Summary of the points made by JVH Planning on the conclusion to matters 1,2,3
On whether plan is sound or not and how should this be dealt with.

We conclude that the plan as submitted is not sound for the following reasons.
A remedy is suggested by way of a modification.

1
Overall housing Numbers

The Plan is not sound because there is no clear evidence to support the way in which the
Council have dealt with the question of the housing requirement for the housing market area.
The two SHMAAs are both inadequate and do not deal with the overall requirement for the
housing market area. The relationship with Sheffield is crucial to this and the housing
requirement included within the Rotherham plan to cater for Sheffield is not based on any
reasonable methodology, it comprises a guess at a degree of flexibility sufficient only to
have enabled Sheffield to withdraw their objection to the Plan.

The plan could be made sound by reintroducing the RS housing requirement which was
tested and fully took into account the relationship with Sheffield. This would require a main
modification to the Plan.
See JVH change to CS6

2
Distribution

The Plan is not sound because it fails to provide an adequate level of growth to the
Wickersley Bramley and Swinton areas and fails to demonstrate how the full housing
requirement should be distributed. It fails to locate sufficient development in the locations
where people want to live and will not boost the housing supply.

The plan could be made sound by providing for the full housing requirement and then
distributing it to take account of locations where people want to live and where the supply of
homes can be boosted.

See JVH change to CS1

3
Phasing

The Plan is not sound as drafted because it includes phasing. The proposed phasing will
simply inhibit the delivery of the strategy and result in a lack of housing in the early to
middle years of the plan.
The plan could be made sound by omitting the phasing.

See JVH change to CS6

4
Affordable homes.

The Plan is not sound because the affordable housing policies are too onerous on small sites and will inhibit delivery of them. There is no clear policy on what proportion of the overall housing requirement can be met by affordable homes and where this should be focused.

The plan could be made sound by a clear analysis of the overall requirement and a clear explanation of how many affordable homes are expected to be delivered and on what type of site.

5
Green Belt alterations.

The plan is not sound because the policy does not clearly set out where green belt alterations will be made or where safeguarded land will be identified. The plan does not identify sufficient safeguarded land which should be sufficient for 10 years beyond the plan period.

The plan can be modified to be clear about where the green belt will need to be changed to accommodate new housing and employment.

See JVH change to CS4

6
Housing Five year supply

The plan is not sound because there is not a five year supply of sites identified and there is no mechanism for bringing sites forward quickly to meet the housing shortfall.

The plan can be modified by being clearer about where land will be released from the green belt to deliver new homes, so that on adoption of the strategy developers can work with confidence on sites to support applications as soon as the sites document is adopted and minimise any delays.
A policy which makes a strategic allocation would also support the early delivery of new homes.
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