

**STAINFORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**  
**SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS SUBMITTED TO THE EXAMINER**  
**Regulation 16 responses**  
**(Full responses available upon request)**

| <b>Respondent</b>                             | <b>Summary of Representation</b>  |
|---|---|
| Canal & River Trust                           | <p>New housing will put pressure on local towpaths, improvements could be made between Stainforth and Thorne. Neighbourhood Plan could explore opportunities to help encourage improvements to the surfacing of the towpath, which compliments sections 4 and 7 of the Plan.</p> <p>Suggest Policy S3 could be expanded to achieve this aim, by stating improvements could be made and showing these on the proposals map.</p>  |
| City of Doncaster Council (Planning)          | <p>The Neighbourhood may want to refer to / elaborate on the Towns Fund and Unity permission in places.</p> <p>Policy S1 part 2 – elaborate on “high quality design”</p> <p>Policy S6 - Under ‘new facilities’ may wish to add the qualifier to the end of the sentence: “...supported on appropriate sites”</p> <p>Map 3 needs revising as additional sites are shown on it; changes needed to Map 5 labelling</p> <p>Policy S9 – seeks clarity about who will deliver the masterplan and how it will be delivered. Should make it clear subsequent development should accord with the masterplan.</p> <p>Policy SNP04 – as the open space requirement could be met via the country park development, may wish to amend the wording to include reference to providing greenery and small informal open spaces with a 15% commuted sum going to the country park.</p> |
| City of Doncaster Council (Pollution Control) | Agree that air quality is not currently an issue in the Stainforth area.  |
| Coal Authority                                | No objections to the Neighbourhood Plan as proposed.  |
| Environment Agency                            | No objections to the Neighbourhood plan.  |
| Historic England                              | Have been working with the owners of the headstocks and endorse the Neighbourhood Plan – especially Policies S9; SNP01 and SNP02.   |
| National Highways                             | Note development may impact on the M18 – development proposals will be reviewed as per normal processes between National Highways and the Council. Dialogue should continue between both parties.   |
| Natural England                               | No comments to make.  |
| Network Rail                                  | Where rail infrastructure is close to development proposals, Network Rail should be contacted.  |
| Sheffield City Council                        | No comments.  |
| Sport England                                 | Policy S5 and supporting text should better refer to NPPF para 102 and 103. Should consider the impact of development on sports facilities and their demand.  |

Waystone Hargreaves (agent: Gerald Eve)

Generally supportive of the overarching principles of the NDP, but cannot support it in its current format, as:

- it fails to acknowledge extant, and significant, planning permissions that directly impact the former Hatfield Colliery site in the NDP.
- it fails to comply with the basic requirements, as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, in that it: o does not have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance;
- is not in accordance with the strategic policies contained in the Development Plan.
- there are various issues in the drafting of the detailed policy wording and supporting text.

The Neighbourhood Plan fails to acknowledge the extent of permissions around the area.

Policy SNP02 supports development of the former pithead site, but does not acknowledge the consent granted under 22/01934/OUTM for over 35,000 sqm of Use Classes B2, B8 and E(g) floorspace alongside circa 2,700 sqm of community, leisure and commercial uses (Use Classes E, F1 and F2).

Policies SNP01 and SNP03 of the NDP, which relate to the proposed country park and employment areas respectively, cover an area of the outline planning permission referred to as the Lay Down Area. General principles of country park and employment supported but there needs to be recognition of ongoing commitments across the area which could impact on timescales and delivery of the schemes.

National policy and guidance states Neighbourhood Plans should support the delivery of strategic policies in the Local Plan and shape development outside of these. Neighbourhood Plans should not re-allocate sites already allocated through strategic plans. Plans should not constrain the deliver of allocated sites in the Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan is re-allocating land which is already a strategic allocation in the Local Plan and is therefore in conflict with national policy and guidance.

The NDP is also seeking to introduce a series of detailed policies restricting future land uses that run contrary to, and therefore constrains, the delivery of this strategic allocated site. For example SNP02 limits the acceptable uses when Policy 69 does not; Policy 69 allows for a broader range of uses than Policy SNP03.

There is further conflict with Local Plan Policy 7 and Policy 65. Policy S2 goes beyond Policy 7 of the Local Plan by requiring a mix of housing which is nor based against up to date market evidence as required by Policy 7. Policy 65 states developer contributions will only be sought where they are necessary,

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>directly related to the development, and fair and reasonable in scale and kind, however paras 9.28, 9.35 and 9.36 and the developer requirements state these will be required for the headstocks and country park. This lacks evidence and is contrary to Policy 65.</p> <p>A number of matters to do with policy and supporting text wording are also flagged.</p> |
|--|--|