in the allocated housing sites. However, it should be made clear that it should be the market that decides the appropriateness of such units, and that the inclusion of such units should not be a prerequisite of any housing layout. For this reason the Lazarus Group object to the Plan placing a limit on the size of any retail unit. They consider the size should be the result of the market and a retail impact assessment.</p> | <p><i>Employment Site, separation of housing and employment is desirable to achieve sustainable development in an environmental sense.</i></p> <p>ANP 19: Lazarus Properties accept that developer contributions may be necessary in line with CIL or Section 106 obligations. Lazarus Properties therefore object to points C and D in ANP 19 which are neither justified or clear in intent.</p> <p><i>However, the APC feels that detailed negotiation on such matters should be reserved to the planning application stage.</i></p> <p>ANP 22: Lazarus Properties support small retail outlets in the allocated housing sites, but feel that the market should decide where and how big the retail outlets should be. Lazarus Properties feel therefore, that the Neighbourhood Plan should not impose a limit on size.</p> <p><i>While the APC understands the logic of this approach, imposing a retail size limit in residential areas could be counter productive in that a large outlet could be set up, thereby</i></p> | <p>No action to be taken by the Parish Council.</p> <p>No further action to be taken by the Parish Council.</p> |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Policy ANP26 The Lazarus Group recognise that new development should be required to contribute to the provision of educational infrastructure where necessary as a result of development. However, they object to the wording of the policy in respect of the provision of new development and facilities. Neither housing allocation is large enough to justify the requirement for a new school when based on the Borough Council's standards.</p> <p>The first and last bullet points of the policy should be removed.</p> <p>Policy ANP27 The Lazarus Group object to the need to identify land on the allocated housing sites for a school. Neither site is capable of accommodating a school and delivering the necessary housing. Furthermore, the policy has no justification for such provision and The Lazarus Group have been advised there is no such education requirement.</p> <p>It is respectfully submitted that this policy should be deleted.</p> | <p><i>prejudicing existing outlets.</i></p> <p>ANP 26: Lazarus Properties recognise that new developments should contribute to extending/enhancing new facilities and services, including primary schools. However, according to the developers neither site no. 1 nor site no. 2 could accommodate both housing and educational facilities. <i>This issue rather depends on the existing demands for schools and present day capacity. The APC and DMBC both feel that there is a point here subject to DMBC intervention as LEA.</i></p> <p>ANP 27: This is a similar point to the one above.</p> <p>Policy ANP 27: the most recent information from Doncaster MBC, the LEA, is that there is intense pressure on Armthorpe Schools, at primary level and additional capacity must, therefore, be provided. (Incidentally, both owners of the land east and west of Hatfield Lane have indicated their willingness to accommodate the site for a primary school on their land). At the</p> | <p>Armthorpe Parish Council to review the need for extra education facilities under joint working with the LEA.</p> <p>Armthorpe Parish Council to review the need for extra education facilities with the user himself as per ANP 26.</p> <p>The LEA to be asked to confirm the requirement for a new school site or to expand to expand an existing</p> |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Policy ANP34</p> <p>The Lazarus Group remain concerned that the extent of the Green Wedge shown on the Proposals Map is contrary to Core Strategy Policy CS17. The Core Strategy makes it clear that Green Wedges are to be used to protect strategic rural gaps between settlements. The Core Strategy identifies the gap in this part of the Borough as between Armthorpe and Edenthorpe. It is respectfully submitted that the introduction of a Green Wedge south of West Moor Link, east of Hatfield Lane play no purpose in this gap. The Lazarus Group accept that a landscape buffer is necessary on the northern edge of the housing allocation, but do not accept that it can or should be regarded as a Green Wedge.</p> <p>The Lazarus Group also object to the failure of the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate a Green Wedge to the south of the existing built up area. Core Policy CS17 clearly requires the provision of a Green Wedge to the south of Armthorpe, between the settlement and Bessacarr/Cantley. Furthermore Map 9 in the Core Strategy clearly shows the Borough Council's intention that this Green Wedge should run across the whole of the southern boundary of Armthorpe. The Neighbourhood Plan is required to reflect adopted development plans and this change is therefore necessary for the Plan to progress.</p> <p>The Lazarus Group have been made aware that a local landowner is proposing development to the south of the settlement and would point out that such a proposal would not be in accordance with the requirements of the Core Strategy, and would place the Neighbourhood Plan out of conformity with the Core Strategy,</p> | <p>moment, DMBC as Local Education Authority, is undecided as to whether to expand an existing school or identify a site for a new one.</p> <p>Policy ANP 34: Acceptance, in principle, by Lazarus Properties of the extent of the Green Wedge to the north of Armthorpe, subject to compliance with the DMBC Core Strategy, is noted.</p> <p>However, Lazarus Properties object to ANP 34 on the grounds that it does not designate a Green Wedge south of Armthorpe (which would be in accordance with the Core Strategy). This objection by Lazarus Properties is supported by APC who accept the need for a Green Wedge on the southern edge of Armthorpe. This part of Armthorpe is, in addition, designated Countryside Protection Policy Area in the ANP and will presumably remain so until 2026. It is important to note also that DMBC, as local planning authority, has said that the Green Wedge in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan is "not in conflict with the Core Strategy". Compliance with the Core Strategy is, of course, a key</p> | <p>one, in either case the location of the new facility to be identified also.</p> <p>A Green Wedge to be recognised in the area south of Armthorpe.</p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>contrary to national planning policy.</p> <p>Policy ANP35 The Lazarus Group consider the wording of this policy to be</p> | <p>consideration in evaluating the Draft Plan and confirming, or otherwise, that the APC complies with the DMBC in this regard.</p> <p>ANP 34: Lazarus Properties are still concerned regarding the provision of a Green Wedge in terms of the area it would take up and other criteria. Green Wedges are to protect strategic gaps between settlements too! Lazarus Properties do not think that a Green Wedge is necessary on the northern edge of sites 1 and 2 – a landscape buffer - yes, but a Green Wedge – no. Lazarus Properties also object to the failure to allocate a Green Wedge south of Armthorpe in line with DMBC’s Core Strategy, which clearly shows a Green Wedge south of Armthorpe. The Armthorpe Parish Council does not agree with Lazarus Properties that there should be a Green Wedge south of Armthorpe. The importance of the openness from the south is recognised by its designation as a countryside policy protection area which should protect the area south of Armthorpe from development.</p> <p>ANP 35: Lazarus Properties</p> | |
|---|---|--|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>contradictory and confusing. By definition new development will impact on openness. They cannot see that the policy is anyway necessary as other policies of the plan require landscaping to be provided to soften the impact of new development.</p> <p>The Lazarus Group hope that their response will be fully taken into account by the Parish Council, and, as ever, would be pleased to discuss their response if it is considered appropriate. They would also register their intention to attend any public debate into the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan</p> | <p>considers this policy to be confusing and would rely instead on other policies in the Neighbourhood Plan which require landscaping to soften the impact of new development.</p> <p><i>However, the PC feels that there is a distinction between a landscape scheme and wider considerations of landscaping, setting and so on, which ANP 35 is seen as embracing.</i></p> | <p>No action to be taken, therefore, by the Parish Council.</p> |
| <p>WYG ON BEHALF OF MILLER HOMES</p> <p><u>CONSULTATION RESPONSE TO DRAFT ARMTHORPE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN (January 2014) ON BEHALF OF MILLER HOMES</u></p> <p><u>Introduction</u></p> <p>1.This submission is made on behalf of Miller Homes regarding the land at Grange Farm in response to the draft Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan now on deposit for public consultation until the 17th March 2014.</p> <p>2. Miller Homes continues to promote a site known as Grange Farm (plan attached) and seeks to create a new, sustainable residential neighbourhood that will become an exemplar of robust, high quality design and of environmental responsibility and excellence. A hybrid planning application for up to 564 homes (reference 12/02133/FULM) which is pending determination by Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council [DMBC] and has been on hold whilst the Neighbourhood Plan Process is underway).</p> <p>3. This scheme represents an opportunity to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver multiple community benefits (including learning resources, local park enhancements, playgrounds, allotments and mixed-use community hubs), meaning the present and future communities of Armthorpe will have better spaces in which to run, learn, grow food, walk the dog, meet friends or relax; • Increase connections in an intelligent and sensitive way between Doncaster and Armthorpe, resulting in better public transport, pedestrian and cycle situation for Armthorpe, whilst at the same time respecting the important | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>geographical separation; and,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a range of high quality, sustainable and functional homes for everyone that Armthorpe can be proud of as a gateway to the parish. Homes to be built by a HBF 5 star rated national homebuilder and that are achievable, available and ready for delivery now. <p><u>Overall Vision</u></p> <p>4. Miller Homes welcomes the Vision for Armthorpe as set out in Pages 5-7 of the draft plan, recognising in particular the importance of promoting the settlement as a 'beacon for sustainable growth', the importance of the protection of the built and natural environment and the delivery of a wide range of quality, local and affordable homes. Indeed, the current planning application for the Grange Farm site (referenced above) reflects such aspirations. Support is therefore given to draft Policy ANP2 of the Plan.</p> <p><u>Conformity with Core Strategy</u></p> <p>5. Policy CS2 within the adopted Core Strategy identifies Armthorpe as a Principal Town within the settlement hierarchy, setting a housing allocation of between 643 to 923 housing units. In the first instance clear justification should be provided over the chosen level of housing numbers promoted through this draft ANP. Whilst it is recognised that the Draft Sites and Policies DPD sets a mid-range number of 735 units, it is important to consider that this is yet to be tested through examination. The draft proposal (set out at Policy ANP1) to allocate a total of 700 – 800 new homes has not been tested or justified through the wider planning process. Aside from the target, the ANP should provide clear evidence over the sites it identifies as available and achievable in meeting this number. We note that Table 1 indicates between 350-400 dwellings for each of the two sites chosen. Without any evidence base it is unclear as to how these figures have been derived and distributed.</p> <p>The Core Strategy recognises the importance of delivering allocations which are sustainable and as such seeks to allocate the sites with priority being given to those well related to the main urban areas. The Grange Farm site is within the area defined as 'Armthorpe', however it directly abuts the main urban area of Doncaster and in terms of its ease of access to Doncaster and its services, the relationship to the highway network and to other infrastructure it performs well. As such it should be recognised through the site selection methodology and in the general text that this is a significant consideration in the assessment being made of the preferred sites for development. There appears to have been no recognition of this in the draft plan.</p> | <p>Overall vision: The Parish Council welcomes the support of Miller Homes for both the overall vision for Armthorpe and the Draft Policy ANP 2.</p> <p><u>Conformity with Core Strategy</u></p> <p>Miller Homes complain that the ANP Policy ANP 1 has not been justified through the wider planning process. <i>However, ANP 1 flows directly from CS2 and CS10 of the adopted DMBC Core Strategy and the mid-range number of 735 sites comes from the draft Sites and Policies DPD currently undergoing examination. Table 1 of the ANP indicates 350 to 400 dwellings for each of the two chosen sites. General conformity of the Draft ANP with the Core Strategy has been confirmed by DMBC's Planning Policy Manager.</i></p> | <p>No action is therefore required by the Parish Council.</p> <p>No action is required as these various matters are fully aligned with the DMBC Core Strategy and the Draft Sites and Policies DPD.</p> |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p><u>Meeting the Legal Requirements of the Plan</u></p> <p>6.The draft plan has not been accompanied by a Strategic Environmental Assessment(SEA); this approach has been agreed by DMBC. There is no legal requirement for an SEA but in situations where a neighbourhood plan could have significant environmental effects, it falls within the scope of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. Where a neighbourhood plan is likely to have a significant effect on the environment a strategic environmental assessment must be carried out. In this instance, where the neighbourhood plan is proposing to allocate 2 significant sites and where the local plan is not assessing impacts in Armthorpe nor has the Core Strategy looked specifically at allocations, guidance does suggest the need for this more rigorous approach.</p> <p><u>Site Selection Methodology</u></p> <p>7. The site selection methodology set out at Appendix 1 of the Plan provides insufficient detail in terms of environmental impact assessment to determine with any rigor why the 2 identified sites have been chosen in terms of their environmental impacts.</p> <p>8. The site selection methodology is not transparent . There is no evidence provided in relation to the ‘twenty sub categories’ referenced in the methodology nor how the final score has been derived. For instance, analysis of the table appears to suggest that the 2 chosen site (422 and 474) generally score equally to Grange Farm (431) apart from the ‘landscape and environmental designations’ category for Grange Farm. The approach to responding to the environmental designations and the landscape structure at Grange Farm has been addressed in detail in association with officers of the Council as part of the planning application process and is addressed in more detail as part of the document attached to this representation, entitled “Policy Alignment of Grange Farm Proposals”. Objection is therefore raised to the identification of ‘landscape and environmental designations’ as a technical issue.</p> <p>9. Reference is made in the text to the fact that if developed, Grange Farm “would</p> | <p><u>Meeting the legal requirements of the Plan</u></p> <p>Miller Homes point out that the draft ANP has not been accompanied by a Strategic Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><i>When asked for a screening opinion as to whether or not there needs to be an SEA, DMBC, as local planning authority, said it did not require an SEA. The three statutory consultees (Natural England /Environment Agency / English Heritage) have also agreed that an SEA is not required in the case of ANP.</i></p> <p><u>Site Selection Methodology</u></p> <p>Miller Homes criticise, on several grounds, the site selection methodology as used by the Parish Council, including lack of transparency and evidence. They also argue that the planning application in respect of Grange Farm and already submitted, has been addressed in detail by DMBC officers, (but is, as yet, undetermined, of course). Miller Homes object, therefore, to the identification of “landscape and environmental designations” as a technical issue. They go on to object to the statement that</p> | <p>No action is therefore required by the Parish Council.</p> <p>Armthorpe Parish Council to review its site selection methodology.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p><i>automatically join Armthorpe and Edenthorpe (ie coalescence of the two settlements) and would have an adverse impact upon townscape”</i> Objection is raised to this assumption. The scheme proposals have paid close regard to this matter and the scheme has incorporated an extensive green wedge buffer to the east of the site to avoid this.</p> <p>10. It is noted that residents did not oppose the Grange Farm scheme in the way they raised objections to the 2 currently proposed sites and in the view of the authors of the plan, this was presumably because <i>“the view to the north of Grange Farm would be towards the residential development of Edenthorpe”</i> The summary of the 65 objectors comments to the pre regulation draft plan does include this as one of the reasons for concern with the proposed allocations. It is also noted that these objections raised ‘in principle’ issues, such as the need for more housing, the loss of countryside, impact in ecology etc. Whilst some of these concerns could equally apply to Grange Farm, there is no transparent assessment as to how those site specific issues may be addressed at Grange Farm, as evidenced in the current application details.</p> <p>11.It is also noted that the 2 chosen sites rate as ‘extremely poor’ compared to Grange Farm on the issue of proximity to local services. Their numeric scores of +4 and +3 (Grange Farm being 0) cannot be evidenced from the table. Grange Farm will deliver a sustainable urban extension well related to the existing local services . Indeed, the Site Selection Methodology recognises that Grange Farm delivers sustainability whereas neither site 422 nor 474 do, both being <i>“isolated from the rest of the village”</i> However it is unclear as to the weight given to this key planning principle in the assessment methodology.</p> | <p>developing Grange Farm would automatically lead to coalescence of Armthorpe and Edenthorpe. Miller Homes do, however, recognise that the summary of objectors to the pre-regulation plan, includes coalescence as one of the reasons for concern with proposed allocations, particularly Armthorpe and Edenthorpe.</p> <p><i>With regard to site selection methodology, the explanatory note and accompanying matrix of eleven sites and twenty criteria were regarded as appropriate for a Neighbourhood Plan. Since then as more Neighbourhood Plans are ‘made’ i.e. adopted, the issue of site selection and allocation has been reviewed with a greater emphasis on detailed considerations.</i></p> <p><i>The Parish Council will, therefore, review its methodology in order to ensure the methodology does provide a sufficiently rigorous evidence base, particularly in the light of the Public Examination of the DMBC Sites and Policies DPD. It does not necessarily mean, of course, that the sites selected for residential allocations will be any different, rather that the evidence gathering will be more extensive.</i></p> | |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p><u>Deliverability and Availability of allocated sites</u></p> <p>12. Delivery potential is clearly an important consideration in promoting allocations in order to be confident that the Council’s housing land requirements can be met. This forms one of the site selection criteria . An assumption has been made that the Grange Farm site has ownership constraints. This is not the case We reemphasise that with the Grange Farm site, Miller Homes is ready willing and able to deliver a range of homes to meet the local needs of Armthorpe. The scheme is the only site in north Armthorpe that is being developed directly by a housebuilder, resulting in a truly deliverable scheme. Miller Homes has an option on the Grange Farm site and, subject to a planning permission, has an obligation to purchase the land and commence development in a very tight timescale. Other competing sites within Armthorpe are not this well advanced or under the same housebuilder control and there will be a significant delay before construction of the much needed dwellings could commence. It would not appear that this has been factored in to the site selection methodology sufficiently clearly (other than the criterion of ‘developer partners’) as a factor in forming the assessment as to the preferred sites.</p> <p>13. Furthermore, the planning obligation offer which accompanies the current application will ensure that the appropriate infrastructure for the delivery of the new homes will be provided as part of the package of measures and thus not impact adversely upon Armthorpe, whilst responding to policy requirements. The S106 which accompanies the application with DMDC will be signed and delivered by Miller Homes should support be forthcoming. That Agreement will ensure that development at Grange Farm will be accompanied by a range of measures to support infrastructure, deliver environmental and ecological enhancements etc.</p> <p>14. In terms of consultation responses, it is unclear how the term ‘neutral’ has been arrived at in forming the assessment as part of the methodology. The work undertaken by Miller Homes in recent years and as evidenced through the statutory consultation process of the application has demonstrated that there are no significant technical issues which would prevent this site being brought forward for development. There should, in our opinion, be a positive weighting on this item.</p> <p>15. There is limited transparency over the reasons for selecting the allocated sites and the way which the draft ANP suggests they should be developed. Taking the first point, in order to be found sound it is expected that any allocation of a site should be accompanied by an assessment of that site in terms of deliverability over the plan period. This should take into account all social environmental and economical constraints. This assessment does not appear to have been carried out</p> | <p><u>Deliverability and Availability</u></p> <p>Miller Homes argue that Grange Farm is deliverable and available in the sense that they are builders and developers with an option on Grange Farm and criticise the site selection methodology where it refers to availability regarding Grange Farm.</p> <p><i>The Armthorpe Parish Council, having considered principally twelve sites in Armthorpe Parish, concluded that land west and east of Hatfield Lane was preferable to other alternatives for the reasons set out in the site methodology note and the accompanying Table of Sites selection criteria and scores. It is appreciated that any developer / landowner whose land is not chosen for allocation, will seek to persuade the Parish Council to review the site selection process and outcomes. Having done that, however, the Parish Council may still not be persuaded that Grange Farm is preferable to land West and East of Hatfield Lane.</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council to review the sites using a more detailed site selection methodology.</p> |
|---|--|--|

which is a present weakness of the informal draft ANP. For instance, WYG has historically raised technical concerns over the impact of development along the eastern section of the Westmoor Link Road at the planning appeal for the land at Hatfield Lane (Ref APP/F4410/A/12/2169858). Whilst the Secretary of State judged that the highways measures of the Hatfield Lane scheme would be satisfactory in that case, the allocations represent a different situation, with the added pressure of the development between Hatfield Lane and Mere Lane. We remain concerned that potential highway implications from the two proposed allocations have not been given adequate consideration.

In allocating the chosen sites there remains a lack of clarity over the availability and deliverability of these sites for development over the plan period. Barton Lane is identified as being a site able to deliver 185 of the total dwelling units required for Armthorpe yet the document recognises that the disparate ownerships and existing uses are a potential barrier to development. This puts considerable doubt upon the ability of the proposals in the draft plan to deliver its strategic requirements as set out in the Core Strategy

16. As set out in our previous letter to Armthorpe Parish Council (dated 15th February 2013) and in the response to the pre regulation draft plan, a suitable buffer can be achieved that maintains separation between Armthorpe and Edenthorpe that is supported by adopted policy CS17, 'Map 9 – Indicative Green Wedge' and the detailed technical assessments produced on behalf of both DMBC and Miller Homes. This evidence demonstrates that it is not necessary for a green wedge to cover the entirety of the Grange Farm site. These assessments also demonstrate the need to allocate green wedge to the south of Armthorpe which we note has not been included within the ANP's spatial mapping. Again, the draft plan makes no reference to this.

17 Draft DMBC Sites and Policies DPD policy SP37 states that an extensive green wedge buffer should be sought in this location (i.e. between Armthorpe and Edenthorpe). It has been confirmed by DMBC that it is not necessary to exclude the entire site from development on this basis. This understanding has been supported through the following technical evidence base documents:

- DMBC; Landscape Appraisal (2007)
- DMBC; Landscape Appraisal (update) (2010)
- DMBC; Green Wedge Study (2012)
- TPM Landscape; Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (2012)

Concern is expressed as to why this draft has promoted a Green Wedge at odds

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>with the approach within adopted DMBC Core Strategy policy and an accompanying technical evidence base. Such an approach does not conform with paragraph 184 of the NPPF through which Neighbourhood Plans are required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Planning Authority. Further, the Draft ANP does not justify the rationale behind the chosen layouts and green wedge buffer distances for the allocations identified at the plans at appendices 2 and 3. Identifying the justification behind these buffers is critical to the process.</p> <p><u>Allocation of Land at Grange Farm</u></p> <p>18. We believe that Grange Farm accords with all relevant policies of the draft ANP (see our attached document "Policy Alignment of the Grange Farm Proposals") and that this site should be brought forward as an allocation to enable the delivery of a substantial part of the housing requirement in Armthorpe. Grange Farm has organically evolved as a sustainable, gateway project with a strong design identity. In particular Miller Homes supports the measures identified in draft Policy ANP5 "Design of New Development" and believes that its current proposals truly reflect the aspirations set out in that text. Furthermore, the site is achievable and deliverable within the plan period, representing a truly sustainable development proposal being promoted by a well respected national house builder with a track record in bringing forward quality housing schemes.</p> <p>19. This representation should be read in association with the accompanying document " Policy Alignment of the Grange Farm Proposals"</p> | | |
| <p>PLANNING POTENTIAL ON BEHALF OF ALDI STORES</p> <p>On behalf of our clients, Aldi Stores Limited and Quora Limited, we have prepared representations in respect of the current consultation which is taking place on the Draft Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan (February 2014).</p> <p>This letter of representation has been prepared following our previous meeting with Armthorpe Parish Council 8th October 2013 to discuss Aldi's current proposals. The proposals have been publicised through public consultation and will be the subject of a forthcoming planning application to be submitted by Planning Potential by the end of March 2014 for the 'Demolition of Markham Main Sports and Social Club (Use Class D2) and Construction of a new Aldi Foodstore, with car</p> | <p>Planning Potential on behalf of Aldi argue that provision of an Aldi food store at Church Street, Armthorpe, would enhance choice and competition within Armthorpe district centre, improve street scape, generate new jobs, reduce shopping journey length and so on. They also point to public consultation responses in favour of their proposal, which is now the subject of a planning application. They</p> | <p>The Parish Council supports this food store proposal and agrees the consequent small amendment to the district centre boundary in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> |

parking, landscaping and associated works' at Church Street, Armthorpe, Doncaster.

The scheme has been publicised through a comprehensive community consultation exercise, including a consultation event held for local residents, stakeholders and businesses on 5th February 2014, and received phenomenal support (97%).

Aldi Stores Ltd and Quora Ltd supports the overall direction of the Draft Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan. We consider the approach pursued by Armthorpe Parish Council to date in defining a hierarchy robust and in accordance with the NPPF. However, we specifically wish to make comment in regard of the proposed District Centre boundaries promoted on the Proposals Map (January 2014). Our clients wish to promote a minor extension of the District Centre boundaries to take in the entire proposed Aldi Food store site.

In addition we acknowledge the amendment of draft policy ANP28 'Armthorpe Miners' Welfare' which partially covers the site. This policy which now states that proposals for alternative uses (such as commercial/village centre uses) may be supported for the site situate near to the former Markham Main Sports & Social Club (the application site), where it can be demonstrated that such uses will contribute to both (a) the vitality and viability of the village centre and (b) the long term maintenance and enhancement of the existing open space/sports fields. This policy criteria has been addressed as part of the application submission and it is considered that the proposals will enhance choice and competition within Armthorpe District Centre and lead to additional spin-off benefits including increasing footfall, assist with linked trips, streetscape improvements, reducing shopping journey lengths and significant employment generation, thus enhancing the overall vitality and viability of the centre. The proposals impact on the existing open space/sports fields will be minimised by landscaping boundaries.

draw attention to the need to extend the boundary of the district centre to include all of their proposed site within the district centre.

This proposal by Aldi will extend the offer in the district centre although possibly at the expense of competitors. The request to extend the district centre boundary to enclose the whole food store site, is sensible. Replacing the Markham Main Sports and Social Club building, (now semi derelict) is welcome too.

The site is located on the former Markham Main Colliery Sports and Social Club, and is intended to provide a localised shopping facility to improve local choice and competition for the residents of Armthorpe. The frontage of this site already forms part of the District Centre in the Draft Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan, however it is considered that the entire site can be and would form a logical extension. The proposed development provides a viable regeneration opportunity that is immediately deliverable. Quora and Aldi are committed to bringing immediate investment to the area and the proposals will redevelop a neglected and underutilised site and in its place will provide sustainable economic use that will bring spin-off benefits for the wider community. This represents good planning in line with national and local policy guidance and has received phenomenal support from the local community thus far. The proposed boundaries of this centre are attached on PP1- Proposed Amendments to District Centre Boundary.

Summary

Our clients have enjoyed a successful relationship working with Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council in recent years and wish to continue this proactive relationship in the future working with Armthorpe Parish Council in the progression of their Neighbourhood Plan. In order to establish Aldi's future estate, we now seek to promote a minor extension of the district centre boundaries to include the entire site currently being progressed by Aldi and their development partners Quora Ltd. At present only the frontage of the site is included within the District Centre boundaries, for robustness we consider it appropriate for the entire site to be included, given the proposed Town Centre use of the site.

We trust that our representations will be given full consideration through the Draft Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan consultation process and that our details will

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>be included on the Council's database to ensure we are notified of all future stages of this document.</p> <p>We would be grateful for confirmation of receipt of the representations.</p> | | |
| <p>HIGHWAYS AGENCY – SCREENING RESPONSE</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation of 2 February 2014 on the screening request submitted to Doncaster Council in relation to the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan. The Highways Agency has considered the request and the consultation response from Doncaster Council and has no further comment to make.</p> <p>Should you require anything further please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> | <p>The reply to the consultation with the Highways Agency as to whether or not an SEA of the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Plan was required was that it was not.</p> | <p>No action to be taken by the Parish Council regarding an SEA of the Neighbourhood Plan subject to similar responses from the other two statutory agencies.</p> |
| <p>HIGHWAYS AGENCY – CONSULTATION RESPONSE</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation of 3 February 2014 on the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) for Armthorpe. The Highways Agency welcomes the opportunity to comment on the latest draft of the NDP and has reviewed the document with our primary area of interest, the safe and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network, in mind.</p> <p>The Highways Agency has previously commented on the Issues Report and an initial draft of this Plan as well as the Sites and Policies Development Plan Document produced by Doncaster Council. This previous correspondence has identified that there is no objection in principle to the level of development planned in the area, but has highlighted the need to identify the traffic impact of proposed development, and all the principles of these previous responses still apply. It is noted that the draft Plan states where new education facilities are to be provided within housing development, then</p> | <p>The Highways Agency's comments on the Draft ANP have focussed on the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network. As the Agency has stated previously, it has no objection, in principle, to the level of development planned for within the ANP. However, it highlights the need to identify the traffic impact of the proposed development and repeats the previous responses which still apply in principle. In particular, the agency repeats its earlier comments about transport assessments being required for all types of development in residential areas and not just education facilities.</p> | <p>No action be taken by the Parish Council.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Transport Assessments will be required. The Agency would reiterate the comments made in our earlier responses that Transport Assessments would be required for all types of development, not just education facilities.</p> <p>I trust the above comments are helpful, should you wish to discuss any of the points further then please do not hesitate to contact me</p> | <p><i>The Parish Council notes the comments by the Highways Agency and agrees with them.</i></p> | |
| <p>GORDONS LLP ON BEHALF OF YEOMAN ENDEAVOURS LTD AND MR. G. ELLISS</p> <p>We act on behalf of landowners who have property interests in Armthorpe these being Yeoman Endeavours Ltd (land at Nutwell Lane South), Mr Graham Elliss and RTTP Holdings Limited (together known as the Landowners).</p> <p>Each of the Landowners will be making individual representations on the Armthorpe Development Neighbourhood Plan 2014 in relation to their own specific land interest. However there are a number of specific issues that the Landowners wish to raise collectively that relate to the legality of the pre-submission Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p><u>Lack of evidence supporting the site selection process</u> The information provided in support of the site allocations for housing is, at the very best, severely inadequate and, in our view, there is no robust evidence base provided within the site selection methodology for the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan. That methodology comprises a two page document with scoring matrix which in itself provides no detail or justification for the score attributed to each site.</p> <p>This point has been previously raised by the Landowners on the Provisional (Pre Regulation) Draft Plan. The Parish Council sought</p> | <p>This response from Gordons was on behalf of Yeoman Endeavours (land at Nutwell South), Mr. Graham Ellis and RTTP Holdings, together known as ‘the Landowners’. The Landowners have raised collectively the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The site selection methodology is inadequate and does not provide a robust evidence base for the ANP in this regard. ○ The screening opinion that the ANP does not need an SEA was wrong and in the absence of an SEA the basic condition that the Neighbourhood Plan should conform to the European Union regulations, has not been complied with. | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>the advice of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (DMBC) and whilst Jane Stimpson, Policy Manager at DMBC advised that there was no requirement for any evidence to be published to support the Plan at that stage, she stated that “when the Plan is published for a statutory six weeks, it will need to be accompanied by the evidence base”. The Parish Council confirmed in a letter to Rollinson Planning Consultancy on 28 October 2013 that “evidence will, however, be available when the approved Draft Plan is published for the statutory 6 weeks period and I am confident that the Plan will ultimately be found to be sound”.</p> <p>The Plan also states in the commentary to Policy ANP1 that “the Parish Council has had close regard to the site selection criteria set out in the Issues Report for Armthorpe and are being proposed with the results of earlier public consultation being taken into account”.</p> <p>The Landholders’ reasonable expectation was that there would be a thorough analysis of all of the sites in terms of providing background evidence and robust base line data.</p> <p>However, the site selection methodology and site assessment are woefully deficient in providing a comprehensive and clear approach to how the sites have been assessed. The two page site selection methodology states that each of the potential housing sites considered were given a numeric score and the outcome of those scores have been provided. There is, however, no information about how those numeric score were arrived at. The matrix of sites that accompanies the methodology is very imprecise in the assessment of sites against specific criteria. For example, on some assessments the matrix simply states “ok”. This is not a meaningful assessment.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is no detail of the comparison of sites and it appears that a number of sites have been summarily dismissed without adequate justification.</p> | <p>With regard to Strategic Environmental Assessment, the opinion of DMBC that an SEA was not required was the determining factor as the regulations stipulate. While there are environmental changes proposed by the ANP, they are fully consistent with the Doncaster MBC Core Strategy and the Sites and Policies DPD in terms of the scale and general location of the residential allocations required. As to sites with European environmental designations which might be breached by the development proposed, there are none within the parish boundary. A preliminary legal consultation concluded that DMBC’s opinion, given the same opinion by the statutory consultees (English Heritage / Natural England / Environment Agency) was definitive and an SEA was not necessary in the case of the ANP.</p> <p>In addition to disagreeing with DMBC’s judgement that an SEA is not necessary, Gordons go on to refer to the implications of DMBC not requiring an SEA to be done. They look at a) archaeology; b) conservation / public open space; c)</p> | <p>Armthorpe Parish Council to seek further legal opinion as to whether or not a Strategic Environmental Assessment is required.</p> |
|---|---|---|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Union (EU) obligations.</p> <p>Directive 2001/42/EC on assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment is relevant to neighbourhood plans. This Directive is often referred to as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA).</p> <p>The advice of DMBC on economic social environmental assessment of neighbourhood plans identifies that at paragraph 3.7 that a neighbourhood development plan may require an SEA under the EU Regulations depending on the content of a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.8 of that advice goes on to state that those neighbourhood plans containing the allocation for significant land allocations for development which are not included in the local authority's plan are likely to require an SEA.</p> <p>In this case we strongly submit that the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan does require an SEA particularly as DMBC's draft Sites and Policies Document leaves the allocation of specific housing sites in Armthorpe to the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan and these are significant allocations.</p> <p>Whilst DMBC undertook a SEA screening on the Plan, we contend that screening process was erroneous in law and that an SEA should be undertaken. The request for a screening opinion from the Parish Council provides little information on which DMBC could base its opinion. Furthermore, it appears to us that the request for a screening opinion was an afterthought as it was made to DMBC on 14 November 2013, after the Parish Council produced the non statutory draft of the Armthorpe Plan in October 2013.</p> <p>In our view, the screening opinion from the DMBC is inadequate in many respects and that the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development</p> | <p><i>gathering will be more extensive.</i></p> | |
|--|---|--|

Plan is likely to have significant environmental effects which require a SEA. DMBC has failed to consider the effects of the following issues identified below.

Archaeology

The village of Armthorpe lies within a rich archaeological landscape dating from the prehistoric to modern periods. Intensive investigations at Gunhills, Armthorpe (the site of the Ikea business park) by the West Yorkshire Archaeological Services (WYAS) during 1999 to 2007, recorded a number of enclosures and associated field systems with associated domestic settlement activity, including hearths, oven/kilns, a well and a number of cremations dating from the late Iron Age to 2nd to 4th centuries AD. No assessment of the allocated sites in the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan appears to have been undertaken, which may render sites undevelopable and therefore requires further assessment by way of a SEA.

Conservation / Public Open Space

The draft housing allocations in the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan are within 3 to 4 miles of the SSSI Hatfield Moor, a designated Special Area of Conservation. No consideration has been given to protecting this area, or mitigation through the designation of public open space. In the Green Space Audit Evidence Base for the LDF in July 2013 it identified that Armthorpe already had a 12 hectare deficiency of formal public open space and was one of three areas described as being “severely deficient” which in turn may result in the over use of Hatfield Moor by current and future residents. The potential environmental impacts of this should be assessed.

Highways

Armthorpe is within 0.75 miles of the strategic highways network namely Junction 4 of the M18. The A630 West Moor Link is a busy distributor road that connects the A18 Thorne Road to the M18

Further work may be necessary to ascertain the extent of archaeological remains in the Neighbourhood Plan area depending upon those views being expressed by English Heritage and the South Yorkshire Archaeological Service.

Further action may be necessary depending on response of interested parties.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>motorway at Junction. No assessment has been undertaken to understand the cumulative impacts in highways and environmental terms of the proposed residential and employment sites in the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan.</p> <p>Drainage Planning guidance recommends a hierarchy of disposal methods for surface water, the first being infiltration as this replicates the pre-development situation. In some of the Armthorpe area permeable soils exist which would allow infiltration. However, it is understood that on the West Moor Park development (IKEA etc), the Environment Agency would not permit infiltration due to the risk of contamination of the major aquifer below. The second ‘choice’ for disposal of surface water is to watercourse. A full assessment should therefore take place to understand the ability for infiltration as well as access to on-site watercourses and any environmental impacts of this.</p> <p>We contend that a SEA is required for the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan and in the absence of one, the Plan does not conform with EU Regulations and therefore does not meet this basic condition. As such the Plan cannot proceed to a referendum.</p> | | |
| <p>ENGLISH HERITAGE – SCREENING RESPONSE</p> <p>We are writing to you in connection with a request for a Screening Opinion in relation to the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in connection with the draft Armthorpe Neighbourhood Plan. English Heritage as one of the three consultation bodies set out in Stage 4 of the SEA Screening Procedure (for compliance with the SEA Directive and the 2004 Regulations). As the Government’s adviser on the historic environment, English Heritage is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of local planning.</p> | <p>English Heritage has concluded that the ANP does not have significant environmental impacts and therefore does not need a Strategic Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council agrees with English Heritage, however it has decided to seek further legal opinion about this matter.</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council has decided to seek further legal opinion about this matter.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>English Heritage has reviewed the documentation to determine whether the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Plan is likely to have significant environmental effects and therefore require a Strategic Environmental Assessment. Having considered the information submitted we agree with the council's determination that the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Plan does not have significant environmental impacts and <u>do not</u>, therefore, need a Strategic Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>If you have any queries about this matter or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> | | |
| <p>ENGLISH HERITAGE – CONSULTATION RESPONSE</p> <p>Thank you for giving notice that the Armthorpe Parish Council have applied to Doncaster Council for adoption of their Neighbourhood Plan Area under Part 2 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.</p> <p>We do not wish to give comment on the draft Neighbourhood Plan, but would draw your attention to the fact that we wrote to the Parish Council on 13 January 2013, and would re-iterate the advice we gave at that time, which is contained in the attached copy letter.</p> <p>If you have any queries about this matter or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Response Dated 31 January 2013</p> <p>Thank you for giving notice that the Armthorpe Parish Council have applied to Doncaster Council for designation of a Neighbourhood Plan Area under Part 2 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General)</p> | <p>English Heritage has repeated its previous response on the Neighbourhood Plan Area Consultation; in other words, that DMBC's conservation team should be referred to regarding heritage matters and the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service as well as they keep the Heritage Environment Record (HER). English Heritage also point to other documents which are available for advice.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council notes English Heritage's response and will notify DMBC's Conservation Team and the South Yorkshire Archaeological Service as appropriate.</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council to refer the Draft ANP to DMBC's Conservation Team and the South Yorkshire Archaeological Service as advised by English Heritage.</p> |

Regulations 2012.

We consider that the planning and conservation team at Doncaster Metropolitan District Council are best placed to assist you in the development of your Neighbourhood Plan and, in particular, how the strategy might address the area's heritage assets. Consequently, we do not consider that there is a need for English Heritage to be involved in the development of the strategy for your area.

We would also advise you to contact the staff at the South Yorkshire Archaeology Service, who look after the Historic Environment Record. They should be able to provide details of not only any designated heritage assets but also locally-important buildings, archaeological remains and landscapes. Some Historic Environment Records may also be available on-line via the Heritage Gateway (www.heritagegateway.org.uk). It may also be useful to involve local voluntary groups such as the local Civic Society or local historic groups in the production of your Neighbourhood Plan.

English Heritage has produced a number of documents which your community might find helpful in helping to identify what it is about your area which makes it distinctive and how you might go about ensuring that the character of the area is retained. These can be found at:-

<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/caring/get-involved/improving-your-neighbourhood/planning-opportunities/>

<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/professional/advice/hpg/historicenvironment/neighbourhoodplanning/>

You may also find the advice in "*Planning for the Environment at the Neighbourhood Level*" useful. This has been produced by English Heritage, Natural England, the Environment Agency and the Forestry

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Commission. As well as giving ideas on how you might improve your local environment, it also contains some useful further sources of information. This can be downloaded from: http://www.ourneighbourhoodplanning.org.uk/news/2012/07/30/Planning for the Environment at a Neighbourhood Level</p> <p>If you have any queries about this matter or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p> | | |
| <p>MR. A. ROLLINSON FOR RTTP HOLDINGS</p> <p>This letter represents our comments on the Draft Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan. They are made in accordance with the statutory consultation timetable set out by the Parish Council.</p> <p>When the Pre-Regulation Draft Plan was published in August of last year a number of comments were made to the effect that the formal draft Plan would need to provide a much more thorough justification for the proposed housing allocations and set out why other potential sites had been discounted. In response, your email of 7th September noted that <i>the issues raised in relation to the housing analysis are noted and it is anticipated that the Regulation draft will deal with this.</i></p> <p>Despite these comments, the published version of the Draft Plan failed utterly to provide the evidence base necessary for the Plan to reasonably be considered to be sound. It is our strong contention that the consultation period must be extended. It is simply unacceptable for the evidence that has been provided (via the Site</p> | <p>Mr. Rollinson contends that the published version of the Draft Plan does not provide the evidence base necessary for the Plan to be considered sound. In particular he argues, that the Site Selection Methodology should have been available earlier.</p> <p><i>This point is a reasonable one and further work is being undertaken on the Methodology itself which will be the subject of further consultation as soon as it is available.</i></p> <p>Mr. Rollinson goes on to state that the argument for the abandonment of the previously required relief road is still inadequate and dismissive.</p> <p><i>However, the Parish Council avers that the Master Plan was a non-statutory document and as such an elaborate explanation of the Parish</i></p> | <p>Further work to be undertaken by the Parish Council on the Site Selection Methodology for a further period of consultation.</p> <p>No action to be taken by the Parish Council.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Selection Methodology information) to be made available just three working days before the deadline for submission of comments. The Draft Plan ought to have included the evidence now provided.</p> <p>We have reluctantly accepted that the strong likelihood is that the case for the allocation of the RTTP Holdings land for housing purposes will need to be robustly presented to an Inspector at the Examination in Public. Nonetheless, at this stage please note the following points:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan is still considered to be inadequate in its response to the points made previously about the abandonment of the previously required relief road. The response to our earlier representations on this matter (i.e. that the Master Plan has no statutory significance and the PC is not required to take it into account) is, in our view, utterly dismissive. It goes no meaningful way to explain the complete ‘about turn’ on this point. It is further considered that the notion that TIAs accompanying future planning applications will address the problems of traffic congestion is optimistic at best. • The Plan does not satisfactorily explain how the Parish Council’s previous strong opposition to the development of the site known as The Lings has been addressed. As set out above further time is necessary to properly consider the Site Selection Methodology information provided on 12th March. | <p><i>Council’s reasoning was not necessary.</i></p> <p>Transport Assessments, as they are now called, are referred to specifically in the Highways Agency Consultation, as being required for all significant developments in residential areas. The Parish Council will, therefore, request that such TAs form part of the pre-application requirements and also form an integral part of the Site Selection process.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council fully agrees that such TAs should be requested regarding the effects of development proposals in residential areas.</i></p> <p>Mr. Rollinson complains that the Draft Plan does not explain how the Parish Council has changed from opposing The Lings for development to supporting it.</p> <p><i>In reply, the Parish Council would argue that further consideration of the alternative housing sites lead it to conclude that The Lings were suitable. Indeed, using the scoring system The Lings represent a better solution to the housing needs of Armthorpe.</i></p> | <p>No action be taken by the Parish Council.</p> <p>No action be taken by the Parish Council</p> |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our previous comments regarding Policy ANP4 Barton Lane remain. We have considered the PC response to these but respectfully suggest that the likelihood of the multiple land holdings at Barton Lane being successfully acquired through compulsory purchase powers is remote and that reliance on such powers is no way to plan positively for the provision of sufficient new housing. <p>We await the response to our comments about time period for considering the evidence with great interest.</p> | <p>Mr. Rollinson concludes by saying that his previous comments about Barton Lane stand; in other words, the land is in multiple ownerships and therefore, less likely to come forward for development, despite the availability of CPO powers exercisable by Doncaster MBC. However, the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act was introduced to encourage planning authorities to use their CPO powers for land assembly, where appropriate.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council agrees that the Barton Lane site requires land assembly if it is to be brought forward and, therefore, puts it forward for residential development having regard to its suitability for such purposes.</i></p> | <p>No action to be taken by the Parish Council since Barton Lane has a number of factors in its favour for housing development, which may delay its development until later in the Neighbourhood Plan period.</p> |
| <p>PEGASUS GROUP ON BEHALF OF CURRENT LANDOWNER OF ARMTHORPE SHOPPING CENTRE, STREET ANCHOR EVOLVE LTD.</p> <p>We have been instructed to act on behalf of the current landowner of the Armthorpe Shopping Centre, Sheet Anchor Evolve Ltd. I apologise for the late response to the consultation, as our client only completed purchase of the site on Friday 14th March. As such, this is the earliest that we could submit a response to the consultation. The ownership extends to include the vacant land to the south of the Shopping Centre and land to the north, which is currently occupied by a hand car wash business.</p> <p>We are writing to make a representation against Policy ANP23 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, which seeks to maintain existing employment and/or service trade uses within the commercial centre and states that:</p> | <p>Pegasus object to the Policy ANP 23 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan which seeks to maintain existing employment and/or service trade uses within the commercial centre. Pegasus further argue that ANP 23 is not flexible enough to conform with National Planning Policy Framework and its presumption in</p> | <p>The Parish Council feels that the period of market testing required under APN 23 should be reduced to six months in the circumstances</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p><i>'Proposals for the redevelopment or change of use of the ground floor of redundant land or buildings in employment or service trade use to non-employment uses will only be permitted if the existing use is no longer economically viable and the site has been marketed for freehold or leasehold at a reasonable price for at least a year without restriction.'</i></p> <p>Planning permission has previously been granted for residential development on the sites to either side of Armthorpe Shopping Centre in 2005. The development was deemed to comply with Policy SH1 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan, and would provide an appropriate form of sustainable development. In addition, the land to the south of the shopping centre has extant planning permission for the erection of a mental health care facility.</p> <p>The draft policy ANP23 does not provide sufficient flexibility to reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which is the golden thread running through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF recognises the importance of providing a wide range of town centre uses and not solely uses in employment or service trade sectors. Paragraph 23 of the document advises that planning policies should be positive, promote competitive town centre environments and set out policies for the management and growth of centres over the plan period.</p> <p>Paragraph 23 states that:</p> <p><i>'In drawing up Local Plans, local planning authorities should:</i></p> <p><i>Allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial office, tourism, cultural, community and residential development needed in town centres.'</i></p> <p>Furthermore, Paragraph 3.24 of <i>Practice Guidance for Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4): Planning for Town Centres</i> which is adopted National Planning Policy Guidance states that:</p> <p><i>'residential uses and commercial offices can also both perform an important role in maintaining and enhancing the vitality and viability of town centres, and should be considered as part of a proactive planning approach for town centres. Encouraging people to live and work in</i></p> | <p>favour of sustainable development. The way ANP 23 is drafted Pegasus argue, restricts the range of uses to employment and service ones and excludes cultural, community and residential uses referred to specifically in paragraph 23 of the NPPF.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council accepts that ANP 23, as drafted, is not as flexible as para 23 of the NPPF. However, ANP 23 does not exclude non-employment and non-service uses, instead requiring developers to demonstrate unviability of the existing use and that it has been advertised for sale or lease for twelve months without success. Having reviewed Policy ANP 23 again, the Parish Council feels the criteria requiring unviability to be demonstrated should be maintained but "market testing" could be reduced to six months.</i></p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p><i>existing centres reinforces local demand and provide additional vitality during the day and in the evening. However, local planning authorities need to recognise and balance the scale and nature of demand for residential and office uses within existing town and city centres, and the requirements for other land uses.'</i></p> <p>The wording in draft Policy ANP23 restricts the development of such uses in the town centre. Paragraph 23 of the NPPF specifically refers to cultural, community and residential uses, whilst PPS4 outlines the importance of residential development in town centres. These important town centre uses are not within the employment or service trade uses that draft policy ANP23 seeks to retain. The wording of the policy is therefore unduly restrictive against non-employment uses, and the policy should be drafted to accommodate more flexibility in future land uses, in accordance with National Planning Policy.</p> <p>We trust that you will take our comments into account when drafting the next version of the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Plan. We would be grateful if you could keep us updated on the progress of the plan and notify us of any consultation process in the future.</p> | | |
| <p>NATURAL ENGLAND</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning. We must be consulted on draft Neighbourhood Development Plans where the Parish Council considers our interests would be affected by the proposals. We must be consulted on draft Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders where proposals are likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest or 20 hectares or more of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. We must also be consulted on Strategic Environmental Assessments, Habitats Regulations Assessment screening and Environmental Impact Assessments, where these are required. Your local planning authority will be able to advise you further on environmental requirements.</p> | <p>Natural England point out that they are statutory consultees in neighbourhood planning and, as such, must be consulted by the Parish Council if the Parish Council considers National England's interests would be affected by the Neighbourhood Plan's proposals. The other circumstances in which Natural England must be consulted include Draft Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Buy Orders in certain circumstances as the Natural England Consultation Reply</p> | <p>No action is required as none of the other circumstances referred to by Natural England in connection with Draft Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders etc. apply within the Armthorpe</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Natural England, together with the Environment Agency, English Heritage and Forestry Commission has published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans and development proposals. This is available at: http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/PDF/GEHO0212BWAZ-E-E.pdf</p> <p>Local environmental record centres hold a range of information on the natural environment. A list of local records centre is available at: http://www.nbn-nfbr.org.uk/nfbr.php</p> <p><u>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening</u> It is our advice, on the basis of the material supplied with the consultation, that, in so far as our strategic environmental interests (including but not limited to statutory designated sites, landscapes and protected species, geology and soils) are concerned, that there are unlikely to be significant environmental effects from the proposed plan. The Parish Council should however seek their own legal guidance on the application of the SEA Directive and take into account the responses of other statutory consultees at the screening stage, before making a decision on the requirement to prepare an SEA.</p> <p><u>Local Wildlife Sites</u> As advised previously and in accordance with paragraph 117 of the National Planning Policy Framework – the neighbourhood plan’s proposals map should identify locally designated wildlife sites, including the woodland wildlife site within the employment allocation which extends Westmoor Park (this site has been preserved within the approved planning permission). We note and welcome the inclusion of Local Sites in your Proposals Map but advise that the shading used to identify Local Wildlife Sites makes identifying them difficult, this is particularly true of New Close Wood which is almost entirely hidden by the much stronger “Employment – with permission” and “Environment Agency Flood Zone 3” layers.</p> | <p>points out.</p> <p>Natural England must also be consulted about a screening opinion as to whether or not a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is required to be undertaken regarding the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Plan. Natural England’s advice is that an SEA is not required in this instance as there are unlikely to be significant environmental effects from the proposals in the Draft Armthorpe Neighbourhood Plan. Natural England, do, however, qualify their Screening Opinion by suggesting that Armthorpe PC seek their own legal guidance on the application of the SEA directive having also taken into account the other statutory consultees’ Screening Opinions. The Screening Opinion should, of course, be taken into account before Armthorpe Parish Council make a decision on the requirement to prepare an SEA. <i>Armthorpe Parish Council accepts the advice of Natural England and will seek legal guidance as to whether or not an SEA is required in connection with the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Plan.</i></p> | <p>Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>Armthorpe Parish Council/Doncaster MBC to seek legal guidance as to whether or not an SEA is required in connection with the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Plan.</p> |
|---|--|---|

Protected species

You should consider whether your plan has any impacts on protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced standing advice to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected or Biodiversity Action Plan species should they be identified as an issue. The standing advice also sets out when, following receipt of survey information, you should undertake further consultation with Natural England.

[Natural England Standing Advice](#)

Humberhead Levels Nature Improvement Area

We note that the Plan area lies adjacent to the Humberhead Levels Nature Improvement Area (NIA). NIA's can provide a focal point for creating more and better-connected habitats. Where housing allocations are proposed in the environs of NIAs the potential to contribute to habitat enhancement should be considered. Further information on the Humberhead Levels NIA please see our website:

<http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/ourwork/conservation/biodiversity/funding/niaprojects/humberhead.aspx>

Opportunities for enhancing the natural environment

Neighbourhood plans and proposals may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment, use natural resources more sustainably and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature.

Opportunities to incorporate features into new build or retro fitted buildings which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes should also be considered as part of any new development proposal.

For any queries relating to this consultation please contact Merlin Ash on 0300 060 4271 or by email at merlin.ash@naturalengland.org.uk. For all other correspondence, please email consultations@naturalengland.org.uk, or if it is not possible to consult by

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>email, please send to the above address.</p> | | |
| <p>MR. I. GRIFFIN OF MLA FOR MR. P. LODGE</p> <p>In response to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan we would like to make the following comments on behalf of the landowner of Sites 513 and 514</p> <p>Scoring Matrix</p> <p>The scoring details for the site selection process were only released on the 12th March 2014, following the initial enquiry on the 5th February 2014. We would argue this has not left sufficient time for interrogation and the consultation period should be extended.</p> <p>In spite of this, we have undertaken an initial review and are still not satisfied with the explanation of how the chosen sites have been selected following the initial scoring exercise.</p> <p>Furthermore, the scoring exercise, particularly in relation to sites 513 and 514 is incorrect. Site 514 is not at risk of flooding and therefore the scores should be amended to reflect this. This change in itself will take site 514 to a score of 5 – the second highest of all the sites. Although we appreciate the change to the flood map occurred at the outset of the consultation period, our consultants JBA who are recognised experts in local flood risk and drainage, wrote letters dated 25th March 2013 and 21st October 2013 to highlight their strong views. Further consultation was undertaken by the EA themselves who will have advised you of the position in the early part of this year. The flood risk position as outlined for site 514 is therefore factually incorrect. Any consultation responses received as part of this consultation should therefore be treated as null and void, given the perception that both sites 513 and 514 are undeliverable, particularly in the context of the recent flooding that</p> | <p><i>The Parish Council accepts that the site selection and assessment methodology should be publicised for a further period of consultation.</i></p> <p><i>The Parish Council acknowledges that the site selection methodology was not fully explained and a further period of consultation about the methodology was a proper course of action. In addition, the Parish Council has used another site selection methodology which will now be consulted upon for a period of six weeks.</i></p> <p><i>This revised information about flood risk has been made available to the Borough Council during the consultation period on the Draft ANP. It is therefore only reasonable to include the updated FRA as part of a second period of consultation on the Draft Plan.</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council will organise a further period of consultation and will include in the consultation the latest information available.</p> |

has affected the south of England.

We also fail to understand how the costs of infrastructure can be deemed uncertain and thus attract a negative score. We have provided a cost consultant view of the costs of providing the estate road, which will form the final link to the wider bypass solution – email dated 22nd March 2013 from Rex Procter & Partners. We are therefore unsure what further information you require to remove the ‘uncertainty’. We did ask in our email of 18th April 2013 (as well as others) whether the Steering Group had any queries, to which we have received no response. As you know from the detailed representations we have submitted to date, we have undertaken significant due diligence including full masterplanning, topographical surveys, flood risk assessments, transport assessment and highways studies, full ecological surveys as well as detailed archaeological surveys which have included geo physical surveys. This full and extensive package of works means there is little uncertainty in relation to infrastructure costs or the deliverability of the site.

We have further concerns that the scoring has been incorrectly assessed to the benefit of some sites. Why for example does site 422 benefit from two positive scores under local considerations – benefits to Armthorpe? There appears to be positive scores for both the extension to allotments and also public open space – all items which have been referenced as part of the promotion of sites 513 and 514, which only sees a positive score in relation to the provision of the bypass. It is also our view that the scoring is too crude for the allocation of sites; that some of the items should have a higher weighting than others, particularly in relation to the deliverability of sites.

The scoring matrix suggests that site 513 and 514 are ‘not supported’ which again attracts a negative score. It is unclear whether any negative consultation responses

The infrastructure information was supplied to DMBC in the beginning rather than the Parish Council. The Parish Council will now include reference to it in the further consultation on the Draft ANP.

26 objections were made to the further submissions by Mr. Griffin (MLA) on behalf of Mr. Lodge after

were received in relation to the sites and would ask for sight of these. It is unlikely that many responses at all were received due to the lack of any reference to sites 513 and 514 in the pre regulation draft which was released in August 2013. It is our strong view that no views were likely expressed and that the scoring should reflect a neutral score. This is further backed up by the responses received to the public consultation event that was held for sites 513 and 514 on the 5th March 2014. The full details for the site were published on www.armthorpebypass.com and this information was publicised via posters around the village as well as social media and mobile trailers circulating the village on the day. The event received a healthy number of attendees as per the separate report we have produced to summarise the day.

This event was undertaken due to the lack of information available to the people of Armthorpe on all the possible development sites, or background information on the sites. The decision was therefore taken to publicise the information in relation to sites 513 and 514 and hold a consultation event to ensure that the electorate can respond to the Parish Council's consultation exercise / make an informed decision.

The general feedback was that most attendees thought a bypass through an additional road around Armthorpe would help to alleviate transport issues in the village. However most did not support development of the whole allocation of Armthorpe's housing numbers to the south of the village. Consequently, we will be concentrating our focus on site 514 to the east of Nutwell Lane, in response to the feedback received from local people.

Other general comments

We do not wish to repeat the contents of the letter from Gordons solicitors to the consultation process on behalf of the promoters of land 170, 525, 596, 513 and

the consultation event arranged on behalf of Mr. Lodge by his agents. It remains to be seen whether a further period of six weeks of consultation will attract a different level of support for Mr. Lodge's proposal.

The Parish Council cannot agree that due process has not been followed by it in preparing and consulting on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. Indeed, this has been confirmed that Mrs. Jane Stimpson on behalf of the Borough Council. However, the Council regrets that the publication of the sites assessment and selection procedure was later in the six week consultation period than intended.

514. However, we must make it clear that we do not feel that due process has been followed, either through the timing of and the result of the screening opinion of the Strategic Environmental Assessment, nor the scoring for the sites as released on 12th March or the process involved. We have made repeated attempts to engage with the Parish Council and the Steering Group which have been met with refusal despite meetings being set up with the promoters of sites 422 and 474 to discuss these sites in more detail.

Nutwell South – armthorpebypass.com – Consultation Summary

A consultation event was held from 2-7pm on Wednesday 5th March 2014 to promote the site known as Nutwell South (to the south of the village, off Nutwell Lane), and highlight the choice that exists for the people of Armthorpe as part of the Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan.

The event was advertised with signs throughout the village, word of mouth, social media, leaflet dropping and signage promoting the website www.armthorpebypass.com which contained details of the event. On the day, trailers were driven around the village promoting the event. The event was very well attended with c. 140 attendees visiting to see the plans and pass comment.

The attendees were asked whether they supported a bypass. The majority of those who left comments did (37 of 51 comments – 72.5%). There were a number who supported the principle of development to the south of the village, and the below summarises the key messages from those in support and also those who did not support the proposals:

- The bypass will help alleviate some congestion in the village, however the FARRRS relief road will also assist and mean a lot of people travelling from Rossington will no longer need to travel through the village to Junction 4 of the M18.
- The bypass was the common theme of support for the site
- Most villagers were not aware that a choice existed for potential allocations in the village

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of villagers were confused by the conflict of the outdated Neighbourhood Plan flood map to the up to date version on show at the consultation event. • People felt that the development of 700-800 units to the south of the village was too much • Numerous views were expressed to spread the impact of development on the village to both north and south • Some thought that the existing infrastructure to the north of the village meant development should be weighted in that direction. • Concerns in relation to settlement coalescence with Old Cantley <p>Early views expressed showed a lack of support for all development to the south of the village (Site A and B on the accommodation schedule plan on show at the event). As such, discussion on the split of housing between the north and south of the village (500 to the north with a significant green bund, and 300 units to the south, with the completion of the relief road) generated a far more positive response, from those who resided at either end of the village.</p> <p>In conclusion, the promoters of Nutwell South will be taking on board the overriding consensus of opinion from the consultation event and will focus plans for development on the eastern side of Nutwell Lane, allowing the completion of the relief road up through the Ikea business park. This will provide a credible option for the Neighbourhood Plan to deliver the housing numbers for the village over the period of the Local Plan.</p> | | |
| <p>DAVID LOCK ASSOCIATES</p> <p>I write on behalf of my client O&H Properties Ltd. (O&H) in response to Armthorpe Parish Council's consultation on the <i>Draft Armthorpe Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan</i>.</p> <p><u>Background to the representations</u></p> <p>O&H are a long term stakeholder in Armthorpe and are the freehold owners of the Land to the West of Hatfield Lane.</p> <p>O&H have a strong record of developing sites in a sustainable way to bring forward residential led mixed use development at varying scales. For example, in</p> | <p><i>The APC welcomes the support of O&H Properties for the proposal in the Draft Armthorpe NP for residential development West of Hatfield Lane.</i></p> | <p>No action required by the Parish Council.</p> |

the role of master developer, O&H have delivered the development a series of thriving village communities to the south of Peterborough, Cambridgeshire, collectively know as The Hamptons, which is widely acknowledged as an exemplar residential project. As the development of The Hamptons continues, O&H's role has evolved so that the company retains responsibility for delivering the long term governance and stewardship of the new community.

O&H also has significant experience of bringing forward the sustainable development of mixed used sites of a similar size to Land to the West of Hatfield Lane around Bedford and within Buckinghamshire.

O&H's preferred methodology for development is to utilise master planning expertise to bring forward open spaces, infrastructure and facilities in a coordinated way drawing upon established partnerships with selected house-builder organisations to deliver high quality residential environments.

O&H welcome the continued opportunity to engage with Armthorpe Parish Council and are keen to contribute to consultation on the *Draft Armthorpe Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan* in order to help the Parish Council bring forward a collective vision for the future of the village focused upon an agreed set of priorities for delivering sustainable development.

O&H are generally supportive of the *Draft Armthorpe Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan* and hope that the following comments will assist and support Armthorpe Parish Council in the shared aim of ensuring that the plan is robust and can be considered sound by the Independent Inspector upon examination.

- Providing open space in a location which relates well to existing facilities in Edenthorpe, enhancing the existing provision.
- The site relates well to existing local services and facilities within the village centre. This is important as it will ensure that local schools and community facilities can be accessed through walking and cycling, minimising the use of the private car as a means of transport.
- The development will provide a new green wedge in line with Policy ANP34. The provision of a green wedge is a key component for the development of the site and it is envisioned that the green wedge could provide the following:
 - A new landscaped varied parkland edge to Armthorpe responding to the existing landscape character to the north of the village. The green wedge will also be a key visual feature defining views from the A18 and working to establish the character of the northern edge of the village.
 - The green wedge will provide land for new sports and recreation

- o facilities which would be accessible from existing residential areas and overlooked by new residential dwellings.
- o The green wedge will provide a new landscaped setting for walking routes which connect to existing pedestrian routes from Armthorpe.
- o The green wedge could be designed to retain important views into and out of the village.
- o The green wedge will ensure that coalescence between the northern edge of Armthorpe and the eastern edge of Edenthorpe is prevented, providing a permanent green settlement boundary to Armthorpe whilst completing the northern settlement edge of the village.

O&H are committed to utilising their experience and expertise to bring forward sustainable growth to deliver new houses, facilities and services through the development of Land to the West of Hatfield Lane.

Proposed amendments

Whilst O&H are generally supportive of the general principles contained within the Neighbourhood Plan and the overall strategy for growth, there a few areas where clarifications and amendments are considered necessary to make the Plan robust and correctly reflect national and local planning policy.

As currently drafted O&H **object** to the particular points set out below and seek amendments on the following issues:

- Policy ANP11 - Affordable Housing requirements to ensure conformity with Policy CS12 of the Doncaster Core Strategy 2011 — 2028.
- The Armthorpe Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Proposals Map & Plan OHB027 — 003 shown at Appendix 3.

Affordable Housing

Whilst O&H are generally supportive of the *Draft Armthorpe Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan* and are encouraged by the progress that has been made to develop policies that will support the long term sustainable growth of the village, in order to ensure that the emerging plan can be considered to be consistent and compliant with the adopted local plan for Doncaster and national planning policy. O&H, object to the wording of policy ANP7 which relates to the proposed general requirements for affordable housing in Armthorpe and concerned that this is not reflected in the wording of Policy ANP11 of the *Draft Armthorpe Parish Council Neighbourhood Development Plan* and suggest that wording more akin to that of the Doncaster Core Strategy would be more appropriate.

The Parish Council notes the comments made by O&H about the wording of ANP7 and ANP11. However, the Council feels that the wording does reflect the wording of Policy CS12 of the Doncaster Core Strategy (KB to check).

Further consideration to be given to the wording of Policies ANP7 and ANP11 to ensure that these policies do reflect the wording of Policy CS12 of the Doncaster Core Strategy.

It is essential that the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan is in conformity with the Doncaster Core Strategy and its strategic policies. As currently worded, particularly in respect of ANP11, the document fails to be in conformity with Policy CS12 and therefore O&H propose that the wording of Policy ANP11 at Point 1 be amended to read as follows:

A proportion of affordable housing should be provided on site in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Doncaster Council Core Strategy 2011-2028 with the proportion, type and tenure split reflecting the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment except where a developer can justify an alternative scheme in the interests of Viability.

O&H are certain that the issues described within this letter could be overcome through minor amendment to Policies ANP7 and ANP11 as outlined above. The suggested amendments will ensure that the policies more accurately reflect Policy CS12 Doncaster Council Core Strategy 2011-2028 by outlining that the needs for affordable housing will be balanced against the viability of development schemes on a case-by-case and up-to-date basis so that affordable housing can be phased, deferred or reduced as necessary to ensure viability.

Armthorpe Parish Neighbourhood Plan Proposals Map and Appendix 3

O&H have examined the Armthorpe Parish Neighbourhood Plan Proposals Map (Appendix 1) and plan OHB027-003 provided at Appendix 3. O&H would like to highlight that there are a few discrepancies with the plans as set out below:

a) Appendix 3 (plan ref: OHB027-003) - there is a minor discrepancy between the land identified as '*extent of housing site*' and the line shown as '084H extent of Development'. This plan has now been superseded and in collaboration with the Parish Council the extent of the green wedge / housing site has now been agreed. The plan included at Appendix 3 was only intended to be for illustrative purposes and there is a risk that the information it shows could cause confusion.

b) O&H also note that the plan shown at Appendix 3 is not consistent with the Armthorpe Parish Neighbourhood Plan Proposals Map shown at Appendix 1 in regards to Land to the West of Hatfield Lane. The area of land identified as a housing site on the Proposals Map exceeds the area of land shown on the plan at Appendix 3. O&H can confirm that the extent of land shown on the Proposals Map (Appendix 1) is accurate and that the plan at Appendix 3 has been superseded. As noted in a) above the plan used at Appendix 3 was prepared for illustrative purposes, and in conjunction with the Parish Council, an agreed extent for the housing site has now been determined which is correctly reflected in Appendix 1.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>O&H have actively engaged with the Parish Council in an effort to resolve the issues relating to Appendix 3 and remain concerned that these inconsistencies have not been rectified. To reflect the collaborative work to date with the Parish Council, O&H consider that it is important to ensure that the correct representation of the proposals is published in the public arena to ensure that there is no confusion as to the extent and disposition of the green wedge and built development extent.</p> <p>I enclose plan OHB027 — 004 Rev A which accurately shows the extent of land required and in the interests of clarity, O&H suggest that this plan should replace the plan currently shown at Appendix 3 to ensure that it demonstrates the joined up working that has taken place to</p> | | |
| <p>J. & M. PANKS</p> <p>When was the last time anybody actually, physically, counted how many new properties have been built in Armthorpe over the last two decades? There are countless new dwellings; small town houses, blocks of flats, flats over shops, several entire new estates. There are yet more flats to be built over more shops on Doncaster Road in the near future. The village has increased immeasurably over the last several years, with little increase in amenities. The roads are busier, often at a standstill at peak periods.</p> <p>The estate on the old pit site is a prime example of why NOT to build other huge housing estates anywhere in the village. Some would describe it as a mixture of 'individual dwellings'. I would say that it is a rabbit warren of hotch-potch dwellings. The properties, as with all new ones, are too close together giving very little garden space and certainly no privacy. There is insufficient parking space for the accepted two-car family. Streets are narrow and twisting. There is little or no space for children to safely play, since there is so little garden space for them. Yes, there is at least one play area - but in this current climate, how many parents will allow their children to go there? I know of several people (including serving Police Officers) who live on that estate and wish they had never seen it. There are several areas which are getting run-down (often due to properties</p> | <p>This response identifies a number of issues including large scale development in Armthorpe in recent years; insufficient facilities such as open space; loss of a view over countryside; and concerns about increased traffic flows and congestion along Hatfield Lane. Mr. Panks concludes by supporting the selection of land adjacent to Sainsbury's at Edenthorpe instead of land east and west of Hatfield Lane.</p> <p><i>While some of these matters are capable of being addressed in the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, such as sites for a new primary school, others are the responsibility of say DMBC as Highway Authority who, for example, may require highway improvements in order to</i></p> | <p>The Council to continue discussions with developers about additional school facilities.</p> <p>Regarding highway issues, the Parish Council will also continue to discuss them with the DMBC Highway Authority in an attempt to find solutions.</p> |

being let out rather than owner occupied) there is noise, there are drugs problems and general dissatisfaction. This often happens on new estates, and residents are left in a position whereby they cannot afford to move out but are miserable staying on.

Now you are looking at putting similar properties on the land behind Mercel Avenue and Fernbank Drive/Holly Dene. These are rural aspect areas; families spent a fortune in hard-earned money years ago buying properties here because of that very rural aspect. It is quiet. It is peaceful. It is relatively trouble-free. There are lovely views to be had, it's like being a part of the countryside. If the plans go ahead, we will be forced into a similar situation as the pit site. I am well aware that extra housing is needed in general, but surely these huge estates are not the answer. Some of the properties on the pit site were built for around £250k. I know somebody who recently struggled to sell one such house, which finally went for £180K - and that took over 18 months to sell! People who have that sort of money don't come to live in a village like Armthorpe. If they do they split up as a family, lose their jobs, struggle financially and then the houses and estates start to see the consequences. New estates eventually bring trouble and we don't need either.

The resources also need to be considered. Wear and tear on the roads and footpaths - badly worn/flooded footpaths and roads with pot holes are reported on a very regular basis and not repaired now. There will be far more wear and tear with extra traffic. The doctors surgeries, the dental surgery, the schools, the post office etc. There will be disruption to enable gas, electricity and water services to these sites and I have heard it said that the current water treatment plant is at capacity already.

To add to it all, the plans also show proposed access roads on Hatfield Lane to each of the two new planned estates. Great. Have you seen the traffic problems at this point already? Several hundred

accommodate additional residential development. Regarding the alternative residential site adjacent to the Sainsbury's store at Edenthorpe, the Parish Council, having looked at the options carefully, has selected the sites either side of Hatfield Lane to provide the dwellings needed in the Plan period up to 2028.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>extra people trying to gain access to these estates is going to provide unimaginably extra pressure. These sites are not viable, not practical and certainly not fair on the nearby residents and the village as a whole.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider building on these sites. There is a huge plot of empty land adjacent to the Sainsbury store in Edenthorpe. Armthorpe is full, thank you.</p> | | |
| <p>S. COATES (CHAIRMAN OF GOVERNORS OF SOUTHFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL)</p> <p>I write in my capacity as the Chair of the Governing Body of Armthorpe Southfield Primary School to comment upon the Draft Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan - January 2014 as part of the current consultation period.</p> <p>In the Plan, Policy ANP26 requires developers to meet the requirements for new and additional education facilities brought about by the need for increased provision, resulting from their residential development.</p> <p>Policy ANP27 provides for the building of either a one form entry school and/or a two form entry school on the housing allocation sites set out in Policy ANP1.</p> <p>As Armthorpe Parish Council has been made aware, on 5th July 2013 the Cabinet of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council agreed to implement the proposals made in a Report titled 'Additional School Places'. This report can be found at - http://www.doncaster.gov.uk/db/chamber/.%5Creports%5Cr6%20ADDITIONAL%20SCHOOL%20PLACES.doc</p> <p>This Report highlighted a projected major shortfall of available school places in Armthorpe between the years of 2014 and 2018. To</p> | <p>Mr. Coates has responded as Chair of the governing body at Southfield Primary School, expressing his concern about overcrowding at the school. Developers, in seeking permission for additional housing, will be required to contribute to the extra school places required either by paying a community infrastructure levy or a similar contribution under Section 106 of the Planning Act. Temporary classrooms, while not ideal, may provide an acceptable short-term answer.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council fully agrees that there is a shortage of school places in Armthorpe and possible sites at either West or East of Hatfield Lane are being considered in discussions with land owners / developers.</i></p> | <p>The Council to continue to discuss the provision of additional school places with developers.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>address this problem, the Report recommended the remodelling and expansion of Armthorpe Southfield Primary School commencing in the financial year 2014/2015 to create an additional 210 school places to be funded by the local authority.</p> <p>Please can you confirm whether Armthorpe Parish Council, subject to planning approval, supports the recommended remodelling and expansion of Armthorpe Southfield Primary School and acknowledges that the provisions of Policy ANP26 and Policy ANP27 in the Draft Armthorpe Neighbourhood Development Plan - January 2014 will not realistically be delivered in sufficient time to alleviate the projected shortage of available school places for Armthorpe between the years of 2014 and 2018.</p> <p>If Armthorpe Parish Council does not support the recommended remodelling and expansion of Armthorpe Southfield Primary School please confirm how it proposes that the projected shortfall of available school places in Armthorpe between the years of 2014 and 2018 will be addressed.</p> | | |
| <p>H & K TIDMARSH</p> <p>My husband & I live on Fair Holme View, at the very back of the estate, with our garden backing onto the farmer's field & the M18 beyond that. We have been interested in the proposals for development around the area since moving in 5 years ago, when neighbours told us of possible plans to extend the 'Ikea' area industrial units into the field behind our house.</p> <p>We have therefore had a good look at the development proposals & plan maps on the Parish Council website. We notice a large area on the main proposals map coloured brown & marked 'Employment - with permission' on the key (between the Fair Holme View estate & the M18). This is a vast area & according to the map, comes right up to the boundary with our housing estate with no sign of a Green</p> | <p>Mr and Mrs. Tidmarsh are concerned about the large employment site between the Fairholme View Estate and the M18 and the lack of a Green Wedge between their house and the employment uses. They are also concerned about “an Armthorpe bypass and a rumoured housing development at Nutwell South”.</p> <p><i>There is indeed an area with planning permission for employment uses, the permission having been granted on 29th</i></p> | <p>No action to be taken by the Parish Council in preparing the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> |

Wedge as is shown around other developments. We have read the proposals document & nowhere does it explain, or even mention, what this 'Employment - with permission' area means, or could be. Could you please clarify for us what is being considered for that area, & why it is not documented in the proposals document? We are also interested to know whether, if industrial use is approved for that area, there will be a Green Wedge between us & the development, as has been specified as a requirement for the new housing & employment sites elsewhere in the village? We certainly hope there would be, as at the moment we enjoy views over the fields & we would definitely object to a development immediately behind our back windows.

As of today, we also have a query regarding an 'Armthorpe bypass' & a rumoured housing development at 'Nutwell South'. We have noticed banners along the fields along Nutwell Lane which mention the bypass & have today received an anonymous flier through the door (typed & printed in appalling English & haphazard layout - therefore not an official document at all). This flier is titled 'Say No to Armthorpe Bypass' & states there is a proposal for a housing development at Nutwell South which would require an Armthorpe bypass. The flier is clearly in objection to this 'plan' & keeps quoting 'Farmer Phil' (presumably the land owner) as being biased in favour of the development. Until now we had heard nothing about such a development & having read the Development Plan proposal document, we are very confused! There is no mention of any such plan for a housing development on that site or a bypass road. In fact the proposals map shows the area in question as a Countryside Policy Protection Area. The flier we (& presumably all other local residents) have received calls for us to voice our concerns at 'the meeting on 05.03.2014 in the community centre' (which is not mentioned on the proposals document as an actual event), or to email. At the moment we are concerned that our country lane is being blighted by farmer's wagons bearing huge white banners about a bypass we know nothing about, & that our doormat is being littered

April 2014. The site was previously supported by another Planning Inspector who, in 2012 conducted an Inquiry into the proposed mixed area of housing and employment uses east of Hatfield Lane. The Inspector, in 2012, while sympathetic to the proposed development, refused planning permission for both the residential and employment development since to grant planning permission would have prejudiced the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, the Inspector said he was in favour of both the residential and employment development and this is now a key factor in determining what will happen on the East of Hatfield Lane site.

Regarding housing development at Nutwell Lane, the land owner in that area has, indeed, publicised a proposed housing development bordered by Nutwell Lane and the M18. The proposal also includes a bypass parallel to the M18 and linking with the A630 and Junction 4 M18.

This proposal is an alternative to the Armthorpe Parish Council's preferred option which is development East and West of Hatfield Lane as published in the Draft ANP. This alternative proposal must now be evaluated by the

Armthorpe PC to review this alternative proposal at Nutwell Lane.

The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>by appalling anonymous fliers about seemingly fictional housing developments & bypass roads!! We will certainly appreciate your clarification on whether there is a proposed housing plan for Nutwell South, & / or a bypass road, & if so, why this isn't included in the development plan or we haven't been otherwise informed. If there is no such plan, we would be keen to know who is scaremongering the local community & why - someone must have got this idea from somewhere.</p> <p>We look forward to your response, & would like to request that our comments above are shared as part of the consultation process into the proposals.</p> <p>Thank you in anticipation,</p> | <p><i>Parish Council with the assistance of DMBC as Highway and Planning Authority.</i></p> | <p>should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>H. & C. ROWLAND</p> <p>We have today received a flyer through our door regarding the intention to build a bypass linking Nutwell lane presumably to the motorway. We have recently moved in to the area (Nov 2013, Fiddlers Drive). Part of the attraction of our property was the field to the back of our house. Having undertaken searches on our surrounding fields we understood this site was not earmarked for developments and had no planning permission approved.</p> <p>Subsequently we understand this is now highlighted as an area for potential development and understandably we are concerned. Also to hear the possibility of a bypass being built near this area causes further concern. Mainly for noise issues, of which we can already noticeably hear the m18, introducing more roads linking these would increase this drastically. As well as affecting the surrounding countryside to the area.</p> <p>We would like to formally notify you of our objection to these plans, and voice our thoughts that any housing development would be</p> | <p>Mr. and Mrs. Rowland object to the proposal to build a bypass linking Nutwell Lane to the M18 and develop the land between Nutwell Lane and the M18 for housing purposes as part of the scheme. Mr. and Mrs. Rowland's grounds of objection are to do with noise and increased impact on the environment which such a development would cause. This development proposed by the land owners adjacent to Nutwell Lane south is contrary to the proposals of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council must now evaluate these proposals in the</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>better placed on other marked sites in Armthorpe, which are already located close to amenities and road links. Minimising disruption and increased impact on the environment and surroundings.</p> <p>We would appreciate a response that our concern has been noted and ask for an update on these plans and the proposals/process going forward.</p> | <p><i>context of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. The proposals, (minus the bypass), were previously evaluated by the Armthorpe Parish Council and rejected in favour of land at east and west of Hatfield Lane. The Armthorpe Parish Council will work with DMBC to consider highway and planning issues raised by the Nutwell Lane south proposal.</i></p> | <p>different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>J. LOCKLEY</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposal of Phil Lodge to build a bypass and houses at Nutwell South Armthorpe. The plans already submitted to develop Hatfield Lane are more suitable because the infrastructure of roads etc. are already in place.</p> | <p>Mrs. Lockley strongly objects to the proposal to build a bypass and houses at Nutwell Lane south and feels that the plans to develop land at Hatfield Lane are more suitable because the infrastructure, especially roads, are already there.</p> <p><i>Armthorpe Parish Council must now consider the merits of this alternative development package in the context of the Draft ANP. In preparing the Draft ANP, the PC has already expressed its preference for sites at West and East of Hatfield Lane.</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP. |
| <p>T. GRIX I would like to voice my and other people`s concerns over a meeting held yesterday at the armthorpe community centre on the subject of building housing on the land to the south of nutwell and fiddlers drive. The meeting was held by our local farmer and property developers who want to develop the land by bribing locals with the promise of a bypass to relieve traffic through the village. As I understand, it has been agreed by the LPC and with consultations with locals that housing should go ahead on land to the north of the village at the Grange farm area, one of the reasons being that the infrastructure is already there. Can you ease our concerns over this issue and that the LPC will not allow their decisions to be overruled by greedy property developers. I am told that the farmer has already put hoardings up on nutwell lane advertising the bypass to drum up support.</p> | <p>Mr. Grix objects to the proposed bypass and associated residential development at Nutwell Lane south on the grounds that to the North of Armthorpe East and West of Hatfield Lane, already has the necessary infrastructure. He also points out that the North of the village was agreed for large scale development, in line with consultation responses from locals.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council has chosen East and West of Hatfield Lane following an evaluation of the alternatives, one of which was land at Nutwell Lane South. The availability, nor not, of infrastructure costs of the alternatives, was one of the considerations.</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>C. WALTON I strongly contest the building on "nutwell south" and the alledged</p> | <p>Cheryl Walton opposes building at</p> | <p>The Parish Council</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>bypass to be built. Land off hatfield lane is far more suitable with transport links already in place.</p> | <p>Nutwell Lane south and including the bypass proposed by potential developers. She goes on to express her preference for land at Hatfield Lane which has existing transport links.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council welcomes the support for East and West Hatfield Lane</i></p> | <p>welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>MR. & MRS. BELL Having attended the local meeting regarding the " ARMTHORPE BY-PASS " we wish to voice our concern about the proposal.</p> <p>In our view it is only the local FARMERS plans to sell is land and open up the area to HOUSING DEVELOPEMENT , and in doing so undermine the work done so far by the PARISH COUNCIL.</p> | <p>Mr. and Mrs. Bell express their concern about the Armthorpe bypass and associated housing development which they see as undermining the Parish Council’s work so far. They also feel building the bypass would increase traffic flow from Cantley to junction 4.</p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>It would also vastly increase traffic flow from the CANTLEY side as an easy access to the M18 JUNCTION 4 .</p> | <p>The Parish Council shares the respondents' concern about increased traffic flows from Cantley to Junction 4 of the M18.</p> | <p>course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>S. STRAY I am writing to you to raise concerns about the proposed plan to build on the Nutwell South site at Armthorpe. Indeed I wish to strongly oppose this plan!</p> <p>I moved to my home, on Mulberry Way, on the outskirts of the village, where I back onto beautiful woodland and fields, with a promise of a protected environment. Tranmoor Wood is a site of Special Scientific Interest and is lapped by fields. I have seen Deer, Foxes, Owls Rabbits and Squirrels and a whole array of birds and wildlife in this area. I do feel very privileged to have this on my doorstep and feel it is my duty to protect it for future generations to enjoy! The here and now, money grabbing land owners seem to disregard this. I guess they will take the cash and move to pastures greener....while we are</p> | <p>Mrs. Stray strongly opposes the proposal to build at Nutwell Lane south and instead she supports the proposed sites West and East of Hatfield Lane. She feels this would mean a reduced impact from the additional housing put forward in the plan.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council welcomes the support for the proposed housing development to be sited at the north of Armthorpe (West and East of Hatfield Lane) and the rejection of Nutwell Lane</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look</p> |

| | | |
|--|----------------------|--|
| <p>left in a concrete jungle! So I am begging you to please fight against this injustice.</p> <p>Armthorpe was a village when I first moved here.....42 years ago...and its expanded in every direction. Doncaster is wanting City status and no doubt Armthorpe will soon be a town!</p> <p>I was reassured by the plan to add housing to the site on the North of Armthorpe (if we really do have to have more housing)as this would hopefully not impact as badly on the already heavy traffic through the village, as town traffic would hopefully take the route up the slip road to Wheatley Hall Road or onto the M18 to access other areas of Doncaster. These roads are better designed to cope with the heavy traffic that such a huge increase in residents would produce. Also, the centre of Armthorpe is very busy with everyone using Morrison's, whereas access to the slip road from Mere Lane which has been in place, but not usable, for years would maybe mean there would be more people heading to Sainsbury's/ Tesco.</p> <p>I am sure many of the older people who live in the bungalows along Parkway and Ladycroft Road, who have backed onto fields all these years, would not welcome their view being blocked or their peace being disturbed. Unfortunately, many may struggle to fight against it as the Map online is very unclear as to where this building plan will take affect.</p> <p>The plans I looked at did not really detail roads and were not specific enough and they clearly show flood plains along the fields at Nutwell....which surely cannot be suddenly disregarded. Indeed if these areas are built on and flooding suddenly starts to occur in this area or the surrounding housing....the Doncaster Council will surely be at fault for allowing this to go ahead?!</p> <p>I am sure with all the planning that has already taken shape for the North of the Village that this is the prime location for all expansion.</p> | <p><i>South.</i></p> | <p>again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
|--|----------------------|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Please do not allow any planning to go ahead on the Nutwell Site. | | |
| <p>D. LOVEGROVE I am writing to you to say that I am totally opposed to the building of 450 houses on the Nutwell South site.</p> <p>My reasons for opposing this plan are as set out below:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The building of these houses will greatly increase the traffic flow through Armthorpe by people using this route as a “Rat Run”. The building of a by-pass will not affect the extra traffic generated by this development. 2. The land, on which these houses are planned to be built, contains some high voltage cables. These are subject to a disagreement as to whether or not they radiate a magnetic field, which can damage people’s health that are living near these cables. 3. When I purchased this house in 1975, all the residents were assured at the time by the Planning Authorities, that the land, which is subject to the current planning application, would not be developed because it was a designated “Green Field” site and because of the High Voltage cables. <p>I hope that this helpful.</p> | <p>Mr. Lovegrove is opposed to building 150 houses at the Nutwell south site for the following reasons;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the increased traffic generated through Armthorpe; 2. concerns about magnetic radiation from the high voltage lines which may damage peoples’ health, 3. Nutwell south proposal is contrary to assurances that the land would not be developed because it was designated a Green Field. <p><i>The Parish Council is to reassess the Site Allocations in response to criticism by developers about the Armthorpe Neighbourhood Plan methodology. The Parish Council shares the concern about increased traffic arising from the residential development proposed in Armthorpe. Concerns about possible magnetic radiations are not proven as yet but may, nevertheless, be a material consideration in planning decisions.</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>A. LILLY I live on the Lings in Armthorpe (can provide full address if required) and I would like to object to building at Nutwell South as I agree that, evan with a bypass the volume of traffic would increase through</p> | Mrs. Lilly objects to the proposed development at Nutwell south because of the likely increase in traffic through | The Parish Council welcomes the support for |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Armthorpe village and heading the other way through Cantley etc both of these areas are congested enough at peak times and even getting through Armthorpe at anytime during the day and on a Saturday is already a nightmare.</p> | <p>Armthorpe and Cantley and the resulting congestion.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council agrees that traffic congestion will very likely increase as a result of developing Nutwell Lane.</i></p> | <p>development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>T. COOKE it has come to my attention that Phil Lodge is trying to trick Armthorpe villagers into opting for Nutwell South [HIS SITE] to build the housing estate on his land!! Rather than the Grange Farm estate, which makes most sense regarding access etc. Also, why was he allowed to create a website saying he will build a by-pass, since when was he anything to do with planning or highways. he, s a farmer who obviously wants to make a lot of money out of it.</p> | <p>T. Cooke is critical of the Nutwell South site owned by Mr. Lodge. Instead T. Cooke prefers the Grange Farm estate which he claims makes most sense regarding access and so on. T. Cooke is also critical of the estimated reduction in traffic of 40% which Mr. Lodge claims will arise if the bypass part of</p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>As far as the traffic problems in Armthorpe, he says that the by pass will reduce traffic by 40%,this is according to his own basic suveys, again, not planning or highways.</p> <p>It is also claimedthat all this PROPOSED building will have no effect on wildlife, or the shrinking greenfield sites that will be left.</p> <p>What Phil Lodge has failed to mention is that by building another 450 houses on Nutwell the traffic will increase on Nutwell Lane and through the village,or these days it's more like a small busy town, getting busier and busier, especially with another 450 houses, Years ago when it was first built, Nutwell Lane was just that, a lane, at peak times it;s more like a motorway now!!</p> <p>There is already a by pass under construction on the M18 to the airport/Rossington, which will ease some of the traffic through the village,but what is the need to build a by pass in Armthorpe, if there is already one being built ??</p> <p>Building on Nutwell South will not only affect the residents closest to the PROPOSED site,but also the rest of Armthorpe too,as our primary schools are already full. Along with the Doctors, Dentist too,however, we have seen no plans to make improvements to any of these essential services.</p> <p>The line has to be drawn somewhere and we need to put our foot down[AT LAST].</p> <p>As far as we are concerned there is only one site , and that is blatantly obvious, the only one that makes any sense [GRANGE FARM] without a doubt.</p> <p>Nutwell South,which I repeat that Phil Lodge, the farmer who suddenly went into construction,and perhaps he took a few lessons off the late John Woodward should stick to farming!!</p> | <p>the Nutwell South scheme is also implemented.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council agrees that Nutwell South has a number of disadvantages, not least the increase in traffic along Nutwell Lane and the possibility that the link road from the M18 to Doncaster Airport / Rossington will, of itself, reduce traffic passing through Armthorpe to get to the A630 and Junction 4 on the M18. However, the Parish Council does not agree that Grange Farm is the best solution, having already having itself decided that Hatfield Lane West and East are the best alternatives.</i></p> | <p>Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>A. WALTON</p> <p>I would like make my recommendation for the proposed housing plan for the village.</p> <p>I am very much against any development of Nutwell Lane thus my preference is the Parish Council's initial proposal off Hatfield Lane.</p> | <p>Mr. Walton is opposed to development at Nutwell Lane and prefers the Parish Council's proposal at Hatfield Lane.</p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p><i>The Parish Council is also opposed to development at Nutwell Lane.</i></p> | <p>Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>J. WALTON I wish to make my recommendations for the proposed Armthorpe Development Housing Plan, I am against building at Nutwell South and as an Armthorpe resident my preferred site is Hatfield Lane.</p> | <p>Mr. Walton opposes development at Nutwell Lane and prefers east and west of Hatfield Lane instead. <i>The Parish Council agrees with him.</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>M. & S. CHAMBERS We object to building on Nutwell South and the so called Armthorpe bypass and think land west of Hatfield Lane is far more suitable for Armthorpe’s development plan.</p> | <p>Mr. and Mrs. Chambers object to building at Nutwell Lane including the proposed bypass and instead prefer land East and West of Hatfield Lane.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council agrees with them.</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>S. BROWN I write to comment on the suitability of the two suggested sites for housing development for Armthorpe. As I have mentioned previously at earlier planning meetings the proposal to build on the NutWell Lane site is a poor one. The site is poorly situated with regards access to resource/amenities available in the village centre and my concerns over the increase in traffic congestion, specifically at peak times, has not been alleviated by the 'now it is here now it isn't ' proposals for a link road or bypass. The earlier proposal to create a link road to the 630 or M18 as a method of reducing traffic flow is flawed as it would primarily rely on vehicles choosing to travel a much more circuitous route to access either the village centre or Doncaster town centre. Therefore my choice would be for the Hatfield Lane site as it would have reasonable access to the village centre and Doncaster town centre from separate routes therefore removing congestion from the village centre. Access via a link road to the M18 and the town centre could be routed into Hatfield lane and utilise existing infra structures. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinions on this matter</p> | <p>Mr. Brown objects to the Nutwell Lane site which he thinks is a poor alternative because of inadequate access to resources / amenities available in the village centre. He also has concerns over the increasing traffic congestion specifically at peak times. He would prefer the site allocated to be at Hatfield Lane as it would have reasonable access to the village and town centres. Also, access via a link road to the M18 and the town centre could be provided along Hatfield Lane and utilise existing infrastructure.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council agrees that the proposal to build on the Nutwell Lane site is a poor one and particularly as regards access to resources and amenities in the village centre. Mr. Brown also has a</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <i>concern particularly about peak times and the increase in traffic congestion that would inevitably arise.</i> | |
| <p>S. DIXON I would like it to be known that I am against the neighbourhood development plan being built on Nutwell south side of the village and any bypass proposed.</p> | <p>Susan Dixon is opposed to development built on the Nutwell South site and any bypass proposed</p> <p><i>The Parish Council notes Miss. Dixon's objection to the Nutwell South site and the associated bypass proposal.</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>K. WHITE I am writing to express my objection to the housing development</p> | Mrs. White objects to development | The Parish Council |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>along Nutwell Lane, Armthopre, particular to the proposal of farmer Phil Lodge and Nutwell South.</p> | <p>along Nutwell Lane, particularly Nutwell South.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council agrees with Mrs. White's opposition to the Nutwell Lane south site.</i></p> | <p>welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>S. LOCKLEY</p> <p>I would like to express my views regarding the armthorpe development plan, my preferred site is hatfield lane west, as I believe this site at that end of the village already has the transport links in place , I believe building on nutwell is not an option with traffic already busy at that end of armthorpe. I think building a bypass would make no difference to those using armthorpe to cut through to get to town, it would only benefit those heading for the motorway and a new bypass is currently under construction at rossington.</p> | <p>Scott Lockley prefers development at Hatfield Lane West as transport links are already in place at that end of Armthorpe. He feels building on Nutwell Lane is not an option because traffic is already busy at that end of town. He does not</p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>favour a bypass either which he contends would make no difference to traffic going through Armthorpe to town.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council welcomes Scott Lockley's preference for development at Hatfield Lane West rather than Nutwell Lane.</i></p> | <p>course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>N. HILL I wish to object to the so called Armthorpe bypass as it is only any use if you want to go from old cantley to the m18.It seems to me that it will only benefit those people with a vested interest in making a lot of money out of it.I also wish to object to any more building to the south of armthorpe as it will take away valuable countryside forever.</p> | <p>Nigel Hill objects to the Armthorpe bypass (down Nutwell Lane) as it will only benefit people wanting to go from Old Cantley to the M18. He also objects to building to the south of Armthorpe as it will remove valuable countryside for ever.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council agrees with Nigel Hill's objection to the Armthorpe bypass and his objection to building on land south of Armthorpe although clearly some</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p><i>countryside will be lost to development at East and West of Hatfield Lane.</i></p> | <p>again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>J. LANGFIELD I would like to lodge my objection to the proposed housing on Nutwell lane and the bypass. As a resident of Armthorpe for many years feel there is no need for this as it would create even more congestion on an already busy road. It has been said that the bypass would ease this but only if every boady was going to motoway when the majority would be going through the village to town. I live in Handsworth gardens and find it annoying now to try and get out onto Nutwell lane</p> | <p>John Langfield objects both to the proposed housing at Nutwell Lane and the associated bypass which he feels will lead to more congestion on an already busy road.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council agrees with John Langfield's concerns about the adverse effects of housing and a bypass at Nutwell Lane.</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | <p>methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
| <p>M. LIZZI I would state my objection to this plan on the following grounds. The plan states that the LDP denotes our Village as a TOWN. I understand is this decision that produces the number of housing development that must take place within that area. The ADP calls us a Village. Why is the Parish Council accepting an allocated status of a town. I cannot believe that this aspect has not been challenged. Armthorpe is clearly not a town. Furthermore the ADP welcomes the fact that this community has traditional agricultural roots and is defined by its open access to countryside. This must be retained at all costs. A greater percentage of residents objected to the plan, that supported it, on the preliminary consultation, but I feel that the issues raised through that consultation have not been addressed and were not given sufficient weighting on the basis of where the objecting households were located. I reiterate only “Four consultation responses” supported the proposal. Land and Site Allocation My major concern is over the West of Hatfield Road site being allocated for housing development. In association with the Lings this is a considerable addition of housing to the North of the village. <u>Minimum numbers</u> of housing should be allocated, not development planned to the medium point. The proposed development area (map) does not show the proposed open space Landscape Buffer between existing properties as is required by the ADP itself. This must be rectified if this site is still</p> | <p>M. Lizzi objects to a number of aspects of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, as follows: excessive housing development at West of Hatfield Lane; brownfield land should be developed before greenfield; the proposals will increase congestion in Armthorpe; the education proposals are unclear; there is no need for a further Sports Centre; the Hungerhill Lane employment site should be developed before greenfield sites and so on.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council accepts that the Draft Neighbourhood Plan is proposing a substantial amount of new development which will, inevitably have some adverse impacts but the Neighbourhood Plan must comply with the 700 – 900 additional dwellings plus associated facilities proposed in the DMBC Core Strategy.</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the</p> |

being considered after this consultation.
 Access to the surrounding countryside is being encroached by this development. This land is used for food production of crops and the Lings Site is used for sheep rearing. This gives a rural outlook to the area and is in keeping with the heritage of a farming community which according to your vision is important. I want this to be retained.

I have great concern about two developments and I believe that land at the West of Hatfield Road does not need to be allocated to the extent that is over this period.

| | |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| Minimum number of housing required | 643 |
| Brown Land on Barton Lane | 185 |
| Remainder to allocate. | 458 |

I don't believe that the parish should be allocating green open space up to 800 houses when 458 are required. There is no need for housing development to extend all along the border of Holly Dene. In fact only 58 houses need be built on the West site should the Lings development take place to full capacity. **I would ask that the Parish stick to the MINIMUM number asked of it from DMBC.** Brown Site Land, despite difficulties should always be allocated first, prior to open green space.

I welcome the comments made about protecting the living conditions of existing householders should this development come to fruition, and this should be given important consideration.

The parish should ensure that if any plan states trees should be planted, then it does happen and that gardens are not overlooked and that existing roads are not affected.

A few grassy areas' amongst houses and a few trees do not constitute or compensate for an open and green outlook. Furthermore existing trees planted in housing sites are left to develop without maintenance and can after a period of time, become a nuisance to adjoining properties, causing root damage, shielding light, increasing damp on walls through shadow, and dropping leaf litter.

Draft ANP.

We already have a green wedge and this should continue to be protected. I do not want houses built on this site.

Transport Links

I don't believe this plan has anything positive to say about congestion in the village. Only that it will be addressed. This is not good enough. How can you plan for additional housing, which you agree will cause extra traffic, and not have a plan to alleviate it. It will not magically disappear when a developer puts in a plan on land you have allocated. If you don't know how to alleviate the traffic then you should be going back to DMBC and saying it is unworkable.

I acknowledge your commitment to sustainable transport by suggesting cycle and pedestrianized routes. Existing roads within especially Holly Dene and the end of Fernbank Drive must not be changed to accommodate car traffic from a new development as that would seriously impact on existing householders.

I object to a mix of housing styles being suggested. Priority should be given to low housing such as Bungalows which would suit an aging population. I certainly would not buy a four bedroomed detached property and expect it to be situated within sight of a block of flats or housing company owned property no matter how affordable or indistinguishable they are supposed to look.

Education ANP 27

The plan is very unclear about how the expected increase in school places is to be tackled. This needs clarifying. My understanding is a new one or two classroom school building in each area? Our children need to be in well managed integrated schools not in one room buildings stuck in the middle of a housing estate.

Sports Centre. ANP 29

I do not believe we need a further Sports Centre within the proposals in such near proximity to the Sports Centre we already have unless this is more attuned to the provision of changing facilities related to field sports. Again the plan is unclear what is under consideration.

Improve parks ANP 32

Again no specific proposals only recognition that at some point in the

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>future should the opportunity arise something will be done! Not good enough. The community building took away our park and bowling greens. Land should be allocated for a park within the village boundary.</p> <p>Industrial Area's ANP 13</p> <p>Why this parish is considering allocating land for this when there is an allocated space at Edenthorpe a neighbouring parish is beyond me. The HUNGERHILL INDUSTRIAL Site with a sign for an industrial park that remains a green field, and has done for a significant period of time, should be used for providing more industry prior to further open space being used in Armthorpe.</p> <p>Shops sites within new development area's.</p> <p>Shops sites will inevitably turn into fast food outlets, and for this reason I object to the provision of shopping units within proposed housing development.</p> <p>So to those Elected Members and lay members of the Armthorpe Community on the planning group, I would urge you to resist development on this scale, in particularly by not exceeding the minimum numbers placed on the village for housing development, and challenge strongly any label as a "town".</p> | | |
| <p>E. LISHMAN/P. LISHMAN/E. LISHMAN</p> <p>We are writing to object to the building on nutwell south.</p> <p>We can't understand why you would want to use this site when there is already a more Suitable place at the Grange Farm site which would not have such a negative impact on the village.</p> <p>Please remember we live in a village and the effect this would have.</p> | <p>These respondents object to building on land at Nutwell South when Grange Farm would have had much less of an impact on the village.</p> <p><i>The Parish Council welcomes the objection by the Lishman family to building on land at Nutwell South. However, the Parish Council does not agree that Grange Farm is the best alternative; instead they would</i></p> | <p>The Parish Council welcomes the support for development at East and West of Hatfield Lane however in the course of reviewing the Site Assessment and Selection Methodology the</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p><i>prefer land West and East of Hatfield Lane.</i></p> | <p>Council will look again at development South of Armthorpe. It should not be assumed that a different methodology and assessment will come to an alternative conclusion to that published in the Draft ANP.</p> |
|--|---|--|