

Rotherham | Local Development Framework Core Strategy Revised Options



Final Feedback Report | March 2010

Addendum – June 2010

The Final Feedback Report summarises the key planning issues put forward in writing to the Rotherham Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy Revised Options consultation draft (2009). The Report includes a summary of the key planning issues arising from the workshops / focus groups, public meetings and drop-in sessions. Full notes of these meetings have already been published in the Interim Feedback Report (January 2010).

Information is provided in this report to aid understanding of the draft Rotherham Core Strategy (2009) by responding to the key issues and concerns raised during the consultation process.

Rotherham Borough Council is mindful of the new coalition Government's proposals (in the Decentralisation and Localism Bill) to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies including district housing targets and regional planning policies (that currently form part of the Borough-wide Development Plan).

The draft Core Strategy document was prepared under the previous Government and as such refers to targets and policy directions that may change in the light of proposals from the new Government. It is important to note that the planning language and procedures currently used to define and prepare spatial strategies and development plans may also change in the future. But it appears to be still pertinent to plan for future development within the Borough, to enable development in the most sustainable locations to occur.

Greater clarity is needed from Central Government before we can say what housing targets would apply in Rotherham and which development sites will be needed to meet the targets. Guidance is also needed on how to replace all, or part, of the strategic planning policies that are currently in the Regional Spatial Strategy. We don't yet know what this will mean in practice for Rotherham's Local Development Framework or its successor document.

In coming months consideration will be given to preparing policies that are most pertinent to this Borough within any future development plan.

Any eventual new targets for house building, potential employment sites, community facilities and services and draft policies to guide future development, will require further community consultation.

In the meantime work will proceed on preparing a robust evidence base to support the future development plan for Rotherham.

Rotherham

Local Development Framework

Core Strategy Revised Options

Final Feedback Report

Executive Summary

This Report summarises the key planning issues put forward in writing during the consultation period 29 May – 31 August 2009 and the key planning arising from the workshops/focus groups, public meetings and drop-in sessions held into the Core Strategy, including the Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension proposals.

Given the scale of written responses received and the breadth of issues covered in the facilitated workshops and face to face meetings, this Report extracts the most pertinent planning issues. The “actions” arising from the consultation will guide the drafting of the next version of the Core Strategy prior to its “submission” to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

March 2010

Contents

	Page
Introduction:	3
Reading your comments on-line	3
The Interim Feedback Report	3
The Final Feedback Report	3
Where and How to view the Information	3
Next Steps	4
Information to help you understand the Rotherham Core Strategy	5
Consultation Feedback:	
most pertinent issues arising from the written representations	10
Chapter 1: Introduction	10
Chapter 2: Previous Stages in Core Strategy Preparation	10
Chapter 3: Why are we consulting again?	11
Chapter 4: Revised Core Strategy Objectives and Policy Content	13
Chapter 5: Scale of New Growth Required	19
Chapter 6: Capacity to Accommodate Growth	22
Chapter 7: Core strategy Revised Options Issues Identified within Standard Representations.	23
Chapter 8: Employment Land Strategy	28
Chapter 9: Options for Rotherham Town Centre	29
Extracts from facilitated workshops, drop-in sessions and public meetings	33
Appendix 1: Accessing the Information	47
Appendix 2: Evidence base required to underpin the core Strategy	49

Final Feedback Report

Introduction

Over the summer, 29 May until 31 August 2009, we consulted on revised options for Rotherham's Local Development Framework Core Strategy. This consultation set out three options to accommodate the Borough's future requirements for new homes and employment land.

Comments On-Line

Over 6000 representations were received and these have been entered into the Council's database and are available to view on-line along with the Council's response to the comment at:

<http://consultation.limehouse.co.uk/rotherham/drafts/12/index.html>

The Interim Feedback Report

We have already published the notes of all workshops, focus groups, public meetings and drop-in sessions held during the consultation period, including those for the Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension proposals. The Interim Feedback Report included a summary and breakdown of the number of responses received. This document, along with all other documents relating to the preparation of the LDF, is now available on our website at:

<http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning>

Final Feedback Report

The Council's response to each of the 6000 comments/representations received is now available to view on-line, and is included on the LDF Consultation Portal (following the link above). This Final Feedback Report summarises the key strategic planning issues put forward in writing during the consultation period. This information is provided for each of the Core Strategy Revised Options Chapters or questions.

The Final Feedback Report also summarises the key planning issues arising from the consultation workshops, public meetings and drop-in sessions held last year. Given the scale of written responses received and the breadth of issues covered in the facilitated workshops and face to face meetings, this Report extracts the most pertinent planning issues. The "actions" arising from the consultation will guide the drafting of the next version of the Core Strategy prior to its "submission" to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

We are not seeking comments from members of the public or other key stakeholders on either the Interim Feedback Report or the Final Feedback Report. These reports are for information only and will help people to understand the breadth and complexity of the comments made.

Where and How to View the Information

All documentation is available on our web site and hard copies of all the Reports are available in selected libraries: Rotherham Town Centre, Dinnington, Wath, Maltby, Swinton, Rawmarsh, Kiveton Park, Wickersley, Greasbrough, Kimberworth and Kimberworth Park.

We are encouraging people to access this information electronically from the Council's web site and access is available from all local libraries. The library network enables people to see documents on-line or by viewing a hard copy provided for reference purposes only. Included within this report is a guide to finding the above web pages. This is a "step by step" guide to assist in viewing all information relating to the Local Development Framework and is available in Appendix one.

Next Steps

We are currently considering all of the submitted comments and carrying out further work on the evidence base to support the preparation of the Local Development Framework. In the next few months we will be selecting an option (or a hybrid option) to decide what development should go where. This Option will plan to meet the target of 24,500 new homes to be built between now and 2026. There will be no provision for further housing development beyond this target figure.

Preparation of the next draft of the Core Strategy will be guided by information and advice sourced from the emerging evidence base (details of ongoing evidence base work are provided at Appendix two). The Landscape Character Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal are essential elements in guiding the selection of sites for potential development in the future. There will also be an assessment of the infrastructure required to ensure the creation of sustainable communities.

We will consult again during 2010 on the Core Strategy and also the potential sites for future development. This next round of consultation will enable local communities to comment further on the proposed vision, the growth strategy for the Borough and on strategic policies. The sites for future development will help us to develop the "growth strategy" to be included within the Core Strategy but will form a separate planning document known as the "Allocations Development Plan Document". Within the Allocations Document there will also be more detailed policies that will guide decision-making on planning applications. Consultation on the Site Allocations DPD will focus on the detail of which sites are most suitable for development in each community

A consultation strategy will be prepared and this will seek to ensure greater frontloading and publicity prior to events, displays, meetings and workshops.

We will use Rotherham News to distribute information throughout the Borough. Rotherham News is delivered to every household and is prepared on behalf of the Local Strategic Partnership. Consideration will be given to providing information in the libraries to draw people in and posters and flyers may be provided to highlight key information. The libraries will be used to promote the consultation process and to raise awareness of local events.

The Interim Feedback Report provided details of the consultation activities undertaken during the summer of 2009 and assessed the activity against the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (2006), which establishes the Council's policy for community participation and the engagement of traditionally excluded groups.

Information to help you understand the Rotherham Core Strategy

This section has been prepared as a response to some of the key issues and concerns raised during the consultation into the Core Strategy Revised Options. Whilst it is not intended to be comprehensive, the following information will assist people to understand the reasons for the content of the Council's Core Strategy and to provide a response to some of the most significant issues raised during the consultation in summer 2009. Much of this information appeared on the Council's web site as "Frequently Asked Questions".

What is the Local Development Framework (LDF)/Core Strategy?

The LDF is a "portfolio" of documents that together form the development plan for Rotherham. It will guide future investment and help the Council determine planning proposals. The Core Strategy is the key document of the LDF. It will set out the broad planning framework for the Borough to 2026 by choosing the towns and settlements for new development. The task for the Core Strategy is to identify the most sustainable and least environmentally damaging locations for this development.

Why do we need so much new housing?

We are planning for the long term. The Government sets the housing requirement for each local authority in the Regional Spatial Strategy (the "Yorkshire and Humber Plan") and has also awarded South Yorkshire "Growth Point" status, further increasing our housing requirement. This means the Council needs to identify enough land for about 24,500 new homes to meet our requirement to 2026. This is approximately 1,225 homes per year.

The LDF must seek to meet, but cannot challenge, the targets established in the Regional Spatial Strategy, which is part of Rotherham's statutory development plan. The derivation and apportionment of the RSS Housing requirement is the task of Local Government Yorkshire and Humber and is based on a complex technical process which is briefly outlined in paragraph 12.5 of The Yorkshire and Humber Plan – Regional Spatial Strategy to 2026 (May 2008) (available via the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber website) and explained in more detail in Background Paper 2: Housing prepared for the RSS Examination in Public.

The Growth Point status achieved by South Yorkshire ties in with the regeneration priorities for the area and will help to address long term under investment in housing stock. The Growth Point status now means that there is funding to help to bring forward brownfield (previously developed land) sites for development earlier than might otherwise have been possible.

In deciding on the housing requirement the Government, via the Regional Spatial Strategy, has looked at a number of different factors including demographic change (an ageing population and the trend towards smaller households leading to a greater demand for new homes); in and out-migration; and the need to support economic growth by providing enough new homes for workers taking up jobs in the area.

We also need to deal with the long term affordability of housing. There are nearly 20,000 people on the Council's housing waiting list, of which over 4,000 have been on the list for more than 5 years. Our last survey of housing need in 2007 estimated a need for about 400 new affordable homes each year. Since then we have only managed to deliver about 30% of this need; a situation made much worse by the current downturn. The backlog of need for affordable housing not being met is therefore increasing year on year. The house price inflation evident before the recent downturn was also fuelling affordability problems; part of the solution is to provide more homes.

What about empty properties, why don't you use those?

There are on average 4,000 empty properties at any given time in the Borough, however currently only 1,311 have been vacant for more than six months - up to 3,000 are transitionally vacant through various reasons such as renovation and sale.

The Council has a multi-faceted approach to dealing with long term vacant private sector dwellings and which includes:

- Enforcement action - Community Protection Unit
- Key Choices Property Management Services - to encourage private sector landlords to bring low demand property back into use
- Working with Registered Social Landlords to bring property back into use through acquisition and investment
- Targeted intervention to engage landlords and the private sector owner occupiers to address problems and identify solutions.

Since the introduction of Choice Based Lettings in June 2005 we do not operate a waiting list system. Applicants can apply to go on the housing register and then place interests on properties advertised each week.

As at 31 July 2009 there were 19,993 applicants on the housing register. Of these 10,468 are actively participating in the scheme by applying for properties advertised each week. 9,465 are not actively participating in the scheme. The number of participating applicants is subject to change according to applicant's circumstances and properties being advertised which they are interested in.

The number on the housing register has reduced since 2008 when there were 24,000 applicants on the housing register. We carried out a full review in June 2008 by writing to all applicants on the register to check their circumstances and that they still wanted to remain on the Housing Register.

- 4,328 households have been on the housing register for more than 5 years.
- On average 35 Council homes are advertised for rent per week.

The Housing register is made up of applicants in lots of different circumstances, applications are categorised in accordance with the Allocation Policy and placed in one of four groups, priority plus, priority, general plus and general which are the groups that the properties are advertised to.

About 1,300 private sector properties are currently empty. As a proportion of our total housing stock this represents a rate which is about half the national average. Similarly, the combined vacancy figure for all sectors of around 4,000 properties is in line with the 3.5% target set for the Council in the Regional Spatial Strategy. As we are performing above the average in bringing empty homes back into use, a further reduction in the amount of vacant properties would be difficult to achieve and offer only a marginal contribution to meeting our housing target.

Who will live in all these new houses, isn't it all for immigrants?

The population projections at regional level show that for Rotherham, approximately 6% is due to migration from outside the UK. The vast majority is made up of 50% internal migration from other parts of the UK and 44% demographic change, i.e. people living longer, the trend towards smaller households, rising birth rates etc.

Links to the Regional Spatial Strategy

As you know, our Core Strategy must conform to the Regional Spatial Strategy otherwise we risk our plan failing when it is subjected to independent examination. The Regional Spatial Strategy's "core approach" is to focus most new development in the existing towns and cities of the region. Growth outside towns and cities is to be targeted to "Principal Towns"; towns that fulfil a regionally significant role as service, employment and transport hubs for their surrounding area. Dinnington is the Borough's only Principal Town.

Core Strategies should aim to achieve the vision, objectives and outcomes of the Regional Spatial Strategy. The extent to which this is achieved will be judged by an independent Planning Inspector as part of their assessment of the soundness of the Core Strategy once it is submitted to Government.

One part of developing the relationship between the RSS and the Core Strategy is considering how it can accommodate the housing figures of the RSS. These figures were derived from a combination of household projections and work on addressing issues such as affordability of housing.

Meeting the housing figures of the RSS is a challenge for Rotherham and indeed for all local authorities in the region, not least given the current economic circumstances. It is important to recognise that in the short to medium term (2 to 5 years) the market is unlikely to be able to deliver the RSS figures.

The RSS recognises that local Green Belt release might well be needed to accommodate some of this growth and there is a need for this to be done in a planned and strategic way. Local evidence will need to be clear about the level of brownfield development that will be possible before Green Belt release is considered. Phased allocation and release of sites is essential in order to meet brownfield targets and take account of windfalls. (Brownfield targets will be set according to the amount of deliverable/developable brownfield land identified).

How have you chosen potential sites to develop?

During 2008 we carried out a comprehensive survey of the Borough looking at sites within and on the edge of our towns and larger villages. Over 500 sites have

been assessed for development for different uses, mostly as sites for housing and employment. Sites suggested by developers and landowners have been assessed alongside sites we already knew about from previous studies.

Why have you proposed “Bassingthorpe Farm” for major new development on the edge of Rotherham Urban Area?

As noted above the Regional Spatial Strategy’s “core approach” is to focus most new development in the existing towns and cities of the region. This approach offers the greatest scope to re-use land and buildings; make the most of existing infrastructure; reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing the need to travel; maximise access to homes, jobs and services; foster social inclusion; and encourage the use of public transport. It is all about promoting sustainable development.

When we applied the core approach of the Regional Spatial Strategy to our housing target the result was a strong focus on the main urban area of Rotherham and the town of Dinnington.

In broad strategic terms, Bassingthorpe Farm represents a “rounding off” of the main urban area surrounding Rotherham. On balance, we felt that Bassingthorpe Farm would be more sustainable in the long term than a similar sized urban extension elsewhere in the Borough or indeed a series of smaller expansions into the Green Belt around all other smaller towns and settlements. The sustainability appraisal of the 3 options carried out by independent consultants reflected this view.

If Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension is chosen for future development, then the aim will be to achieve a mixed development of residential, employment and community facilities that also incorporated greenspace, green corridors, habitat protection, walking and cycling routes. It is close to the existing infrastructure, transport hub and services provided by Rotherham town centre.

The layout would avoid the protection zones around the hazardous installation in the vicinity and would have due regard to the landfill gas zones and localised flooding issues.

Why are you taking so much Green Belt land?

Our 2008 sites survey showed that we simply do not have enough brownfield land or other land within the urban area for the amount of new housing required to meet our target. As a consequence, we need to identify Green Belt land where urban extensions could be considered.

Why aren’t you building on old industrial sites?

We have looked at redundant industrial sites and factories to see if they can be used for new housing. However, not all industrial sites are suitable for housing; for example, many are located next to remaining industry or are sites that may be vulnerable to flood risk. Brownfield land is often contaminated which makes its viability for development more sensitive to market fluctuations; a situation made worse by the current downturn. We also need to meet future employment needs through the identification of land for industry and businesses, some of which will be brownfield sites.

What about schools, shops and roads etc?

The Local Development Framework will look at where new facilities and infrastructure such as schools, shops and roads are required and how they will be provided; either by developer contributions or public finance.

An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is required to accompany submission of the Core Strategy to the Government for independent public examination. The infrastructure requirements from new development, and impact on existing infrastructure, need to be reasonably demonstrated and catered for. In further preparation of the LDF, the Council will need to discuss its proposals with relevant service providers to ensure that adequate infrastructure is provided to support new development. The LDF will establish where infrastructure will be required and how it will be provided; either by developer contributions or public finance.

What about flooding?

Maps have been prepared telling us levels of flood risk across the Borough, this helps us to avoid those areas of unacceptable risk.

Who will be building the houses?

Most of the houses would be built by private developers. The Council will continue to require private house builders to provide a proportion of these as affordable housing. We currently seek a contribution of 25% affordable housing on developments above a certain size.

Impact on Food Production

Government planning guidance on the consideration of the impact of development on food production concerns the need to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land given in Planning Policy Statement 7 (paragraphs 28-29). Regional Spatial Strategy Policy ENV7 states that if development of agricultural land is required it should take place on poorer quality land wherever possible and appropriate. The survey work to identify potential allocation site has had regard to DEFRA's classification of agricultural land quality. Further Sustainability Appraisal work is to be undertaken to assess the possible urban extensions and possible alternatives and for future preparation of the Site Allocations Document which will examine this issue in more detail.

Consultation Feedback

The following are some of the main issues arising from the written letters of representation received during the Core Strategy Revised Options consultation: May 2009 – August 2009. This is not an exhaustive list of all comments received but is a summary of the main issues and concerns raised by local communities and key stakeholders. The issues are presented on a chapter by chapter basis.

Chapter 1 Introduction

Several general points were raised under the Introduction chapter (23 representations), with the adequacy of the consultation arrangements in particular raised by several respondents. The main issues are summarised as:

- not enough publicity/time allowed for the consultation
- too much growth is proposed for Dinnington/ Anston
- the number of new homes proposed exceeds need
- the document is confusing and uses too much jargon
- the impact on wildlife and conservation has not been taken into account
- the options should be considered in a wider environmental context
- the next stages planned for the Core Strategy are not clear

In contrast, support for the document and the Council's approach to consultation was received from one respondent who found the document well produced and professional and considered that it put forward the issues and options clearly.

Detailed comments were also received on the need to explain how the Core Strategy should conform to the Regional Spatial Strategy and that the next version should be a "complete" document rather than just focussing on housing, employment and the town centre.

Chapter 2 Previous Stages in Core Strategy Preparation

A limited number of responses were raised under Chapter 2, the adequacy of the consultation arrangements being the main topic. Of the 10 representations received, the majority complained about a perceived lack of, or poor consultation. These have not been accepted as the Council exceeded the requirements established in the Statement of Community Involvement (which itself was subject to independent examination).

The main issues are summarised as:

- not enough publicity/time allowed for the consultation
- too much growth is proposed for Dinnington/ Anston
- objection to the loss of any Green Belt

In contrast, one respondent thought the chapter a good summary of previous consultation.

Chapter 3 Why Are We Consulting Again?

Several general points were raised under Chapter 3 (41 representations), mainly revolving around the adequacy of the consultation arrangements. The main issues are summarised as:

- not enough publicity/time allowed for the consultation
- location and timing of public meetings could be improved
- too much growth is proposed for Dinnington/ Anston
- impact on the Tropical Butterfly House
- object to the RSS target and Growth Point status
- the document is confusing and uses too much jargon
- too much reliance on the website and not enough hard copy material
- the Council's website and LDF consultation portal are difficult to navigate
- need for more localised consultation
- need for more "personalised" notification of residents
- response form too long and complex

One respondent raised a more technical point about the nature of the Core Strategy in that it should be a strategic document and should not be concerned with detail about specific sites.

The following issues relate to the Sustainability Appraisal

Question 1: Do you have any comments on the Sustainability Appraisal report which accompanies the Core Strategy Revised Options?

This question attracted 53 representations, raising issues including:

- objection to the omission of UDP Housing Allocation H6 (Thorpe Hesley) as a potential urban extension.
- the inclusion of Bassingthorpe Farm in all three options.
- the age of the economic data used to inform the Appraisal.
- querying the extent to which the appraisal is evidence based.
- the level of the housing target and the principle of Green Belt release.
- that more options should have been suggested.
- that appraisal should include assessment against travel to work patterns and transport implications.
- complaint about the complexity of the appraisal; others gave support for the methodology used.
- the need for Borough Landscape Character Assessment.
- objection to the recommendation that logistical warehousing be located near to the strategic highway network.
- site specific objections to sites at Bramley and Dinnington.
- complaints that not all of the sites were open for consultation.
- Appendix J should refer to the Rotherham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

- Further Sustainability Appraisal is required of all possible alternatives for urban extensions.
- Employment Land Review to investigate merits of identifying logistical warehousing near the 'strategic road network'.
- Appendix J should refer to the Rotherham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Question 2: Do you have any comments on the Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy objectives?

This question attracted 17 representations, raising issues including:

- the level of the housing target and the principle of Green Belt release
- objectives should recognise need for smaller communities to meet their own growth needs.
- walking and cycling to key destinations should be promoted through the Local Development Framework
- inadequate consultation arrangements.
- Some support for Sustainability Appraisal view that the RSS baseline will not provide for sufficient levels of housing and employment development and that further provision needs to be identified.
- Some support for level of compatibility between objectives of the Core Strategy and of the Sustainability Appraisal.
- Whether population levels need to be maintained.
- the age of the evidence base used to inform the Appraisal.
- Support for recommendations to enhance evidence base, including Landscape Character Assessment.
- Querying the scoring for Sustainability Appraisal 19 against various Core Strategy Objectives including 3, 7, 8, 9 and 14.
- Querying the scoring for Core Strategy 1 against Sustainability Appraisal Objective 19. Review the findings for impact upon SA Objective 19

Question 3: Do you have any comments on the Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy policies which have been outlined?

This question attracted 15 representations, raising issues including:

- Querying the inclusion of Bassingthorpe Farm in all three options.
- Querying the classification of Waverly as an Urban Extension of Rotherham.
- Lack of reference to financial sustainability.
- Objection to the principle of Green Belt release and to addition of Thorpe Hesley UDP Housing Allocation H6 to the Green Belt.
- Objection to decision to apply for Growth Status.
- Unable to comment on policies as they are only presented in outline.

Question 4: Do you have any comments on the Sustainability Appraisal of the options and sites?

This question attracted 29 representations, raising issues including:

- Objection to the potential urban extensions at Bramley/ Ravenfield, Bassingthorpe Farm, Dinnington and Kiveton Park.
- Sustainability Appraisal does not differentiate between the two possible Town Centre expansion areas in Option B.
- Objection to the principle of Green Belt release and to addition of Thorpe Hesley UDP Housing Allocation H6 to the Green Belt.
- Appraisals should be informed by Landscape Character Assessment. Landscape assessment will be required to assist in the final choice of sites and to inform any mitigation requirements.
- Some support for Option 2 as most sustainable option.
- Some support for allocation of urban extensions to west and east of Dinnington.
- Querying the inclusion of Bassingthorpe Farm in all three options.

Question 5: Are there any additional mitigation or enhancement measures that the Sustainability Appraisal should identify?

This question attracted 17 representations, raising issues including:

- Level of rigour of analysis of implications/ issues around the options.
- Impact on existing or potential food production is not recognised.
- The Sustainability Appraisal should look at the support or harm to the Town Centre which will result from the two expansion proposals separately.
- Infrastructure impact ignored.
- Options should not be mutually restrictive.
- Greater emphasis needed on high landscape value of sites, bio-diversity and use of renewable energy.
- Address the contradictions between its objectives 5 and 12 and the nature of options 1, 2 and 3

Chapter 4 Revised Core Strategy Objectives and Policy Content

Overview

This part of the consultation document gave rise to 235 representations. 35% of these were expressed or implied objections which were generally opposed to the current document without putting forward tangible alternatives and often not specifically addressing the consultation questions concerning objectives and related policies. 32% of responses were supportive of the objectives and policy outlines. A further 33% of responses made comments, observations and other statements about the content of this section of the document. 31% of all the representations constituted both critical comments and constructive suggestions on how the objectives and policy outlines might be rationalised, supplemented or improved. These comments and suggestions will be particularly helpful in the preparation of refined objectives and related draft policies for the Pre-Publication Draft Core Strategy and they have been outlined below.

(NB. Representations did not always relate to the specific question posed but they have been assigned as originally intended by the respondent or by planning staff as “best fit “to the structure to this feedback report).

General Issues

- All mineral deposits should be safeguarded not just limestone. It may be necessary to reduce the green belt around the Maltby brick clay quarry to facilitate future development.
- Insufficient attention to creation of a sustainable economy, advancing a low carbon economy, mitigation of the harmful impacts of climate change and the loss of agricultural land to development. More attention to be given to green infrastructure and infrastructure delivery.
- Outline of the role of National Grid, infrastructure in Rotherham and potential constraints on spatial strategy and individual sites.
- The hierarchy of local retail and community service centres needs to reflect Planning Policy Statement 6 (PPS6) (now replaced by PPS4) and the future role of Maltby (as a possible Principal Town).
- The Vision is still very generic. Consider issues of implementation, flexibility, infrastructure delivery, monitoring and involvement of stakeholders and cross boundary implications with adjacent authorities. Appropriate Assessment under Habitat Regulations required. Education provision, rural, cultural and neighbourhood renewal issues are not explicitly covered.

Question 6: Do You Support The Revised Objectives?

- Objective 1 is ambiguous and Objective 2 should reflect the presumption of retaining green belt.
- Objectives lack focus and cohesion.
- Objective 2 - green belt to be taken as a last resort.
- No mention of the needs for gypsies and travellers and provision for accommodation.
- Probably too many objectives, scope for rationalisation and resolving some inconsistencies.
- More emphasis needed on the importance of waterways and their impact on objectives.
- Too many objectives to be realistic – concern about development on green belt when there are alternative brownfield sites with good transport connections.
- Objection to Thorpe Hesley being added to green belt in the context of the scale of housing provision and changes to green belt being considered.
- Need for more emphasis on the contribution of woodlands to Objectives 3,5,10,12,15,16 and 17.
- Need to make clear that the release of green belt will be phased.
- Green Belt review required to meet future housing needs under Regional Spatial Strategy and Growth Point target with related comments concerning Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 7.
- Concern how climate change and delivery objectives will be achieved.
- Objectives could be more inter-related – particularly 2, 3, 7 and 8.
- Need to ensure developer contributions are spent within relevant communities.

- The spatial strategy and relevant supporting policies need to be developed in the light of SFRAs (Strategic Flood Risk Assessments) 1 and 2. Affordable housing and infrastructure delivery policies will need to consider development viability issues.
- Request that “Additionally Major Developed Sites will be identified in the Green Belt” be added to Objective 2 (to ensure that there is a clear policy context in place to facilitate the designation of Maltby Colliery).
- Supports Objective 10 but has concerns about the deterioration in number and quality of sport and recreation facilities.
- Potential development opportunities should be assessed on a site by site basis concerning biodiversity and green infrastructure implications with additional comments on Objectives 3, 5, 10 and 12 and suggestions for a Biodiversity Supplementary Planning Document (GIS Geographic Information System data submitted concerning biodiversity opportunities and wildlife sites in Rotherham).
- There may be scope for further rationalisation of a number of objectives, particularly 5, 6, 12, 13, 14 and 15.
- Objective 5 is not in conformity with PPG15 suggest amendment to wording to ensure conformity.
- Objects to objectives 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 11 and 17 –growth point will increase population which needs to be balanced with provision for employment; a piecemeal review of green belt would be contrary to PPG2; there should be emphasis on delivery rather than use of previously developed land; landscape objective/policy outline does not accord with national or regional guidance; difficulty in monitoring obesity and skin cancer which is beyond the remit of planning policy and there needs to be evidence to support what infrastructure is required to support the amount of development proposed.
- Suggests a selective green belt review in line with RSS Policy YH9, irrespective of Growth Point status.
- The issue of climate change should be the highest priority and be given due consideration in all objectives.
- Consider implications for future role of Dinnington within the spatial strategy and subsequent Allocations DPD.
- Objectives 8 and/or 16 could include reference to the potential for innovative live/work schemes to contribute to sustainable development.
- Concerns about the relationship of Objectives 1(spatial development and growth /distribution) and Objectives 7/ 8(qualitative aspects); consider the purpose of Objective 3 as it could form part of Objective1 and it overlaps Objective 9; Objective 6 should be looking to a suite of policies; Objective 7 needs to be spatially specific and Objective 17 should be delivered by a South Yorkshire based tariff system.
- Objective 3 is too narrow it needs to be expanded to include other key sustainability indicators.
- Support for Objective 5 but doubts about this broad range of issues can be covered in a single policy.
- Some of the objective may need updating in terms of climate change adaptation and ecosystems – additional specific comments regarding objectives 2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 17.
- Specific comments regarding issue of local specificity.

- Qualifying comments concerning the need for a Borough-wide landscape character assessment in support of objective/policy 5; the contribution of green and blue infrastructure and street trees to climate change adaptation related to objective/policy 11; and landscape, biodiversity and aftercare issues associated with mineral working under objectives/policies 12 and 13.

Question 7: Do The Objectives Reflect Local Concerns?

- The Core Strategy should reflect previous consultation (i.e. a combination of matching needs with opportunities and managing the environment as a key resource).
- Objective needed for improving the viability and vitality of the Town Centre and the document needs to reflect public support for a food store at Westgate.
- Reference to Objectives 5 and 6 reflecting strategic themes of the Community Strategy and to reflect local specificity.
- The objectives seem to reflect the main thrust of government policy and respond to topical political issues particularly those relating to sustainability.
- Objectives do not reflect government proposals to use more land to grow food.
- The approach to housing figures may well address local concerns in terms of not planning for growth, however, the Growth Point requires expansion beyond RSS levels.
- Objective 8 reflects the need to provide land and opportunities in suitable locations to existing local businesses to expand/re-locate.
- No reference is given to the relationship between the different objectives and how certain objectives could assist or hamper the outcome of others.
- Many objectives could apply anywhere and there needs to be transparency between policy themes and the Community Strategy.

Question 8: Do You Support The General Approach To The Core Strategy Policies Which Have Been Outlined? Have We Missed Anything?

- Consider the inclusion of a criteria based policy to deal with a firm prison proposal should it arise during the plan period.
- Need to be clear how offices, job densities, leisure based tourism (including YES Project) and the role of Rotherham's two principal canals will be addressed.
- Objective/policy outline 13 does not fully address Minerals Planning Statement 1 or Regional Spatial Strategy Policy ENV4. There is a need for a suitable policy to safeguard mineral resources within Minerals Safeguarded Areas including shallow coal resources which cover the majority of the Borough. Also reference needs to be made to Planning Policy Guidance Note 14 due to the range of potential public safety and land stability issues

relating to the legacy of former coal mining within Rotherham with a policy to require new development to take account of risks associated with former coal mining and where necessary incorporate suitable mitigation measures. This could be incorporated into policy outline 3, 6 or 11. Mining legacy issues need to be fully considered in the site allocation process based on information on the mining position and ground conditions.

- Will a climate change policy that focuses on energy be wide reaching enough and adequately consider both mitigation and adaptation issues?
- The importance of Rotherham Town Centre is understated.
- Support a reduced number of dwellings and workspaces built on existing brownfield sites.
- Policies should include “Secured by Design” standard for housing and look to possible S106 developer contributions towards additional policing requirements for new and expanded communities.
- The restoration of the Chesterfield Canal should be reflected in the Core Strategy and future Development Plan Documents.
- A detailed phasing plan for the release of Green Belt sites needs to be published.
- Delivering sufficient housing to meet the needs of the population should be the over-riding objective including details on the delivery of affordable housing contained in a Supplementary Planning Document.
- Support for policy outline 5 and 6 with further suggestions concerning the safeguarding of historic sites and sources of roofing and building stone – English Heritage.
- There is a lack of consideration concerning interaction with adjacent authorities.
- There is a need for detailed policies not just vague outlines.
- Attention drawn to cross boundary agreements in Rights of Way Improvement Plans.
- Suggests a policy to minimise light pollution (attention drawn to the ILE publication “Guidance notes for the reduction of light pollution”).
- The Core Strategy would benefit from placing additional emphasis on the role and potential social, environmental and economic of quality green infrastructure.
- Places of worship must be integrated into developments.
- Targets for affordable housing, on site renewable energy and satisfying Code for Sustainable Homes requirements will all impact on the viability and delivery of housing developments and need to be justified by robust evidence.

- Objective 3 should refer to transport impact mitigation using travel planning.
- The Energy White Paper does not see reduction in energy use, energy efficiency and production of renewable energy as alternatives. There needs to be a clear and realistic indication of expected renewable energy generation based on the capacity related to the scale of development. Targets should be set as installed MWs as in RSS policy guidance and be expressed as minima.
- Recommend an overarching climate change policy in the Core Strategy supported by discrete, proactive policies on energy efficiency, renewable energy, sustainable design and construction in a Policies Development Plan Document. The LDF needs to include a brief outline and equal promotion of the different renewable energy technologies. There needs to be criteria based policy used to assess all renewable energy proposals. Percentage targets for renewables in new development should relate to decentralised and renewable or low-carbon energy sources and be justified by an appropriate evidence base.
- Concerns about the lack of detailed policies for consultation. A thorough examination of alternative policy options is essential. Objective 13 is weak in relation to the use of recycled/secondary aggregates and should be strengthened to encompass the protection/enhancement of the physical and natural environment.
- Prompts for the content of Objectives 7 (affordability, density, mix, gypsy/traveller accommodation) and 12 (integration of cross boundary wildlife corridors) arising from Sheffield Core Strategy examination.
- Need policy for the location of hazardous installations/pipelines and controlling development in their vicinity. The Proposals Map need to show the location of hazardous installations and pipelines.
- Policies and proposals should embrace the relevant objectives and recommendations of the draft Green Space Strategy.
- Create a new objective that focuses specifically on climate change mitigation and adaptation.
- More explanation of inter-relationship of objectives and policy outlines required.
- Greenspace standards (including ANGSt requirements) need to be addressed in the development of policy related to Objective 10. The Landscape and Heritage policy ought to adopt the European Landscape Convention's (ELC) definition and take account of ELC guidelines with a view to protecting the character and value of all landscapes not just those concerning the character of settlements, conservation areas, historic building and tourist attractions - Natural England

Question 9: Do The Policies Outlined Reflect Local Priorities And Address Issues Important To Rotherham And Its Communities?

- Need provision for economic development locations that are accessible and attractive to the market.
- Greater clarity is required about Green Belt boundary changes.
- Policy drafting related to Objective 10 needs to be influenced by the greenspace strategy being developed with Transform South Yorkshire- Natural England

Chapter 5 Scale of New Growth Required

No reference to empty homes; need to use empty properties before building new ones.

Challenge the requirement figure:

- Why is the target figure higher than that in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment derived figure in Table 2 and council waiting lists?
- How will this be matched by employment; are we importing unemployment or increasing commuting?
- Is this high target figure because of resistance to growth in the South?
- The taking of agricultural farmland will lead to increased food miles and result in the loss of productive agricultural land.
- Central Government has announced that it will be restricting in-migration; will this have an impact on the target for house building?
- Why is the requirement so high that we have to use sites in the green belt?

Need to better reflect the importance of impacts on sustainability and bio-diversity in future drafts of the Core Strategy.

Core Strategy should be flexible enough to accommodate future changes to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) given the Government's stated growth agenda, RSS is not a ceiling. Need to maintain awareness of the emerging RSS and take this into account if timescales coincide with the preparation of the Rotherham Local Development Framework.

The Council should improve the current housing stock before building new houses (specifically an issue raised in respect to Dinnington).

Why is Rotherham Urban Area the main focus for new development?
Development in public transport corridors are also a key consideration.

Inclusion of Growth Point housing numbers in the requirement is not convincing the Core Strategy is not clear how the Growth point figure was arrived at.

Table 2 (of the Core Strategy) highlights the disparity between the locally derived figure and the local figure, this disparity is made worse by the 'Growth Point' house building additions. Over-allocation of housing land could needlessly destroy countryside, result in unsustainable distribution of development, and threaten regeneration.

Table 2 is confusing and the purpose not clear. Given the undersupply against the requirement so far, management of delivery and the housing trajectory are very important.

Support for growth but flexibility in distribution required. Housing need should be taken into account when distributing growth between settlements. Reminded that the RSS figure is not a ceiling figure and Option 1 does not deliver enough housing to meet the overall target (i.e. with Growth Point included).

Sequential approach no longer included in Planning Policy Statement 3; greenfield land will need to be released along with previously developed sites (brownfield) to meet the requirement. The Council has not demonstrated a five year supply of housing land, many of the sites in the urban area may prove to be unviable. Given the scale of growth required, it is unlikely to be accommodated on previously developed land.

Phasing should concentrate development totally on brownfield sites, until they are all used up, before moving onto green field and green belt land. The phased allocation and release of sites is essential in order to meet previously developed land targets and take account of windfalls.

Given the current economic downturn there is a need for careful monitoring of housing sites to prevent an oversupply of sites. Growth targets were based on optimistic figures before the downturn.

The Core Strategy should be flexible enough to accommodate future increases in the housing requirement generated by the Government's growth agenda.

Build rates on larger sites need to be realistic and, subsequently, how much could actually be built during the plan period needs to be accurately assessed e.g. at Waverley.

Why are you proposing to build on land designated green belt? The community has not been consulted on this.

Why did the council not seek views on the housing target? Increases in housing without increases in employment would increase commuting, vacant homes, increased food miles and result in the loss of productive agricultural land.

Developers should build upwards (at higher densities) to save the Green Belt.

Already pressure on infrastructure, more housing will make this situation worse. Development should be gradual, rapid change cannot be good for communities. Doubts about the Councils' ability to service more areas, an example is their ability to keep the streets clean.

Knocking down houses and building new ones seems counter-productive.

The level of analysis is not robust enough to support inclusion of some sites.

Further consideration needs to be given to the viability of sites - are they deliverable?

Using Red / Amber / Green classification could be confusing given that we are talking about greenfield sites.

New buildings cause flooding.

There is a need to review the provision and location of Greenspace within the urban areas.

Employment Issues

4 responses under chapter 5 related to employment issues; 3 of these raised concerns around the employment land requirement identified, and 1 concerned a specific site. The remainder of employment land comments were submitted under question 10.

Question 10: do you agree that we should provide in the region of 250 to 300 hectares of land to meet our employment needs to 2026? If not, how much land do you think we should provide and why?

This question received 68 responses. 22 respondents indicated that they felt that there was no need for the amount of land proposed, with the majority citing the current economic recession, the amount of brownfield land available and number of vacant premises for this view. 12 responses indicated support for the proposed amount, with 1 respondent also indicating that the amount should perhaps be increased.

In 14 responses the need for additional evidence base work to justify the amount of land was highlighted, whilst 14 responses also stated that demand should dictate the amount of land provided. 1 response indicated that employment land should be provided in areas close to key transport links and where designated for growth in the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Sheffield City Council suggested that the provision of employment land be based on the approach taken in their adopted Core Strategy. A separate representation stated that joint employment land provision with Sheffield should be provided, recognising the links between Rotherham and Sheffield in terms of the economy.

A range of other comments and views were provided by respondents including:

- The need for flexibility in the employment land figure
- Brownfield sites and vacant units should be utilised first
- The need for employment and residential provision to balance/support each other
- The quality/suitability of sites to the market should be taken into account
- The impact on the character/historic assets of the borough should be considered
- The infrastructure requirements of employment land provision should be considered

Yorkshire Water indicated that they have made provision for 250ha of employment land in their plans – any additional sites differing from current provision may drain to infrastructure with uncertain capacity. They also indicated that option 1 most closely resembles the growth they have programmed for.

The Development Plan should ensure that with mixed use sites land is not double counted for employment and housing – in the mixed use allocations and supporting policy should indicate how much land a site should contribute to different uses.

Ensure that the balance between housing and employment land in settlements/areas is justified

Ensure that the Core Strategy refers to Sheffield City Region and shows economic role of Rotherham within this. Also articulate the interplay between Rotherham and neighbouring authorities.

Chapter 6 Capacity to Accommodate Growth

35 representations were received to Chapter 6, raising issues including:

- Lack of capacity within Rotherham, Wickersley, Bassingthorpe Farm, Wath, Brampton, West Melton, Dinnington and Anston to accept levels of population growth.
- Allocations should be considered in the context of the influence of Sheffield both in terms of providing higher level services and facilities as well as being a major source of housing demand and employment.
- Query why North & South Anston have been separated in the settlement hierarchy.
- Some agreement with capacity at Bramley and Wickersley and possibility that capacity could be increased.
- Some support for increased development at Dinnington.
- Objection to the principle of Green Belt release.
- The status of Catcliffe in the settlement hierarchy should be increased.
- Highways Agency requested that the operational conditions of the Strategic Road Network in the vicinity of Rotherham and programmed improvements to the network in this area be included in the main Core Strategy document.
- Document fails to record the increased demands and pressures on local infrastructure.
- Thorpe Hesley should not be identified for further significant development.
- National Grid highlight passage of high voltage underground electricity transmission lines at Waverley and overhead lines at Bramley/ Wickersley.
- LGYH : query level of discussion with Doncaster regarding cross boundary implications of any expansion into Doncaster Green Belt; query whether strategic allocations will be identified in the Core Strategy; and stress importance and need for infrastructure plan.

- Concern that the South Yorkshire Settlement Study is out of date and needs updating.
- Support for a new community at Waverley.

Chapter 7 Core Strategy Revised Options Issues Identified Within Standard Representations

The following table has been prepared to deal with all of the issues raised under questions 11, 12 and 13 relating to the three options put forward to deliver the Borough's Growth Strategy. The majority of representations received objecting to specific sites or the proposed urban extensions have been included under question 13. The questions can be found on page 39 of the Core Strategy Revised Options document May 2009.

Issue(s)	Response
	<p>Please note: The Council is to undertake further Sustainability Appraisal work to ensure that it has considered all possible alternatives for urban extensions (for example land at Thorpe Hesley) and to allow a fuller comparative appraisal of those suggested (including Bassingthorpe Farm), so that the final Core Strategy can select the most sustainable sites.</p>
<p>Specific LDF site references/street names provided</p>	<p>The Core Strategy Revised Options are presented to help decide the broad growth strategy for the Borough and to establish the basis for the later identification of Site Allocations. This is in line with Government Policy. The decision was taken to present the results of early survey work for the Site Allocations Document to give an indication of how the Core Strategy options could be implemented. However, the delivery of actual sites must be Core Strategy led, not the other way round. Full consultation and appraisal of the individual sites will take place as part of preparation of the Site Allocations Document. The Core Strategy's strategic sites have been subject to Sustainability Appraisal as presented.</p>
<p>Loss of Green Belt Land</p> <p>Consider all brownfield sites for development initially which would more than meet the current housing demand/utilisation of existing empty housing and business units (both private and publicly owned for sale or rent)</p>	<p>Rotherham's housing target is set in the Regional Spatial Strategy, which is part of Rotherham's statutory development plan. The LDF must seek to meet, but cannot challenge, the targets established in the Regional Spatial Strategy. The Council has carried out an extensive survey of the Borough during 2008 and has determined that there is not enough brownfield land or other land within the urban area to meet our targets. The Core Strategy Revised Options document therefore sought views on the most appropriate strategic locations for growth and release of Green Belt land to meet our targets. The vast majority of the Green Belt will remain intact. If the Core Strategy and accompanying Site Allocations document do eventually allocate sufficient Green Belt land for development to meet our targets this</p>

Issue(s)	Response
Proposals do not take account of an ageing population and static/declining birth rate in terms of housing requirement	will consist of only about 2% of the current Rotherham Green Belt.
Loss of (ancient) woodland, fields, (ancient) hedgerows, gardens, allotments and grasslands.	As an irreplaceable asset, equivalent to Site of Special Scientific Interest status, ancient woodland will not be developed. Allotments can be subject to their own statutory protection and the Council will have regard to the requirements of any legal mechanisms conferred on allotment sites. These will form a crucial element in any discussions surrounding their future use. Fields and hedgerows would be lost but opportunities can be taken to ensure new boundaries are created respecting the characteristics of existing hedgerows.
Increased carbon footprint	New development would need to minimise its carbon footprint through new and innovate design and incorporation of sustainable features, noting the Government's target that all new housing should be carbon neutral by 2016. Building upon Government guidance, the LDF will include policies to reduce the carbon footprint of new development at standards yet to be decided.
Disruption of local bridleways & footpaths	If existing routes cannot be retained, equivalent or enhanced provision will need to be provided.
Loss of valuable, heavily used recreational spaces	If sites are to be developed, the balance of built development to open space would need to be informed by the findings of the Borough Council's Greenspace Strategy and Green Infrastructure requirements, both of which are currently in preparation and will be supported by LDF policy. Open space standards would need to reflect both existing use from current neighbouring residential areas and new demand from new development.
Loss of the natural break from other communities/urban sprawl/feeling close to the countryside	The sites presented are "areas of search" within which there would need to be retained and enhanced green infrastructure. Coalescence of currently distinct and separate communities will be prevented unless this would improve existing settlement form. Links to surrounding countryside would need to be retained wherever possible, or replaced by enhanced provision elsewhere.
Housing would be near to Laportes Chemical works	This chemical works is subject to a consultation zone to exclude development as informed by the Health and Safety Executive. This would be enhanced further by an additional buffer zone as part of any new development.
Over capacity for local infrastructure e.g.	An Infrastructure Delivery Plan is required to accompany submission of the Core Strategy to the Government for

Issue(s)	Response
schools, doctors/dentists/elderly care and post office	independent public examination. The infrastructure requirements from new development, and impact on existing infrastructure, need to be reasonably demonstrated and catered for. In further preparation of the LDF, the Council will need to discuss its proposals with relevant service providers to ensure that adequate infrastructure is provided to support new development. The LDF will establish where infrastructure will be required and how it will be provided; either by developer contributions or public finance.
<p>Heavy traffic on local roads which are usually in a poor state of repair & possible safety issues for current residents</p> <p>Links to the main transport interchanges are inadequate for an industrial application</p> <p>Existing bus services are poor</p>	Proposed development of the sites would be assessed for their contribution to traffic generation and their impact on congestion, particularly on bus routes and on the primary road network and against the present and potential availability of public transport and its capacity to meet increased demand. Links to transport interchanges and to the Borough's Strategic Highways Network would also be examined.
Specific sites having overhead power cables – noise and health hazard	Development on sites with overhead power cables can normally be accommodated through appropriate buffer strips and consideration within the overall site design and layout of development, respecting existing noise and health guidelines.
Specific sites may be unstable due to historic mine workings	Consultation on sites to be considered further for potential allocation would be subject to consultation with the South Yorkshire Mining Advisory Service and the Coal Authority who hold records of historic mine workings.
Loss of agricultural land and reduction in the capacity to produce "local" food	Government planning guidance on the consideration of the impact of development on food production concerns the need to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land given in Planning Policy Statement 7 (paragraphs 28-29). Regional Spatial Strategy Policy ENV7 states that if development of agricultural land is required it should take place on poorer quality land wherever possible and appropriate. The survey work to identify potential allocation site has had regard to DEFRA's classification of agricultural land quality. Further Sustainability Appraisal work is to be undertaken to assess the possible urban extensions and possible alternatives and for future preparation of the Site Allocations Document which will examine this issue in more detail.

Issue(s)	Response
<p>Impact on watercourses/flooding concerns</p> <p>Contouring of land and its potential to act as a series of conduits to channel water</p>	<p>The identification of sites for potential allocation will be informed by the Borough's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, as supplemented by any additional more detailed assessments that may be required, in consultation with the Environment Agency. Drainage considerations will need to be included within the site's overall design to include measures such as Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems wherever possible.</p>
<p>Loss of wildlife/plant life /aquatic life and associated damage to habitats and environments</p>	<p>Further work to enhance the biodiversity knowledge of sites being considered as potential urban extensions will inform additional Sustainability Appraisal to in turn inform choice of the preferred Core Strategy Option. This will supplement the existing analysis undertaken for each site as part of the Borough wide survey of potential site allocations in 2008. Further work will also be undertaken in deciding which individual sites should be identified within the Site Allocations Document.</p>
<p>Damage to pride of longstanding community in the shared environment</p>	<p>The development of large scale urban extensions will have an impact on existing communities. However any future development must respect the character of existing communities and their setting in the wider environment. Using the principles of urban design and the provision of strong landscaping this will assist the integration of new development into the wider environment.</p>
<p>Visual impact</p>	<p>Through appropriate layout and design the visual impact can be reduced and existing poor settlement built form can actually be enhanced by sensitive new development. The Council has undertaken a Landscape Assessment, including detailed assessment of the landscape character of the proposed urban extensions, and this will help inform choice of sites.</p>
<p>No rail links to this area of the Borough</p>	<p>There is potential to improve linkages to existing rail links in Rotherham town centre by improved integration with existing public transport services and with new services provided to meet the needs of newly developed areas.</p>
<p>The area is bereft of leisure facilities</p> <p>If people wanted to visit local beauty spots they would invariably drive rather than walk through streets of houses</p>	<p>Whilst this position may be argued based on the facilities that are available at present, the Council will endeavour to promote as wide a range of recreation and leisure opportunities as feasible in accessible locations to ensure the widest possible choice and participation by all groups. Sites well-served by public transport will be favoured in order to encourage use by those people without access to a car or with restricted mobility. Such uses could also complement shopping and business functions as well as adding greater life and vitality to communities. The green infrastructure and public rights of way networks will form significant components of the</p>

Issue(s)	Response
	future leisure offer and contribute strongly in shaping any potential architectural or aesthetic form.
The unemployment rate is rising and the ability to attract businesses into the area is falling	Whilst preparation of the LDF will take account of the current economic recession, it should be recognised that the development plan is a long term strategy covering the period to 2026. The Council is currently updating its Employment Land Review, which will involve a further consideration of our employment land requirements taking into account the current economic climate. Deciding which sites to use for economic development will be taken forward through the Site Allocations DPD.
There a number of significant historical sites within these areas	The impact of the sites upon the historic environment requires careful consideration, such as the potential of the Bassingthorpe Farm site to impinge upon the Wentworth estate or on the listed Barbot Hall. However, through appropriate layout and design, including buffer zones protecting the setting of these features, it is considered these concerns can be accommodated. Assessment of impact upon historic features, informed by further discussion with the statutory body English Heritage, will be used to inform the selection of sites.
Corus steelworks is now an alternative – the Council are urged to consider this site	There is no suggestion that CORUS is closing nor is this something the Council would wish to promote. Contamination, flooding difficulties and proximity to industrial development are likely to be significant obstacles to residential development.
Agree that Rotherham needs to build new homes and Bramley may be able to accommodate some of this need for homes but the scale proposed using green belt land would devastate Bramley	Various urban extensions have been considered across the whole of Rotherham, one of which includes an area of land east of Moor Lane South in Bramley/Ravenfield. However, the coming forward of this site is only proposed within Option 3. Put simply this is the option that presents all of the development opportunities that are available on the sites that have been surveyed to date. As such, it makes no judgement on the future selection of any of these sites and suggests that development could take place in, or on the edge of, any of the Borough's settlements. In considering this specific site, it is acknowledged that a significant element of deliberations regarding its potential to form part of a future preferred Option, would include possible access routes onto the strategic road network. Discussions with the Highways Agency would strongly inform the approach taken and help establish the relative desirability of this site being developed.

Chapter 8 Employment Land Strategy

Overview

This part of the consultation document gave rise to 132 responses; 78 of which were in response to question 14 regarding options for an employment land strategy, and 41 in response to question 15 which asked about potential strategic employment locations.

General Issues

13 representations were received of which 5 concerned specific sites or made comment regarding particular proposed strategic employment locations. 4 comments were made regarding the current economic recession and existing vacant units, indicating a need to revisit the evidence base for determining employment land requirements.

Other comments included the need to ensure flexible policies to allow re-use of employment land for alternative uses where appropriate, support for developing brownfield sites first, and detailed points concerning assumptions on commuting patterns, cross boundary movements and the distribution of employment land in differing core strategy options. These will be helpful in finalising the core strategy and supporting policies.

Ensure that the Employment Land Review update takes account of the recession, vacant units etc. Consideration will also be given to cross boundary movements.

Question 14: should land for new jobs be provided:

a. on sites within or close to settlements?

b. in a smaller number of strategic employment areas in accessible locations?

c. in a combination of the above locations?

This question received 78 responses. In addition to responses to the specific question many representations raised other employment land issues.

With regard to the options presented:

- 4 responses supported option A
- 15 responses supported option B, and
- 25 responses supported option C

Over half of relevant responses (57%) supported option C, providing land in both strategic and local locations. 34% supported development in strategic locations only, and only 9% supported providing land in local locations only.

A large number of responses (24) raised concerns about the need for employment land given the current economic situation, highlighting the need to ensure that employment land requirements are based on up to date evidence base. Another respondent queried the evidence base in respect of analysing future market and employment sector needs and requirements, accessibility and taking account of site suitability.

12 respondents commented on specific sites or possible strategic locations, which will be helpful in informing the preparation of the Core Strategy and the Site Allocations work.

Other comments covered a range of issues including support for the town centre as an employment location, the need to prioritise development of brownfield land first, the need to ensure sites are accessible and the need to avoid ecologically sensitive locations and take account of the Landscape Character Assessment.

Assess the viability of alternative sites for new office development.

Question 15: if you support options b or c above, do you agree with the strategic employment locations identified? Are there other locations which you think should be considered?

41 responses to this question were received, 16 of which agreed with the proposed strategic employment locations. 4 responses disagreed with the locations; 2 raised concerns around the Maltby/ Hellaby area and the potential to encourage unsustainable transport choices, whilst the Highways Agency are concerned with the impact in all proposed locations on the Strategic Road Network.

5 responses highlighted the need to develop on brownfield sites or re-use existing premises first. One respondent thought the locations poorly thought out, whilst another noted the need to take account of any historic assets located in the potential strategic locations.

A range of other areas for strategic locations were suggested including the YES Project at Rother Valley Country Park, Maltby Clay Pit, sites in Treeton, Bassingthorpe Farm, Thornhill, Centenary Way and Parkway corridors, Aldwarke and Parkgate.

Consider the need for a sequential policy for employment sites

The Highways Agency expressed concern about the selection of strategic locations for new employment activities unless supported by sustainable, feasible transport schemes in place and can demonstrate “no worse off” impact on Strategic Road Network.

Chapter 9 Options for Rotherham town centre

Overview

This part of the consultation document gave rise to 114 representations. Response to the specific questions was varied, with many comments expressing concern for the current state of the town centre. A number of responses identified how the town centre could be changed or improved which will be helpful in preparing the Core Strategy, allocating land and developing supporting policies.

General Issues

These comments expressed support for the 10 'Town Team' Renaissance Goals and for housing overlooking the river, noted the need to address the implications for retail expenditure of the increased housing provision and identified concerns around parking and the safety and image of the town centre.

Ensure that the borough-wide retail and leisure study takes account of likely distribution of population arising from the chosen core strategy option, and that it reflects the projected population in the Core Strategy

Question 16: in planning for the future of the town centre should we aim:

a. to keep the town centre broadly the same size as it is at the moment (option a)?

b. to expand the town centre, with a larger boundary and shopping area (option b)?

c. for the town centre to be complementary with Parkgate shopping park? This is likely to involve a reduction in the size of the town centre and shopping area and a consideration of the types of uses encouraged within the town centre (option c).

This question attracted 74 responses, 54 of which indicated which option they prefer. The remainder provided other comments. Of those that indicated a preference:

- 28 responses supported option A
- 16 responses supported option B, and
- 10 responses supported option C

One comment expressed confusion with the options given the recent consultation and adoption of a Town Centre Interim Planning Statement. For clarity, following its adoption the Interim Planning Statement was subject to a judicial review and after careful consideration the Council resolved to withdraw the Interim Planning Statement and to take its content forward through the Local Development Framework wherever possible.

Just over half of those responding favoured option A, to keep the town centre broadly the same size as it is at the moment. However support is also evident both for expanding the town centre and developing a complementary role with Parkgate Shopping Park.

Comments provided covered a wide range of issues including the current state of the town centre, the need for investment and the need to take forward the ideas in the Town Team Masterplan, to accepting that the town centre has declined and that the focus should be shifted to Parkgate.

Many comments highlighted the areas of difference between the town centre and shopping centres such as Meadowhall and Parkgate Shopping Centre. There was

also some doubt that improvement to the town centre will actually occur, whilst others highlighted the importance of ensuring that housing plays a key role in any future town centre strategy.

A number of responses put forward arguments in support of extending the town centre in certain locations, which will prove helpful if this option is taken forward. Other responses suggested how parts of the town centre could be developed or altered which will also prove helpful in taking forward the Site Allocation document and supporting policies. Comments also highlighted the need for further evidence base work to inform decisions.

Need to be clear of the 'planned investment' in Rotherham town centre this is important not only to assist in the Core Strategy, Allocations and Policies, but also to assist Development Control in dealing with planning applications

Consider the need for an evening economy policy

Need to incorporate the town centre retail study evidence base as a background paper on the town centre to accompany the draft core strategy, and ensure that a borough wide retail and leisure study is commissioned at the appropriate time

The supporting dual node/strengthened role of Parkgate needs to be addressed in the town centre background document accompanying the draft Core Strategy.

Question 17: if you support option b, do you have any views on how much the town centre should be expanded by and where this should take place? The map for option b identifies two possible areas where the town centre could be extended.

This question attracted 19 responses. None of the responses indicated specifically by how much the town centre should be expanded. Several responses indicated that this should be determined by further evidence base work and also depend on the types of facilities which might be offered.

Responses varied in terms of where any extension should take place. 5 responses supported an extension southwards towards Westgate/the former Guest & Chrimes site, 1 response favoured a northern extension to include the current civic buildings which are to be vacated, and 4 responses favoured extensions to both of these areas. No alternative areas for any expansion were identified, and 7 responses felt that the town centre should not be expanded at all.

One response objected to the redevelopment of the existing civic site, maintaining that the existing buildings should be refurbished. Other comments identified the implications for extending to the north or south, or indicated uses that should be considered in different locations. These comments will be helpful should this option be taken forward.

Need to ensure that any extension is carefully considered and that the issues raised during the consultation are adequately addressed in the town centre background document accompanying the draft CS

Question 18: if you support option c, do you have any views on how much the town centre should be reduced by and where this should take place?

This question attracted 15 responses. Only 1 response expressed any views on how much the town centre should be reduced by (by approximately half), although 4 responses in total indicated broadly that the town centre should be concentrated in a more limited area.

Other comments noted the role of Parkgate Shopping Park and 1 response noted the need for option c to ensure that retail expenditure is not lost to centres outside of the borough. Several comments highlighted potential other roles for the town centre, including more of an entertainment/leisure focus and the re-use of properties and land for housing.

2 responses re-iterated that option c was not supported, one of which noted that giving greater emphasis to Parkgate Retail Park may fail the sequential test set out in PPS6 (now replaced by PPS4) and would be contrary to the Rotherham Renaissance Goals.

The concerns regarding expenditure leakage to other centres needs to be addressed in future evidence base work.

Extracts From Facilitated Workshops, Drop-In Sessions and Public Meetings

The following comments have been extracted from the Interim Feedback Report (December 2009). A number of comments were made in the Report that will guide the future drafting of the Core Strategy for submission purposes. It is not possible to capture all comments in this Final Feedback Report but as already noted, notes of the meetings have already been published and are available for people to read.

This Report includes the most significant planning issues. However every effort has been made not to duplicate issues raised by the workshops and to ensure that there has been a spread of significant planning issues from each of the workshops.

Rotherham North Area Assembly 24 June 2009 Growth Options

Bassingthorpe Farm Urban Extension is a common feature in all options leaving no choice in its selection; any future development needs to be handled sensitively. There is a need to maintain green corridors within the landscape as well as facilities for recreational access. Need for quality design and amenity provision throughout any potential future development.

Concern about urban sprawl between Kimberworth Park and the town centre

Concerned that Greasbrough will lose its identity if the urban extension at Bassingthorpe Farm is pursued.

It is important to strengthen the role of the defined 'principal centres'. Option 2 reduces urban sprawl and better reflects public transport corridors and provides potential solutions to transport issues. It is important that there is a clear transport strategy and sustainable public transport links.

A balanced approach is required in assigning housing numbers to local communities, and an assessment of housing windfalls and the delivery of higher density housing in the town centre and the contribution this will make to the housing supply.

Favour option 2 as infrastructure is already in place, needing enhancement rather than large scale investment.

If option 3 chosen there need to be safeguards to prevent urban sprawl. Need to increase the designations of quality greenspace and ensure high quality design appropriate to localities. Green infrastructure, play areas, provision of community facilities and high quality design were highlighted as being of importance.

Generally felt that the best option would be to locate growth where it can be most sustainably accommodated.

Town centre

The town centre should be developed in preference to further development of retail parks. The existing retail offer in Rotherham is inferior without any branded coffee shops. Clifton Park is a joy.

General support for Rotherham Renaissance Initiative; something needs to be done to stem further decline. Improvements are needed to poor quality buildings on Corporation Street.

Wentworth Valley 25 June 2009

Growth Options

Concern was raised regarding the high level housing target that has been regionally determined.

Maltby Masterplan prepared by Latham's should have been better related to the LDF process.

Expansion of Maltby would potentially have extremely damaging environmental impacts, particularly on limited magnesium limestone reserves.

Noted that the Quality Bus Corridor is now a SMART route and that bus frequency has declined.

Concern expressed at the closure of the gap between Maltby and Hellaby. There is a need to retain the local distinctiveness and identity of the two communities.

There is a lack of traffic capacity in the Maltby area to meet further growth.

Affordable housing needs to be fully integrated within new residential developments.

Employment Land Strategy

Before further employment development takes place, consideration should be given as to how best to utilise the currently unoccupied vacant floorspace.

Wentworth South Area Assembly 25 June 2009

Growth Options

One of the problems is that developers are only interested in profit. There needs to be strong control by the Council to ensure that the community infrastructure needs of the community are understood and essential community infrastructure is provided. Need to create beneficial places for people to live.

Town Centre

People felt that there should only be one town centre and that is the current one.

The town centre will benefit from the niche markets and smaller shops as it is clear to everyone that the big retailers prefer Meadowhall and Retail World at Parkgate. Cost of parking was felt to be a major issue that affected the town centre, when parking is free at places like Retail World and Meadowhall.

Rotherham South Area Assembly 29 June 2009

Town Centre

The Minster has become a more prominent feature now that the former All Saints complex has been demolished. This should be made central feature with seating areas etc.

Why do we persist in putting flats in the town centre? This is not encouraging families into the town and it is not conducive to building communities. Concern expressed that there is potential conflict between residents and the night-time economy.

Rotherham town centre is very compact and easy to get around. However we have to accept that Parkgate will not go away and need to develop transport links there.

Rotherham market is very important to local people and is not being improved.

Growth Options and Employment Strategy

Why isn't the Council House waiting list relevant to the discussion?

Will there be sufficient educational facilities for all the proposed new houses?

Development of the Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension will have a major visual impact.

Any new development would have to have improved transport links.

Need to attract employment opportunities before building significant numbers of new homes.

Women's Strategy Workshop 6 July 2009

Growth Options

Concern re: drainage at Bassingthorpe Farm – Scrooby Lane floods. Concern expressed about the viability of the farm and farm land. There is possible conflict between any future development and the retention of allotments in the area.

Concern noted regarding the maintenance of greenspace areas. Will ECO homes be built as part of these proposals? Problems expressed over congestion on local side roads and the inability of emergency vehicles to pass along them.

There is a need to create new communities rather than simply providing areas for housing, they should be inclusive and integrated and must not just be an 'add-on' to existing communities. Need to prevent social isolation within new developments and the promotion of community cohesion and good design is essential to achieving these principles.

Greenspace is essential within all new developments. The development of previously developed land is not a good thing if informal play space / activity areas

are lost to new development a good example is the former primary school land at Maltby.

Town centre

Rotherham Markets are very good but not enough diversity to attract people into the town. There is not much to attract folks into the town centre. The closing time of shops is too early to take advantage of the free parking initiative.

We should be considering the provision of a cinema within the town centre. The re-developed arts centre and cultural quarter need to be close to the bus station and safe to walk to at night.

Subways are unpopular with women. They are perceived as unsafe.

Not in favour of demolition of the current Civic offices. Why are you building new offices? Why not refurbish existing buildings? Not clear what is currently happening within the town centre through the Rotherham Renaissance Initiative.

Rother Valley South Area Assembly 7 July 2009

Growth Options

The taking of allotments for new development is going against national trends; allotments bring local communities together.

All new housing estates will need services and utilities and the issues of drainage and the risks of flooding will need to be considered and resolved.

There will also be a need for new schools. All of these issues will need to be addressed where new development is proposed.

Infrastructure in terms of roads and sewage were the biggest concerns as the group felt that the infrastructure is already working at capacity and would not be able to take the stress from more houses being built.

Concern that there are limited bus services to areas in south Rotherham specifically Woodsetts.

What consideration will be given to environmental issues and climate change?

Need for greater parking opportunities to be provided at Kiveton Park and Kiveton Bridge Stations to enable commuting by public transport.

The loss of greenspace is a concern.

New jobs should be for local people living in the area not for people commuting into work.

Need for older people's housing should be considered.

Need to develop more green industries that will assist in tackling climate change.

Who are the new houses to be built for?
What is the type of housing to be built?
How will the sites be selected?

Would it be more cost effective to build a new village or town from scratch rather than spending money on correcting previous errors and promoting more dispersed developments in areas which don't have the necessary infrastructure capacity?

What will be the plans for recreation?

Wentworth North Area Assembly 8 July 2009

Concern was raised regarding the level of publicity for the workshop. Concern was raised that the Parish councils had not been invited to the facilitated workshop. Publicity regarding the workshop was not sent until a week before the event itself - this is too short notice. Concern expressed that in the past, consultation has been carried out but feedback has not been provided to the community.

Concern that people have moved out of properties that are to be demolished and that these have then stood empty for a long time.

There is a need to build employment opportunities before building houses. The jobs available need to include professional, managerial and skilled jobs.

Biodiversity Forum Workshop 14 July 2009

Protection of sites: where this is a population of protected species shouldn't these be protected from future development?

How did the government decide on the housing target? A number of factors are considered, moving development from the over-heating south east to the Midlands and north of England, increasing birth rates, people living longer, changing household occupancy figures, in-migration, and housing to meet the planned growth in jobs are all factors that are considered.

Have empty and vacant housing figures been included within the calculations?
Does the Council know where these sites are? Could the development of windfall housing sites lead to an over supply of houses?

Concern that the release of all sites in one go will lead to "cherry picking" by developers and could jeopardise the countryside. Will there be phasing policies for sites to be released after 15 years? Will the Council plan, monitor and manage the release of housing site to meet the predicted target?

How are you managing cross-boundary issues? Need to take an overview of sites beyond local authority boundaries.

Dinnington, Maltby and Silverwood collieries: where these have been restored for bio-diversity purposes are they likely to be developed in the future?

What is the scope and extent of the proposed policies? The forum would like to be able to comment on these in the future. How will sites be selected in the future?

The group discussed the potential impact of future development on identified Local Wildlife Sites (LWS). Consideration was given to the following factors: where the proposed allocation will have no negative impact on the LWS; where there is some query about the boundaries of the allocation and wildlife sites that may require minor amendments to the allocation boundary and or require the provision of agreed buffer areas between the site boundaries; where the group has significant concern about the likely impact of the proposed allocation of a site for development on the LWS.

Any sites that are put forward for development and in conflict with a LWS should be reviewed and decisions taken on a site by site basis.

How are landscape and archaeology being considered in the Options consultation?

It was recommended that sites are allocated for 10 years of development only. Development should be undertaken in a phased way to ensure that the most sensitive sites are protected. The most sensitive sites should not be allocated for future development.

Forum very anxious about urban extensions within the green belt and they promoted the provision of Green Infrastructure Corridors throughout any future development sites; these should be substantial and an essential part of any future design. Every effort should be made to ensure that roads and highway infrastructure do not cut-off permeability and don't divide LWS and foot path links. Consideration will also need to be given to hedgerows and streams throughout the area.

Rother Valley West Area Assembly 27 July 2009

The RMBC web site is not easy to use.

Does today's economic downturn affect the target figures for housing numbers and employment land provision?

Concern expressed that there has been no consultation with service providers such as the Environment Agency.

Why are we not looking to utilise empty houses first? There are plenty of them. The council could buy homes from the private sector.

Where are the people in the area to fill the homes?

Aston, Aughton, Swallownest do not want another supermarket.

Concern was raised regarding the potential for further flooding issues, given the recent flooding problems in this locality.

Is the development of a new railway station at Swallownest, as part of the proposed YES extreme sport project, viable? When YES is up and running, the transport situation in this area will be horrendous.

Renewable energy must be a priority in any future development proposals. There should be greater support for solar energy.

Town Centre

Leeds, Doncaster and Barnsley have all benefited from good shopping centres but Rotherham Town centre is poor.

How will the development of a new Tesco's Extra store in Rotherham impact on other shops in the town centre?

Rotherham Tenants and Residents Rotherfed 29 July 2009

People in Rotherham don't want to be part of any urban sprawl, we want individual communities.

We don't want people saturation or problems with flooding.

We should make sure that a certain number of new properties are council houses or affordable.

People are worried about overloading of the transport systems.

There is a need for more flats and houses for single and disabled people.

Why is Bassingthorpe Farm Urban Extension on all of the options?

There should be a policy of filling vacant property first. Prioritise brown field sites with a sequential approach to releasing land for development.

Don't be hard and fast with green belt policy. Promote building on scraggy green belt land near existing built up areas first.

There need to be strict policies on dealing with sewerage and drainage.

Transport infrastructure needs to be put in place before development proceeds.

Future design needs to be in-keeping, promote history and heritage and at the very least the facades should be retained.

There will be a need for extra schools, GP surgeries, public transport provision and greater connectivity between buses and trains. There should be more facilities for disabled parking.

Greenspace losses should be compensated for. Greenspace should be provided within local communities and designed to encourage defensible space and regular usage.

The Council needs to encourage greater recycling by local communities and businesses and should itself recycle more.

Rotherham Ethnic Minority Workshops 29 July 2009

East Dene needs better houses; Masbrough and Kimberworth Park need more new homes including large family homes.

(The Council) should be looking at old industrial sites to see if these can provide housing opportunities.

Concern that cycle lanes are not safe; the council should consult with local cycling clubs to determine need and to promote cycling in local schools.

Concerns were raised regarding local infrastructure requirements.

The profits made from parking charges should be reinvested in the town centre.

There is a need for a cinema within the town centre.

It is a good idea to have people living in the centre – this is affordable and a green option.

The use of green energy including solar panels should be promoted in new development within the town centre.

Use as little green belt land as possible, protect attractive surrounding land, and exhaust all other options first. Town centre living should be at a higher density than elsewhere.

Dislike the design of new houses - there is no character in 'box' design. Need for greater distinctiveness, people cannot live in hamster cages. High quality design is important.

Need to develop and design safe and secure environments. There is concern regarding safety at bus stops, racial abuse was raised as an issue.

The town centre has a good health drop-in centre.

Concern expressed that a number of houses are over crowded sometimes with two or three families living in them. There are long waiting lists for property and more housing needs to be provided locally (on the edge of the town centre). When designing new homes there is a need for larger homes and more than one living room.

Asian people prefer to live near to one another – they are a tight knit community and like to live near to local mosques.

The Asian population is aging and there is a need for more care workers who speak different languages. Is there a need for an Asian residential care home? However it is taboo to have the family in care.

When building new communities there is a need for faith buildings to meet spiritual needs.

There are limited shopping opportunities for the BME community within the Borough.

There is a need for small local open spaces with seats and open spaces, like pocket parks.

Town Centre

The town centre is not used as much as it should be. It does not cater for all ages. There is not enough to attract or appeal to 18 – 24 year olds. There are limited opportunities for youth within the town centre and inner Rotherham. There is a lack of facilities and not enough job opportunities. Shops close at 5pm. Need for more and better leisure and community facilities within the town centre including a cinema and function rooms. The communities have to go to Sheffield (and Bradford) for many things.

There aren't enough jobs for people coming out of education. People are getting trained but no jobs available on leaving education.

Policy Areas

There are no train connections between Barnsley and Rotherham. We would like one public transport ticket that can be used on all bus and train journeys and all services. Rotherham Train Station is dirty and smelly. Need for better toilet facilities (and other services and facilities) at Rotherham Train station.

No outdoor areas for recreation particularly in Eastwood.

Problems were identified regarding the lack of space for funerals and for people to show respect to the deceased's family. There isn't a community venue locally for weddings and funerals and have to travel to other parts of South Yorkshire.

Within the last three years an Asian supermarket selling halal meat has opened in Rotherham however many people go to Sheffield to shop for food. Clothes are bought out of town in Bradford and Sheffield.

The town centre is close to some homes which is good. Concern was raised at the poor state of repair of pavements. Need for greater access around shops.

Rotherham Town centre needs a facelift, it needs new shops. The public realm needs to be improved, something more colourful but not crass. It needs more character. An internet café is need in town.

The market is important to the town centre area.

What benefits will there be to the wider community from the development of a Rotherham Football Stadium.

Need for a female only gym.

Clifton Park is fantastic and very central.

Older People's Forum 30 July 2009

It was recognised by the people present, that some activities subsequently included as articles in the local papers, were motivated by different political parties for their own ends. Concern expressed that information from the Council was not being channelled to the right people.

Concern was raised over health impacts and on site contamination arising from the former coking activities and undertaken on the Orgreave Colliery site. Dealing with the contaminants, dust control and ongoing monitoring activities has all been at the forefront in reclaiming and restoring this site for potential future development.

If residential development proposals are to go ahead it has to be demonstrated that the houses and people can be protected from flooding. Keeping people safe from flooding is a key principle to be adhered to.

The Development Plan will plan for a variety of housing types, size and tenure and the local housing needs strategy will be taken into account. A Housing Market Assessment has been undertaken to assess local housing needs.

One participant expressed grave concerns at the misinformation in the local press. It is essential that people attend consultation events so that they can gain a true picture of the proposals.

There is a need for exhibitions in the libraries to draw people in. A poster is required to highlight key information and provide accurate and better information. Were any leaflets prepared? This is a good way of getting information and messages across to people. Use the libraries as a promotional tool to raise awareness of the consultation events and activities.

Concern expressed that the building of huge new employment units will encroach and negatively impact on housing development. New residential properties are overlooking industrial units at Wath (Express Parks). Is there any conflict here?

There are apparently 3000 empty properties in the Borough, why not fill these properties with people needing accommodation? What is the Council doing to minimise the number of vacant council houses?

Is the Borough's indigenous population demanding the proposed increase in housing?

Rotherham Youth Cabinet 21 July 2009

The Council should make use of existing waste land. East wood is cramped now and there is only playing fields left to build on. New homes would be good if they brought new facilities for young people. Transport links and the roads would have to be improved.

No problem with building new housing if the infrastructure is provided for instance new roads, public transport, leisure, schools, shops and play areas.

No real outcry against the development of new homes in the borough as long as the existing open and green spaces were not destroyed and new facilities, especially for the young, were included.

Need to promote more modern architecture, more leisure facilities and a lot more use of the river area.

Bramley Parish Council Public Meeting 7 July 2009

Have the significant number of currently vacant homes been factored into the Borough's future housing requirement?

Are the housing figures the Borough needs to meet, set by statute or do the Council have discretion to vary them?

What would be the impact of significant development upon the existing infrastructure and what measures have been taken to engage with the highways agency, utility providers and education and health services to ensure that these issues can be addressed?

Ravenfield Parish Council Public Meeting 11 August 2009

The Community of Ravenfield says no to the development of 1,500 more houses.

Queries were raised regarding the target of 24,500 homes. Where had this figure come from?

Queries were raised regarding who would live in these homes in the future?

Concerns were raised regarding the 'Growth Point'.

Concern over using green belt land, especially land in agricultural use as it was now on the political agenda. Concerns were also raised as to the agricultural land classification at Ravenfield.

Public transport infrastructure at Ravenfield is classed as rural and would be inadequate to support significant new development.

Concern was raised that the consultation process discriminated against those without computer access or computer literacy.

For the community of Ravenfield: "Option 3 is not an Option".

Request to revoke 'Growth Point' status.

Rotherham cannot accommodate any more residents.

Bassingthorpe Farm Drop-in Sessions 9, 13, 23, 25 July

The view was expressed that this was a very poor consultation event (Greasbrough Town Hall) venue too small, no parking for non-Greasbrough residents. There were not enough officers to explain things, too many yes and no

answers. Core Strategy response form worse than useless without supporting information. Needed an opportunity to speak and be heard. There needed to be a presentation of the Options.

Opposition expressed to the loss of green belt land.

Concern expressed at the loss of community identity, loss of village feel and loss of rural activities including countryside walks and recreation. We will lose our identity as a separate village, greenspaces should be left all around Greasbrough so it remains a village and wildlife is preserved.

Let's keep Greasbrough as a village, totally against losing the identity of our village. It has already had a lot of its character taken. Allow Rawmarsh to retain its identity and not be 'Rotherham Urban area'.

Concern expressed that there will be a lack of privacy, overcrowding, devaluing of the parish of Wentworth, the Haughs and individual houses and loss of countryside if these proposals go ahead.

The proposals will lead to an increase effect of global warming due to loss of trees, vegetation.

Wildlife exists better without houses and people – leave it alone, build on brownfield sites. There are many protected species in the area. On the old pit site at Stubbin there are bee orchids, lapwing, grey partridge, skylarks, kestrel, 20 species of butterfly and a wide variety of birds. How are hedgerows going to be saved?

Loss of open views, nothing will lessen the impact of the proposed development. This land is seen from Rotherham Town Centre, large tracts of housing would be visually unattractive.

Houses will lose their value if their views are removed. The development will impact on views and quality of life of existing residents.

Loss of viable farmland; Bassingthorpe Farm is a working farm providing food and cutting carbon footprint. Loss of food production locally – development of this agricultural land will contribute to food air miles. Increasing of the carbon footprint if crops no longer grown locally.

Development will lead to a loss of open space near to town centre and views from town will be affected. Greenspaces relieve stress why take it all away?

There is no need to build on green belt land as there is more than enough derelict / boarded up houses in need of repair. Why not regenerate and tidy up the many brownfield sites that are in Rotherham, instead of destroying what little green belt that is left for us and our children.

The proposed development will create urban sprawl. Urban sprawl compounds problems of flooding, congestion and overcrowding of public services. Share out

the build with no loss of green belt land. You have to deal with the re-use of brownfield land first. There is plenty of land round without taking good farm land. Regenerate run down areas.

Build elsewhere not Rotherham, not enough jobs for local people. Where are the proposed residents coming from?

There is no need for a population expansion creating more socio-economic pressures. Make existing area better for people who already live here. More development will only bring social problems. What about crime increase? More homes will create pollution.

New build should include Eco-homes, they should be entirely self-sufficient – solar, wind and ground source energy etc. should all be used. Anything less is detrimental to what is already there.

Businesses are needed but should be on brownfield sites. In view of the recession there is no shortage of these.

There is no employment of all these new people. Think about existing businesses why don't you help them? We have enough unemployed people already. We'd like to see new jobs for people in existing homes.

Parkgate already gridlocked due to the shopping centre. We do not need more traffic. Road links are inadequate at present without more traffic. There will be increased traffic congestion.

People who live in this area have chosen to do so, on the basis of green space, green belt and easy access to the countryside. A development of this scale ignores quality of life on this basis. Evidence shows that smaller developments within existing communities create better, more cohesive living spaces and better integration for people new to the area.

How sustainable / ecologically friendly will the development be? How does this fit with other Government targets? Who is really profiting from the development?

What about the cause of flooding at Cinder Bridge? The area has flooded heavily in the last few years. Why get rid of flood plains to cause even more damage. Where will the water go?

There aren't enough schools, doctors or infrastructure to cope with such a huge development. What about over crowding in our local schools and hospitals? What about the provision of police, fire and ambulance services for this proposed development? What additional community services will be put in place? There is already an over-use of existing facilities.

Where are all these extra people coming from that increase the population to the extent that it warrants this amount of new houses? Who forecasts this population explosion to fill these extra houses?

Within Thornhill there is a need to keep the allotments.

To the east of Bassingthorpe Farm there is a Viking Heritage site.

There are mine shafts dotted all over this area.

Appendix 1: Comments On-Line

Over 6000 representations were received and these have been entered into the Council's database and a response from the council is now available to be viewed. These representations and the Council response are available to view on-line at: <http://consultation.limehouse.co.uk/rotherham/drafts/12/index.html>

The Interim Feedback Report

In addition we have published the notes of all workshops, focus groups, public meetings and drop-in sessions held during the consultation period, including those for the Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension proposals. This document, along with all other documents relating to the preparation of the LDF, is now available on our website at: <http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning>

A hard copy of the Interim Feedback Report is also available to view in the following libraries: Rotherham Town Centre, Dinnington, Wath, Maltby, Swinton, Rawmarsh, Kiveton Park, Wickersley, Greasbrough, Kimberworth and Kimberworth Park and Aston.

Attached for information is a guide to finding the above web pages. This is a "step by step" guide to assist people in viewing all information relating to the Local Development Framework.

Phone:	01709 823869	Post:	Rotherham MBC
Fax:	01709 823865		Forward Planning (CSRO)
Email:	forward.planning@rotherham.gov.uk		Planning and Regeneration Service
Minicom:	01709 823536		Bailey House
Web:	www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning		Rawmarsh Road
			ROTHERHAM S60 1TD

Guide to Using the Council's Forward Planning Web Pages – Quick Help Guide.

Steps to be followed to download the Interim Feedback Report:

1. Log on to the Council's web page and **click on** the 'i' information symbol.
2. In the Popular Information Box **click on** 'planning'.
3. In 'Categories in Planning' **click on** 'Local development framework' category.
4. In 'Local development framework' **click on** the 'Interim Feedback Report' in the text.
5. In 'Core Strategy downloads' **click** 'Download now'. This document is bookmarked and this will help you find the event you are interested in.

Please follow the same procedure for downloading the Final Feedback Report.

If you want to view the comments (representations) made by individuals or organisations follow the next steps:

6. Go back to 'Local development framework' **click on** 'LDF Consultation Portal' in the text.
7. **Click** 'Core Strategy Revised Options'. This will open the Core strategy revised Options document and you can view all comments or representation made. Representations received have been input against either a chapter or a question. The majority of comments from members of the public have been input against question 13.
8. To look at all comments against question 13 **click on** '7 Revised Options' in the left hand box.
9. **Click** 'Summary of Options' in left hand box, this will take you to a further page in the document. Scroll down the main page to the bottom of the page **click on** 'View' icon and all representations received under that question will display. Question 13 has 4176 representations. Follow this procedure to see the comments received for all chapters and questions.

If you want to find a comment from a specific person or organisation, follow the next steps:

10. Go to top right hand side of the orange bar and **click on** 'search'. You can now view all comments made by individuals and organisations in alphabetical order.
11. You can either **click on** a letter tab and search for the specific name under that tab or enter the surname or organisation in 'search' box, this will bring up all representations for that individual or organisation.

Appendix 2: Evidence Base Required to Underpin the Core Strategy

To help support and refine our preferred spatial option for the Core Strategy we are currently progressing several important work streams as outlined below. The Core Strategy is also subject to ongoing and iterative Sustainability Appraisal as required by the regulations.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP): to provide evidence of what physical, social and green infrastructure is needed to implement the Core Strategy. This should cover infrastructure needs and costs, phasing, funding, and responsibility for provision. An approved IDP will be required, alongside an adopted Core Strategy, before any local introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy, which the current Government are intending should mostly replace Section 106 agreements.

Employment Land Review (ELR): to review and assess our current employment land allocations against our RSS target and local employment aspirations. Some land may be surplus to requirements and could potentially be re-allocated as housing land, subject to suitability.

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA): a detailed and thorough technical study in conjunction with private sector house builders to identify housing sites that are suitable, available and achievable. The results of the SHLAA will help to reality check the suitability of potential housing sites.

Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA): to update the previous assessment to determine the amount of housing need in Rotherham and the level of affordable housing provision we should aim to achieve and the mix of housing types and tenures required.

Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Levels 1 and 2 (SFRA 1 & 2): to ensure that our preferred spatial option for the Core Strategy does not rely on sites at severe risk of flooding or sites at lower risk that cannot be developed even with mitigating measures of design and layout.

Landscape Assessment: to determine the character of the landscape at the strategic locations identified for potential urban extensions to assess their capacity to absorb growth.

Green Belt Review: to ensure the methodology we have followed to identify the most suitable locations for release of Green Belt land is robust and transparent.

Environmental evidence base: to ensure that biodiversity, geology and archaeology issues are adequately assessed.

Retail Study: to update the Council's previous retail study to determine the need and capacity of retail development in the Borough and to inform a settlement hierarchy of towns to guide types and levels of retail development to appropriate locations.

This document can be made available in your language and in alternative formats such as Braille, large print, electronic and audio-tape versions.

Contact us at:

minicom 01709 823 536

www.rotherham.gov.uk

اگر آپ کو یہ دستاویز کسی دوسری زبان اور / یا کسی متبادل صورت (فارمیٹ) میں درکار ہو تو ہم سے رابطہ کریں۔
如需索取這份文件的其他語文譯本和/或各種形式版本，請聯絡我們。

در صورتیکہ این مطلب را به زبان و یا شکل دیگری می خواهید - با ما تماس بگیرید

أتصل بنا إذا تريد هذه الوثيقة بلغة أخرى أو بصيغة بديلة

Veillez nous contacter si vous désirez ce document dans une autre langue et/ou dans d'autres formats.