ED23 INSPECTORS MATTER 1 – SUGGESTED WORDING

Para 5.2.12 and 5.2.41

We welcome and support the additional clarification that would be achieved through the suggested modification.

Hastings Planning Strategy Example

Whilst continuing to express our strong reservations regarding the difficulties and challenges associated with Rotherham MBC seeking to comply with the Duty to Cooperate particularly in respect of working together with Sheffield CC to assess and deliver the objectively assessment needs of the Housing Market Area, we consider that the introduction of a paragraph similar in wording to the Hastings Planning Strategy would be helpful. However, in this particular case, an additional sentence should be added which explicitly confirms that in the circumstances where there is a misalignment between the delivery of the strategy being pursued in the Core Strategy and the results indicated from the objectively assessed evidence base for the Housing Market Area then the plan should be subject to an immediate review.

ED25 – HBF – PROPOSED CHANGES TO POLICY CS4

We welcome the underlying principle behind the revised wording suggested by the HBF as it seeks to create an enhanced level of certainty and direction regarding the potential release of suitable Green Belt sites during the time lag between the adoption of the Core Strategy and the adoption of the Sites and Policies DPD. Such approach would seek to accelerate the delivery of housing sites to help assist in meeting the five year land supply and the backlog caused by RMBC’s historic under performance. It would ensure that the proposed housing trajectory is shifted to boost housing delivery earlier in the Plan Period rather than the current delay to growth anticipated.

The suggested Key Diagram proposed could work closely with the evidence base work associated with the emerging Sites and Policies DPD as well as the Strategic Green Belt Review assessment which is a key background document to inform the Core Strategy process.

With reference to the two strategic sites mentioned within this policy, this aspect would need to be reworded should the Inspector be minded to support Bassingthorpe Farm as a Strategic Allocation. We would recommend the following amendment:
“Two strategic sites are identified at Bassingthorpe Farm on the north western edge of Rotherham Urban Area and at Dinnington East. Bassingthorpe Farm is a Strategic Allocation and is removed from Green Belt, the revised detailed boundaries are identified at Plan X. For Dinnington East, the detailed Green Belt boundaries will be defined in the Sites and Policies Document and accompanying Policies Map.”

ED31 – POLICY CS6

We welcome and support the revised wording which identifies Bassingthorpe Farm as a key site as well as a strategic allocation.

We would question the specific reference to an amalgamation of sustainable small and medium size sites as technically they do not comprise ‘key sites’. In Paragraph 2, the intention and sentiments behind the second sentence should specifically relate to all key sites identified rather than singling out sites c) and d).

In so far as the last paragraph is concerned, we suggest that the Inspector adopts the suggested approach and housing numbers identified within the proposed change to CS6 prepared by JVH Town Planning Consultants Limited and circulated during the Hearing.

We welcome and support the reference to phasing being removed from the policies as this will stifle and restrict the opportunity to boost the delivery of housing in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF.