Rotherham Core Strategy: Statement of Co-operation
Introduction

1 The Localism Act (s110) introduced a duty to co-operate in order to encourage and enable strategic planning. The duty covers local planning authorities and other public bodies. The duty came into force on 15 November 2011. The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (part 2) and the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraphs 178-181) elaborate on this duty in relation to plan making.

2 This statement, which accompanies submission of the Rotherham Core Strategy, is intended to assist the Planning Inspectorate in conducting the examination into the plan by explaining how the Council has met its requirements under the ‘duty to co-operate’. The Council already participates in regular cross boundary discussions on strategic planning and related matters. In addition to this ongoing co-operation, specific consultations have been held with neighbouring authorities and other bodies to inform drafting of the Core Strategy. This paper summarises the main conclusions of these discussions. Notes of meetings held are also included as appendices.

3 This paper represents the position at time of writing. However, it is recognised that cross boundary co-operation is an ongoing process. Ultimately, once the Core Strategy has been adopted by the Council, cross boundary co-operation will continue via the established groups working within the Sheffield City Region to ensure successful monitoring and implementation of the plan.

4 Work on the Core Strategy began prior to the duty to co-operate coming into force and some of the ‘prescribed bodies’ were not in existence at the time of preparation. However, it is the council’s view that it has co-operated with relevant local authorities and prescribed bodies, or their predecessors, as part of the process of preparing the Core Strategy. Cross-boundary and sub-regional strategic issues have been addressed. The Council also has working arrangements in place or imminent that will enable strategic issues to be progressed in future.

The Duty to Co-operate

5 Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 adds a new section (33A) to Part 2 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This imposes a duty to co-operate in relation to planning of sustainable development “so far as relating to a strategic matter.” In paragraph 6 of the National Planning Policy Framework it says: “The policies in paragraphs 18 to 219, taken as a whole, constitute the Government’s view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system.” Section 33A (1) as mentioned above imposes the duty to co-operate in relation to planning of sustainable development on local planning authorities, county councils that are not local planning authorities, and where relevant the bodies set out in Part 2, Section 4 (1) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

6 The above regulations also require Local Enterprise Partnerships to ‘engage constructively, actively, and on an on-going basis in any process of the preparation of development plan documents so far as relating to a strategic matter’; this amounts to much the same as ‘co-operation’. The Government has also indicated that Local Nature Partnerships (LNPs) will be treated in the same way when established.

7 ‘Sustainable development’ and ‘Strategic matters’ are defined in the Localism Act 110 (3) and (4) as sustainable development or use of land that has or would have a significant
impact on at least two planning areas, strategic infrastructure that would have a
significant impact on at least two planning areas, or a county matter. Paragraph 156 of
the National Policy Planning Framework 2012 states that strategic matters relate in
particular to:

- homes and jobs needed in the area;
- provision of retail, leisure and other commercial development;
- provision of infrastructure for transport, telecommunications, waste management,
  water supply, wastewater, flood risk and coastal change management, and the
  provision of minerals and energy (including heat);
- provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure and other local
  facilities; and
- climate change mitigation and adaptation, conservation and enhancement of the
  natural and historic environment, including landscape.

8 In paragraphs 178 to 181, the National Planning Policy Framework comments about the
diverse forms the co-operation might take and where joint working might be appropriate. It
is worth noting that the duty to cooperate is not a duty to reach consensus, although in
the majority of cases that is the intention.

9 In terms of the duty to co-operate, the relevant local authorities for Rotherham are:

- Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
- Bassetlaw District Council
- Bolsover District Council
- Chesterfield Borough Council
- Derbyshire County Council
- Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
- Nottinghamshire County Council
- North East Derbyshire District Council
- Sheffield City Council

10 The relevant prescribed bodies for Rotherham as set out in Part 2, Section 4 (1) of The
Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 are:

- Civil Aviation Authority
- English Heritage
- Environment Agency
- Highways Agency
- Homes and Communities Agency
- Rotherham Primary Care Trust (replaced from 1st April 2013 by the local clinical
  commissioning group and the National Health Service Commissioning Board)
- Natural England
- Network Rail (supervised by Office of Rail Regulation)
- South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority (formerly South Yorkshire
  Passenger Transport Authority)

11 To these should be added, for practical purposes, Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise
Partnership (LEP) although, as mentioned above, it is as a result of a slightly different
section of the regulations, and the South Yorkshire Local Nature Partnership.
Existing cross boundary working

12 The longstanding requirements within Town and Country Planning legislation for local planning authorities to consult with a wide range of organisations and individuals (including specified ‘statutory consultees’) when preparing their plans, has been in place for many years. This has ensured at least a minimum contact with these organisations, bodies and individuals, and in the case of neighbouring planning authorities and highway authorities the contact has been more significant.

13 At the regional and sub-regional level the council has made an active contribution to, either through the joint commissioning, involvement and/or preparation of the following plans and studies:

- South Yorkshire Settlement Assessment: Phase 2 Settlements (2005)
- Regional Spatial Strategy (The Yorkshire and Humber Plan), 2008 (now revoked);
- Natural England Yorkshire & Humber Green Infrastructure Mapping Project, 2010
- South Yorkshire Green Infrastructure Strategy, 2011
- Low Carbon and Renewable Energy Capacity in Yorkshire and Humber, 2011;
- Sheffield and Rotherham Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (updated 2012)
- Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Joint Waste DPD, adopted March 2012
- Forecasts of Populations and Households for the Sheffield City Region, 2013
- Regional Marine Aggregates Study, 2013 (currently in preparation)
- Draft South Yorkshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Study, 2012
- Joint Rotherham and Doncaster Local Aggregate Assessment / Minerals Monitoring Report (currently in preparation)

14 Work on the Core Strategy has taken place within the context of the Regional Strategy, prior to its revocation; initially the Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber which was published in December 2004, and subsequently the Yorkshire and Humber Plan which replaced it in 2008. The Council actively participated in the review of the Spatial Strategy, including engagement in all rounds of consultation and officers taking part in the Examination in Public.

15 Since 2009 the Council has been working with authorities in South Yorkshire and the north of the East Midlands, to plan together in a Sheffield City Region context. With the formation of the Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) this work has become more proactive with a view to being able to both discuss with and advise the LEP board concerning policy-making across the city region. This has contributed towards the achievement of Enterprise Zone designation along the M1 corridor, focused around the Advanced Manufacturing Park, Templeborough and the Lower Don Valley.

16 The Council plays a full part in existing cross boundary working structures, including the bi-monthly Sheffield City Region Planning Officers Group (where authorities share progress reports and discuss items of mutual concern, concentrating particularly on strategic matters) and the South Yorkshire/Sheffield City Region Heads of Planning meetings (held every three months to discuss issues of mutual concern). In fact, during Rotherham’s tenure as chair of the Planning Officers Group (2010/11) its membership was widened from South Yorkshire to encompass all the Local Planning Authorities within the Sheffield City Region in response to the demise of regional planning. The Terms of Reference of the Planning Officers Group are attached at appendix 18. Through the
Planning Officers Group a Duty to Cooperate matrix is being produced which will record cross boundary issues that exist in the Sheffield City Region, provide evidence of the issues being tackled and monitor progress as to how they are resolved. The matrix will also provide information on any common issues across the city region that could require a joint approach and/or allow best practices to be adopted. A draft is currently being produced and it is intended to be a living document that can be updated on a regular basis. The draft is attached at appendix 24 which, although yet to be finalised, includes the issues identified between Rotherham and other City Region authorities.

17 Spatial planning leads from the Sheffield City Region local authorities attend meetings under the LEP structure to liaise with housing colleagues and the Homes and Communities Agency to feed into the work of the LEP Housing and Regeneration Board.

18 From 2009 meetings of a Sheffield City Region Spatial Development Group brought together planning, transport and economic development officers interested in taking a City Region-wide approach. Officers participated fully in this work, until it was taken up by the Housing and Regeneration and Planning Policy Officers groups.

19 Along with Barnsley and Doncaster, the Council has recently adopted a Joint Waste Core Strategy DPD (March 2012). This sets out how the three authorities will accommodate waste arisings over the next 15 years and safeguards existing and potential new sites for waste treatment. A preferred site for a new waste treatment facility to serve the three authorities has been identified in Rotherham at Wath upon Dearne, and has been granted planning permission by the Council subject to conclusion of a S106 agreement.

20 At Member level the Council actively engages with neighbouring authorities in a number of areas, including representation on the LEP and its sub groups (including the Housing and Regeneration Board mentioned above). The Council has been represented on the South Yorkshire Planning and Transportation Steering Group (which last met in February 2011) which provides informal political scrutiny, guidance and feedback on the delivery of Local Transport Plan 2 and the development of Local Transport Plan 5, the development and delivery of the sub-regional major scheme portfolio and on relevant spatial/land use planning issues.

21 The South Yorkshire Local Nature Partnership (SY LNP), covering the northern half of the Sheffield City Region, was formally recognised by Government in July 2012. The Council provided input to and supported the partnership’s establishment and continues to play a central role in taking forward the Local Nature Partnership. RMBC are represented on the partnership Board; work to date has included drafting ‘terms of reference’ and working to agree proposals for the partnership’s vision and strategic priorities.

Consultations with neighbouring authorities and other bodies and agencies

22 Throughout the evolution of the Core Strategy, the Council has sought to engage with the various statutory bodies and other agencies with an interest in Rotherham. This has been accomplished via the various consultation stages undertaken on the Core Strategy. More detail is available in the Consultation Statement accompanying the submission of the Core Strategy (RSD/11).
In addition to this ongoing consultation, the Council has completed an Infrastructure Delivery Study to support the Core Strategy (KSD/4). This has quantified the amount and distribution of future growth, sought infrastructure providers views on this growth, identified where and when new infrastructure will be required and provided a costed schedule of new infrastructure. This study involved extensive consultation with the other bodies and agencies responsible for infrastructure provision within and beyond Rotherham borough. The Infrastructure Delivery Study has been submitted alongside the Core Strategy. For convenience, the list of bodies consulted is given at Appendix 19.

The Council has also participated in a number of meetings, particularly prior to Publication of the Core Strategy, to discuss cross boundary issues. Meetings were held with the following:

- Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council (1/12/11)
- Bassetlaw District Council (28/11/11)
- Bolsover District Council (5/1/12)
- Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils (29/5/12)
- Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council (18/1/12 & 15/6/12)
- Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council & Derbyshire County Council (7/5/13)
- Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council & Nottinghamshire County Council (13/5/13)
- English Heritage (25/9/12)
- North East Derbyshire District Council (27/1/12)
- Sheffield City Council (7/12/11, 28/3/12, 24/8/12, 5/9/12, 24/9/12, and 7/3/13)

Minutes of these meetings are attached at appendices 1 to 17. The discussions broadly revealed few concerns from neighbouring authorities regarding Rotherham’s proposed strategy. The areas highlighted for further discussion and joint working follow.

**Barnsley** – no major concerns raised with the Core Strategy’s growth targets, spatial strategy and strategic policies. Agreement to consider the Dearne Valley, employment land provision and distribution, transport connectivity in future joint working/co-operation. Specific issues of rail alignments between Barnsley and Doncaster that may be impacted by site choices in Rotherham and Barnsley’s respective site allocation documents to be considered in drafting these documents.

**Bassetlaw** – no major concerns raised with the Core Strategy’s growth targets, spatial strategy and strategic policies. Any potential cross boundary impact, such as the potential for increased traffic on the A57 generated by development at Dinnington, to be considered by Rotherham’s Infrastructure Delivery Study and any mitigation measures identified to be sought through S106 and/or CIL.

**Bolsover** – no major concerns raised with the Core Strategy’s growth targets, spatial strategy and strategic policies. Local strategy statements and employment land studies discussed. Nearest potential impact on Rotherham borough is a strategic site to north of Bolsover borough which has been dropped by the Council but still being pursued by developers.

**Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Counties** – no major concerns raised with the Core Strategy’s growth targets, spatial strategy and strategic policies. Areas identified for further investigation were the levels of commercial development in settlements in the
south of Rotherham borough and the potential for waste arisings from such development to require additional waste capacity at facilities in the north of Derbyshire County. Also the issue of future sand and gravel supply was highlighted as an area for further discussion with Doncaster MBC. Following discussions a joint position statement regarding minerals has been agreed between Rotherham MBC, Doncaster MBC, Nottinghamshire CC and Derbyshire CC; this is attached at appendix 22.

**Doncaster** – no major concerns raised with the Core Strategy’s growth targets, spatial strategy and strategic policies. Specific issues of rail alignments between Barnsley and Doncaster that may be impacted by site choices in Rotherham and Doncaster’s respective Sites DPDs to be considered in drafting these documents. Consideration of reference to links to Robin Hood Airport in Rotherham Core Strategy. Consideration of findings from updated South Yorkshire Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment, to be included in Rotherham Core Strategy policy. Future joint working on longer term minerals supply would be beneficial. Following discussions a joint position statement regarding minerals has been agreed between Rotherham MBC, Doncaster MBC, Nottinghamshire CC and Derbyshire CC; this is attached at appendix 22.

**North East Derbyshire** – no major concerns raised with the Core Strategy’s growth targets, spatial strategy and strategic policies. Agreement that approaches to protection and promotion of the Chesterfield Canal now broadly in line between RMBC and NEDDC.

**Sheffield** – the City council lodged an objection to Rotherham’s Draft Core Strategy consultation of summer 2011 on the subject of housing targets. Sheffield expressed concern that Rotherham were proposing a lower local target than that contained in the Regional Spatial Strategy. Extensive discussions have taken place over a number of subsequent meetings considering housing targets, population projections and land supply issues in Sheffield and Rotherham. Agreement has been reached to co-operate on a memorandum of understanding. Setting aside the issue of the amount of Rotherham Local Plan’s housing target, Sheffield had no major concerns with the Core Strategy’s spatial strategy and policies.

**Civil Aviation Authority** – Rotherham contains one small airfield in the south-east of the borough at Netherthorpe, Thorpe Salvin. In response to consultation, the Civil Aviation Authority has not raised any concerns regarding Rotherham’s Core Strategy (see appendix 20).

**English Heritage** – English Heritage have been consulted during Core Strategy preparation, and have provided comments and feedback which have shaped the document. Most recently, following the submission of objections to the Publication Core Strategy a meeting was held with English Heritage to discuss their concerns. These focused on the need for additional wording relating to heritage in the challenges and opportunities section, the need for a separate issue relating to heritage, amendment of objective 11, further evidence base requirements in relation to Policy CS1 / Bassingthorpe Farm, and the wording of Policies CS3, CS13 and CS26.

**Environment Agency** – the Environment Agency have been consulted during Core Strategy preparation, and have provided comments and feedback which have shaped the document. In particular the Agency has helped shape the flood risk and water environment policies of the Core Strategy.
Highways Agency – feedback from the Highways Agency has helped shape and improve transport related policies within the Core Strategy. Most recently the representation in respect of the Focused Changes consultation indicated that the Highways Agency does not consider that they raise any issues in terms of soundness or legal compliance and has no further comment to make at this stage.

Homes and Communities Agency – the Agency has been consulted from the Draft Core Strategy stage (2011) onwards although no representations have been received. However the Council is working closely with the Homes and Communities Agency and the Bassingthorpe Farm Broad Location for Growth landowners in producing the Bassingthorpe Farm Concept Framework (which accompanies submission of the Core Strategy: KSD/6)).

Rotherham Primary Care Trust – the Primary Care Trust have been consulted in preparing the Core Strategy and whilst representatives have attended previous launch and consultation events no formal representations have been received. It is noted that from 1st April 2013 the National Treatment Agency (Abolition) and the Health and Social Care Act 2012 (Consequential, Transitional and Saving Provisions) Order 2013 replaced the Primary Care Trust with the Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group and NHS England as statutory consultees and Duty to Co-operate bodies.

Natural England – have been consulted and have provided comments throughout preparation of the Core Strategy. In particular comments have been taken into account and influenced the development of Core Strategy policies including Green Infrastructure, green space and biodiversity and geodiversity. Natural England had no specific comments to make on the Publication Core Strategy however they “…welcome the revisions that specifically relate to our core interests which appear to strengthen the Core Strategy”.

Network Rail (supervised by Office of Rail Regulation) – no representations have been received from Network Rail in response to previous consultations in preparing the Core Strategy.

South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority (formerly South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Authority) – representations have been received throughout the Core Strategy preparation process from the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (supervised by the Integrated Transport Authority). Their feedback has assisted in shaping policies within the Core Strategy relating to the location of development and in particular with transport-related policies.

Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership / South Yorkshire Local Nature Partnership – the Core Strategy has been prepared having regard to the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) which was formed in 2010. The Local Nature Partnership (LNP) was formed in 2012 and has therefore not influenced development of the Core Strategy. However the Council considers that the Core Strategy does not conflict with the LNPs emerging strategic priorities (particularly around promoting the value and benefits of a high quality environment, offsetting biodiversity loss and mitigating risks to the economy from the environment – e.g. flooding, climate change).

How issues have been addressed
Housing targets
26 Rotherham and Sheffield have agreed a memorandum of understanding on Rotherham’s Local Plan Housing Target. This has been agreed and signed by the respective Cabinet Members of Rotherham and Sheffield. The memorandum, attached at appendix 23, demonstrates co-operation on the issue of housing targets between the two local planning authorities. It sets out areas of agreement between the authorities and a number of proposed amendments which has enabled Sheffield City Council to withdraw their objections to the Core Strategy (see appendix 21).

Employment / economic development
27 Rotherham and Barnsley will look at cross boundary employment issues, particularly around the Dearne Valley and associated connectivity issues related to public transport provision. This is most appropriately taken forward through the allocation of sites for development and the drafting of Development Management policies.

28 The Focused Changes to the Publication Core Strategy 2013 include amendments to recognise the key areas of activity for the LEP as set in the Sheffield City Region LEP Proposal (2010).

Transport
29 Rotherham and Barnsley will continue liaising on drafting of respective Site Allocation and Development Management documents to ensure a co-ordinated approach to the alignment of any future restoration of a heavy rail link between Barnsley and Doncaster. Development sites in the north of Rotherham borough at Manvers may influence this alignment.

Minerals
30 Rotherham and Doncaster are in continuing discussion, along with Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils relating to future aggregates supply and any joint evidence base / working that may be required. This has resulted in the agreement of a Joint Minerals Position Statement between Rotherham MBC, Doncaster MBC, Derbyshire County Council and Nottinghamshire County Council. This is attached at appendix 22.

31 Rotherham is contributing to the Regional Marine Aggregates Study, the production of which is being led by Leeds City Council. Once complete this study will form part of the regional minerals evidence base which Rotherham will take into account.

32 Rotherham and Doncaster are working together to produce a joint Local Aggregate Assessment (including monitoring report for 2010). Rotherham also intends to co-operate in the production of a wider regional Local Aggregate Assessment, although the scope and timescales of this work has yet to be agreed. Promised government funding for aggregate working parties to replace the previous regional arrangements may be beneficial to this process. Rotherham will contribute to future aggregate working party meetings to consider regional and sub-regional apportionments.

Waste management
33 Rotherham and Derbyshire/Nottinghamshire to continue co-operation to confirm the levels of growth (particularly commercial development) in the south of Rotherham borough envisaged by the Core Strategy and assess whether this would result in waste capacity issues in Derbyshire/Nottinghamshire.
**Heritage**

34 In response to the concerns raised by English Heritage a number of Focused Changes were developed. These Focused Changes, which accompany submission of the Core Strategy, have enabled English Heritage to withdraw all but one of their objections to the Core Strategy (see appendix 21). The Council is continuing to engage with English Heritage regarding the remaining objection (relating to the Bassingthorpe Farm Broad Location for Growth).

**Conclusion**

35 The Council believes that, in preparing its Core Strategy, it has consulted and co-operated properly with relevant local authorities and prescribed bodies (or their predecessors) about strategic issues. Moving forward, the council, through the Local Plan process, is committed to further joint work.
Appendix 1: Meeting between RMBC and Barnsley MBC (1)
Thursday, 1 Dec 2011, Westgate Plaza One, Barnsley

Note of meeting

Present:
Paula Tweed  LDF Group Leader  Barnsley MBC
Alan Hart  Senior Planning Assistant  Barnsley MBC
Andy Duncan  Strategic Policy Team Leader  Rotherham MBC
Ryan Shepherd  Senior Planner  Rotherham MBC

Apologies:
None

1. Note of meeting

Introductions and outline of current status of respective Core Strategies and wider LDFs.

Outline of Rotherham CS strategy, development areas around north of Rotherham Borough and Wath/Manvers.

Discussion around housing target and RMBC approach, shortfall against RSS target. Sheffield bid for transitional fund to carry our sub-regional housing projection work. Barnsley support looking at housing assessment across sub-region in principle but have no plans for review of Barnsley CS.

Discussion of Sheffield housing figures in adopted CS, issue of perceived need for “overspill” in neighbouring areas.

Discussion of employment land provision, Barnsley raised no concerns with Rotherham CS targets for housing and employment land. Specific growth locations discussed, ie Dearne Valley corridor, Hoyland.

Tourism discussed and potential for future joint promotion of Wentworth (Rotherham MBC) and Elsecar (Barnsley MBC) as complementary visitor attractions. Wider issue of future role for smaller rural settlements.

Future joint working between Barnsley and Rotherham on employment provision more beneficial, housing less of an issue in cross boundary terms.

Transport issues discussed.

a) Roads
Dearne Towns Link Road, some issues around lack of public transport provision to serve recent new development in this area.

b) Railways

Possible route of HS2 rail discussed. HS2 Birmingham – Leeds leg will include:

- a high speed rail route,
- a South Yorkshire station and possibly
- one or more depots (infrastructure / rolling stock).

The route and other details are to be reported to SoS Transport March 2012 (subsequent to the BMBC / RMBC meeting the SoS for Transport referred -January 2012- to options for these details being reported to her in spring 2012). HS2 Birmingham-Leeds leg will have planning implications for both RMBC and BMBC even though implementation of the Birmingham – Leeds leg is scheduled for 2032.

Additionally Barnsley wish to safeguard disused rail routes between Barnsley and Doncaster, may have implications for parts of Rotherham Borough. Would need to look at detail for any proposed rail route reinstatement to assess potential impact, ie Bolton Road waste management site. However, although this long term aspiration may be less significant as a strategic connection issue with advent of HS2 it would be of benefit as a sustainable option to the current road only link between Barnsley and Doncaster.

**Consider detailed alignment of Barnsley-Doncaster rail route reinstatement as part of drafting Rotherham LDF Sites DPD.**

Discussion of Dearne Valley Eco Vision and potential for a joint planning policy framework. Barnsley seeking higher eco standards set out in PPS1 supplement. Dearne Valley Exec Board now a consultee on major planning application in the Dearne Valley. Recognition of potential for a joint DPD covering the Dearne Valley but issues of time and resources would have to be addressed first, especially in current challenging climate. Need to progress each LPAs individual LDF programme before considering additional DPDs.

Barnsley have funding previously awarded under eco towns programme to look at viability evidence base on feasibility and impact of seeking higher eco standards in Dearne Valley. Issues of developer relocation and affordable housing provision.
Compare CS Key Diagrams to ensure consistency across boundaries.

In conclusion, Barnsley had no major concerns with Rotherham CS emerging strategy.

Employment and connectivity identified as areas for future joint working.

2. Any other business
   None.

3. Date of next meeting
   TBC as required.
Appendix 2: Meeting between RMBC and Bassetlaw DC
Monday, 28 Nov 2011, Queens Building, Worksop

Note of meeting

Present:
Richard Schofield  Planning Policy & Conservation  Bassetlaw DC
Andy Duncan  Strategic Policy Team Leader  Rotherham MBC
Ryan Shepherd  Senior Planner  Rotherham MBC

Apologies:
None

1. Note of meeting

   Introductions and outline of current status of respective Core Strategies and wider LDFs.

   Outline of Rotherham CS strategy, development areas around south of Rotherham Borough and Dinnington.

   No particular issues raised by Bassetlaw with Rotherham CS strategy, some discussion of potential traffic on A57, highway improvement scheme at Todwick committed.

   Possibility of safeguarded land being identified at Dinnington to provide for longevity of Green Belt boundary beyond plan period.

   Discussion of concerns raised by Dinnington residents group about potential flooding arising from development at Dinnington. No concerns raised by Bassetlaw DC on flooding.

   General discussion around Sheffield/Rotherham functional relationship and joint housing market area.

   Discussion of employment land provision in general and at Harworth in Bassetlaw. No particular cross boundary issues identified.

   Discussion around experience of Bassetlaw at CS EIP – inspector advised against including housing commitments in calculating housing target as cannot guarantee delivery.

   Chesterfield Canal discussed – no concerns raised by Bassetlaw DC.

2. Any other business
   None.

3. Date of next meeting
   TBC as required.
Appendix 3: Meeting between RMBC and Bolsover DC
Thursday, 5 Jan 2012, Sherwood Lodge, Bolsover

Note of meeting

Present:
Ian Collis Planning Policy Manager Bolsover DC
Andy Duncan Strategic Policy Team Leader Rotherham MBC
Ryan Shepherd Senior Planner Rotherham MBC

Apologies:
None

1. **Note of meeting**

   Introductions and outline of current status of respective Core Strategies and wider LDFs.

   Outline of Rotherham CS strategy, development areas around south of Rotherham Borough and Dinnington.

   Discussion around RSS housing target and implications of revocation. Bassetlaw, NE Derbyshire, Chesterfield, Bolsover all in a joint housing market area. Chesterfield has produced a local strategy statement.

   Bolsover have no concerns with the housing figures suggested by Rotherham's CS growth strategy.

   Discussion around employment land provision and methodology used for employment land review.

   **Rotherham to provide methodology to Bassetlaw for info.**

   Transport discussed, need for transport assessment of growth strategy, Derbyshire CC use of Saturn model.

   Bolsover emerging CS strategy – looking at a local target of 300 dwellings per annum as opposed to RSS figure of 400 per annum.

   CS strategic site at Clowne of circa 500 dwellings and 15ha employment land included in Revised Preferred Options, has been deleted from emerging Strategy following public consultation and consideration of impacts. This deletion should reduce potential impacts of Core Strategy related development on J30 of M1. Inclusion of strategic site circa 1,000 dwellings at Bolsover North, confirmed by Bolsover Planning Committee.

   Discussion of Green Belt review methodologies.
Update on respective LDF timetables.

2. **Any other business**
   None.

3. **Date of next meeting**
   TBC as required.
Appendix 4: Meeting between RMBC and Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils
Tuesday, 29 May 2012, Shand House, Matlock

Note of meeting

Present:
Rob Murfin Head of Planning Derbyshire CC
Chris Massey Policy and Monitoring Team Leader Derbyshire CC
Michelle Spence Derbyshire CC
Richard Cooper Planning Policy Lead Nottinghamshire CC
Suzanne Moody Nottinghamshire CC
Andy Duncan Strategic Policy Team Leader Rotherham MBC
Ryan Shepherd Senior Planner Rotherham MBC

Apologies:
None

1. Welcome and introductions

RM welcomed everyone and CM and MS explained their teams’ roles at DCC:

- Policy & Monitoring Team (CM) – strategic infrastructure (DCC’s Derbyshire Infrastructure Plan/Developer Contributions Protocol); evidence base work, e.g. project management of county wide land use data system (cdpsmart); population and household projections with NCC, Derby and Notts City Councils, input to Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs), Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMAs), employment land reviews etc; coordinate responses to strategic planning policy and planning application consultations; environmental policy/management issues

- Development Plans Team (MS) – preparation and review of the Derby and Derbyshire Joint Minerals and Waste Local Plans with Derby City.

- There are also 2 Development Management Teams (North and South Areas) dealing with minerals, waste and DCC’s development for its own purposes.

AD is the Strategic Policy Team Leader at RMBC with responsibility for the Local Development Framework (LDF). Ryan Shepherd is a senior planner in the team.

Richard Cooper’s role at NCC is similar to CM’s. He explained about the current changes to the Planning Policy Team at NCC. Sally Gill is the Strategic Group Manager, Planning. RC’s current job role is changing and Suzanne Moody deals with waste policy.
2. **Duty to Cooperate**

The meaning and implications for ways of working arising from the new Duty to Cooperate (D2Co) were discussed, including the approach advocated by the Planning Inspectorate (PINs):

(a) **Issues based**
- Re-establishes strategic approach to replace regional planning (sub-regional strategy work).
- Economic priorities are needed to give strategic context for Local Economic Partnerships (LEPs).
- DCC and NCC consider there is the need to undertake similar spatial mapping work to that of Sheffield City Region (SCR) for planning and D2N2 LEP.
- Neighbouring councils need to consider implications of growth levels for each other.

(b) **Joint evidence base and process**
- Forecasting – SCR is commissioning population and household projections from Edge Analytics that will provide common evidence base with the projections carried out for Derbys/Notts local councils. RC attends a new SCR Forecasting Group as does AD for RMBC.
- D2Co – need to go through the process before EIPs – agree or agree to disagree!

(c) **Involvement of members**
- PINs has highlighted the need to involve Council members.

(d) **Statement of Cooperation/Memorandum of Understanding**
- D2Co - CM agreed to raise the issue of a Memorandum of Understanding (MU) between RMBC and the NHMA councils at its next meeting should this be thought necessary.
- AD said that RMBC plans to have a MU with Sheffield City Council (SCC) over housing targets.

3. **Highways**

Both CM and RC confirmed that DCC and NCC Highways officers had raised no highway issues regarding RMBC’s Core Strategy (CS).

4. **Housing**

AD explained that their CS proposed a reduced housing provision of 850 per annum (pa) compared to 1160 pa in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) based upon past building rates (average 750 pa) and population and household projections (ONS 2008-based figures). In
response to SCC’S concerns about this reduced figure, both councils were working towards a compromise position to be set out in a MU.

AD said that no issues/concerns had been expressed by councils in the Northern Housing Market Area (NHMA), although RM mentioned the possible impact of Sheffield’s housing need on it.

AD described how RMBC had twin tracked their housing work to show what delivery of the Core Strategy would mean on the ground through the SHLAA process and draft Sites and Policies DPD. SCC is consulting on additional site allocations because of supply issues.

SM confirmed that Notts CC had no housing issues re RMBC’s CS.

5. Green Belt

RS said that RMBC are undertaking a review of the Green Belt; this is required to meet the housing and employment land requirements set out in the Core Strategy. The Safeguarded Land policy in the Core Strategy would also provide for an additional 5 years supply of land for future housing and employment land requirements.

6. Economy

RM explained that SCR is in the process of drafting sub-regional economic and transport priorities. Its strategic economic and highways prioritisation exercise will help underpin the LEP as well as Core Strategy work. DCC and RMBC have contributed data to this work.

7. Waste

The Joint Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham Waste CS has been adopted.

RM sought cooperation from RMBC on cross border waste issues, including the need to provide facilities for both domestic and commercial waste. DCC has received a significant number of applications for waste development in North Derbyshire; hence a key issue for DCC is to be aware of growth levels above trend because of its impact on Derbyshire’s waste facilities. SM expressed a similar need for Notts CC to be made aware of waste facilities likely to be needed. Notts uses waste recycling facilities at Alfreton.

AD and RS confirmed that it is planned to adopt RMBC’s CS in 2013; the plan period is to 2028. A preferred housing site with potential implications for DCC waste facilities includes land to the east of Dinnington; the CS also proposes 19 hectares of employment land around existing sites. In addition, one sub-regional waste facility is proposed at the northern tip of Rotherham borough and one landfill at
Thurcroft (no cross boundary issues). No gaps in recycling facilities had been identified.

MS reported that it was hoped that Strategic Waste Advisory Groups (SWAGs) would continue the role of the former Regional Technical Advisory Bodies.

It was considered that conditions on planning permissions to restrict the use of waste facilities by adjoining council areas would not be needed if adjoining areas delivered their fair share, which also meets the proximity principle.

8. Minerals

RM explained that DCC proposes to continue to supply similar levels of minerals to past apportionments. Whilst it is unclear at present whether Regional Aggregates Working Parties (RAWPs) will continue, MS anticipated that an Aggregates Working Party (AWP) would be set up to replace the East Midlands regional one when/if funding was available. It would then agree the Local Aggregates Assessment (LAAs).

RS confirmed that Rotherham’s Publication Core Strategy keeps to the RSS apportionment figures.

RM – Derbyshire has a large supply of minerals for crushed rock and supplies minerals of industrial quality, e.g. Whitwell Quarry supplies Notts County and Rotherham. Sand and gravel from south Derbys supplies Manchester and the West Midlands, however, there are supply issues here; hence why DCC needs to be involved in Doncaster and RMBCs’ LAA should discussions between the two authorities determine that a LAA is required

RM and MS explained that the Dept of Communities and Local Government is to produce a national minerals demand forecast, including marine aggregates, and therefore needs LAAs to reflect the overall demand forecast. DCC and NCC are producing a LAA. Concerning the D2Co, we need to show cooperation with the minerals industry. RM mentioned DMBC’s sand and gravel supply and quality issues, with implications for DCC and NCC.

RC gave Notts CC contacts for minerals policy – Steve Osbourne-Smith.

9. Infrastructure/Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

CM explained that DCC approved a Derbyshire Infrastructure Plan and Developer Contributions Protocol in April 2012 that sets out its priorities for strategic infrastructure provision and the mechanisms to achieve them; the officer contact is Harriet Fisher. DCC had no other
concerns in addition to comments made above about provision of waste facilities regarding strategic infrastructure arising from RMBC’s CS.

RMBC’s contact for the Infrastructure Delivery Plan is David Edwards.

10. **Summary of action regarding the D2Co**

In relation to the potential impact of proposed housing and employment growth in the Rotherham CS on the supply of minerals and need for waste facilities in Derbys and Notts:

- DCC and NCC requested that RMBC involve them in its LAA if one is required relating to the supply of sand and gravel in terms of quality and quantity.
- DCC, NCC and RMBC to consider the potential impact of proposed levels of housing, commercial and industrial growth in the southern part of Rotherham borough (Dinnington area) on provision of additional waste facilities in North Derbyshire and North Nottinghamshire.
- NCC would contact RMBC regarding the Idle Valley relating to mineral supply issues.
- CM to raise the issue of a Memorandum of Understanding (MU) between RMBC and the NHMA councils at the next NHMA meeting should this be thought necessary.

11. **Date of next meeting**

   TBC as required.
Appendix 5: Meeting between RMBC and Doncaster MBC (1)
Wednesday, 18 Jan 2012, Danum House, Doncaster

Note of meeting

Present:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Johnson</td>
<td>Economy &amp; Commissioning Manager</td>
<td>Doncaster MBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard McKone</td>
<td>Principal Planner Housing</td>
<td>Doncaster MBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Dobson</td>
<td>Planning Officer</td>
<td>Doncaster MBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Duncan</td>
<td>Strategic Policy Team Leader</td>
<td>Rotherham MBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Shepherd</td>
<td>Senior Planner</td>
<td>Rotherham MBC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apologies:
None

1. Note of meeting

Introductions and outline of current status of respective Core Strategies and wider LDFs.

Outline of Rotherham CS strategy, development areas around north east of Rotherham Borough and Maltby.

Discussion around RSS housing target and implications of revocation.

Discussion of land to the north of Maltby falling within Doncaster Borough. Doncaster may support release of this land for development (subject to member approval) if necessary for Rotherham’s spatial strategy and growth requirement for Maltby. RMBC advised that the sites in question are not required for the level of growth outlined for Maltby in the CS. Therefore there is no need at present to pursue this option. DMBC advised that as the sites would not conform to their Core Strategy they would not help address Doncaster’s housing allocation.

Discussion of respective employment land targets and broad locations for land allocations. Employment in the Dearne area was of interest to Doncaster as this would impact on needs for land around Denaby. Rotherham were proposing 16ha of land required in the Wath Manvers area but no new allocations needed.

Doncaster outlined the CS housing target – 1230 pa – keeping with RSS figure. Following an overt strategy to attract growth to Doncaster to support economic growth. Retaining the RSS figure could be a complementary approach to Rotherham’s proposed lower housing target by providing new housing for the wider city region area?
Doncaster SHLAA has identified more than enough suitable land for CS housing target and in accordance with the CS distribution strategy. Anticipating approx. 50:50 greenfield/brownfield development with no major Green Belt encroachment. Results of Rotherham SHLAA imminent.

Discussion around strategic transport links and long-term aspiration to reopen Bamsley-Doncaster heavy rail link. Referred to in Doncaster CS. May become less of an issue with advent of HS2? RMBC will consider line of potential routes when drafting Proposals Map.

Discussion of car parking standards, Doncaster have maintained the standards in RSS but would welcome discussion with other LPAs to achieve a consistent approach post RSS revocation.

FARRRS link scheme designed to improve access to Robin Hood airport and access employment land en-route. Helpful if CS could recognise role of FARRRS as strategic route giving improved access to air services. Doncaster seeking private sector agreement for funding towards the regional growth fund proposal – start on site is envisaged in 2012. Airport Masterplan used as evidence base for CS – approx. 44ha of employment land is proposed for business park development, most of which has planning permission.

Infrastructure requirements for Doncaster CS not investigated in depth at EiP.

Dearne Valley Eco Vision not referenced in Doncaster CS.

Discussion around housing numbers, some debate at Doncaster EiP around correlation with employment growth. Rotherham CS forecasting has considered this issue but found that current projected levels of employment growth would not trigger a need for a higher housing target.

Meeting the needs of gypsy and traveller population discussed. Doncaster leading on updating the South Yorkshire gypsy and traveller needs assessment on behalf of other SY LPAs. Issue of study only identifying 5 year need figure raised and need to allow for this in setting CS targets/policy. DMBC would wish to see a more even distribution of sites in the region and would urge neighbouring LPAs to “do their bit”. RMBC updated on current approach to this issue in LDF – policy in CS to set out need for gypsy and traveller provision based on updated needs study and review of potential sites to be included in next consultation on Sites and Policies DPD.

Minerals and waste planning discussed – RMBC working with Doncaster officers on minerals policy wording for Rotherham CS to achieve consistent approach. Imminent adoption of Joint Waste CS
by Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham has dealt with this issue.

In conclusion, Doncaster confirmed no major concerns with Rotherham's housing and employment land figures and the spatial/growth strategy set out in the emerging CS.

2. **Any other business**
   None.

3. **Date of next meeting**
   TBC as required.
Appendix 6: Meeting between RMBC and Doncaster MBC (2)
Friday, 15 June 2012, Danum House, Doncaster

Note of meeting

Present:
Steve Butler Planning Policy Manager (Natural Environment) Doncaster MBC
Helen McCluskie Planning Officer (Environment) Doncaster MBC
Andy Duncan Strategic Policy Team Leader Rotherham MBC
Ryan Shepherd Senior Planner Rotherham MBC

Apologies:
None

1. Note of meeting

Introductions and outline of current status of respective Core Strategies and wider LDFs.

Outline of the discussion at Rotherham’s meeting with Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils relating to minerals provision and the issue of wider than local apportionments.

Historically, South Yorkshire’s apportionment has been met mainly by Doncaster and to a much lesser extent by Rotherham. Sheffield and Barnsley having no suitable reserves. The situation post RSS revocation and the disbanding of the Regional Aggregate Working Party (RAWP) is less clear. Potential issue of under supply in the Yorkshire and Humber region as a whole due to political resistance to consider working of reserves in the Aire Valley and also the recent reassessment downwards of reserves in North Yorkshire by the British Geological Survey.

Recently, Leeds have sought to reinstate an aggregates working party to look at new apportionments under the new planning guidance. This work is ongoing. A study to assess the viability of using marine aggregates for the Leeds City Region is understood to be in process.

Further to previous discussion, Doncaster have carried out a monitoring survey that covers the Doncaster and Rotherham areas. This is to be supplemented with more information on sand and gravel. When complete, this survey can serve as a joint evidence base for Rotherham’s Core Strategy, alongside papers produced on minerals for the recent Doncaster Core Strategy EIP.

Bearing this in mind, Rotherham and Doncaster concluded that a local aggregate assessment for the area was not required. It was
however agreed to consider a joint feasibility study looking at longer term minerals supply towards the end of and beyond the respective core strategies’ plan periods.

This is a wider issue than just one local authority. It was felt beneficial to open up discussions with other LPAs in the Sheffield City Region and East Midlands areas, especially with regard to any future increase in mineral supply flows from Nottinghamshire (Whitwell). Rotherham agreed to raise this issue at the next SCR Planning Officers Meeting. Rotherham also agreed to attend the next planned AWP meeting led by Leeds.

2. **Actions**

Forward the Doncaster/Rotherham minerals monitoring report to Rotherham when complete.

Forward details of new AWP to Rotherham for attendance at next meeting.

Raise cross boundary minerals supply as an issue for discussion and further work at the July SCR Planning Officers Meeting.

Attend the next AWP meeting.

3. **Any other business**

None.

4. **Date of next meeting**

TBC as required.
Appendix 7: Meeting between RMBC and North East Derbyshire DC
Friday, 27 Jan 2012, Sheffield

Note of meeting

Present:
Helen Fairfax Planning Policy Team Leader NE Derbyshire DC
Andy Duncan Strategic Policy Team Leader Rotherham MBC

Apologies:
None

1. Note of meeting

Introductions and outline of current status of respective Core Strategies and wider LDFs.

Outline of Rotherham CS strategy, development areas around south west of Rotherham Borough, Aston, Wales, Kiveton Park and Dinnington.

Discussion around RSS revocation, housing targets and Sheffield/Rotherham housing market. Update on population and household forecasting work done for LPAs in East Midlands joint housing market. Possibility of similar work being done for South Yorkshire LPAs.

Discussion of Chesterfield Canal. Rotherham outlined approach taken in emerging Core Strategy to promote/protect canal. NE Derbyshire outlined LDF approach, work done so far and desire to see canal protected for future restoration. Agreement that approaches were broadly in line.

NE Derbyshire emerging LDF issues that may be relevant to Rotherham discussed – e.g. mixed use allocation at Norwood. No current proposals to encroach into Green Belt from either direction, although NED have not formally ruled this out as an option for the Core Strategy.

In conclusion, NE Derbyshire had no concerns with the housing and employment figures and distribution suggested by Rotherham’s CS growth strategy. NED will consult Rotherham on its emerging strategy and local housing targets in the near future.

2. Any other business
None.

3. Date of next meeting
TBC as required.
Appendix 8: Meeting between RMBC and Sheffield CC (1)

Wednesday, 7 Dec 2011, Howden House, Sheffield

Note of meeting

Present:
Simon Vincent  Principal Planning Officer  Sheffield CC
Peter Rainford  Principal Planning Officer  Sheffield CC
Andy Duncan  Strategic Policy Team Leader  Rotherham MBC
Ryan Shepherd  Senior Planner  Rotherham MBC
Neil Rainsforth  Senior Research Officer  Rotherham MBC
Nick Ward  Planner - Housing  Rotherham MBC

Apologies:
Maria Duffy  Forward and Area Planning Manager  Sheffield CC

1. Introductions

Introductions and outline of current status of respective Core Strategies and wider LDFs.

Outline of Rotherham CS strategy, development areas around west and south west of Rotherham Borough.

NPPF – noted speculation about possibly being published around Feb 2012, potentially extending transitional arrangements.

Rotherham – update on LDF timetable for CS and Sites DPD.

Sheffield – identified land supply issues relative to their housing requirement – lost city centre capacity, supply against requirement is very tight, don’t have a 5 year supply due to housing market conditions affecting ‘achievability’ of development.

Adopting a stage approach:

1 – identifying additional site options within CS approach to be consulted on early 2012 (Jan/Feb) – will inc. greenfield sites but not Green Belt
2 – early review of Core Strategy including GB review – looking to result in drawing docs together into a single local plan

Sites DPD programme – publication Sept/Oct 2012, submit early 2013, EiP Easter 2013, adoption end of 2013. At exam will need to demonstrate serious about CS review given housing supply issues.

CS review – want to be informed by looking at housing requirement at city region level, census data, looking for a city region consensus on housing numbers etc. Expect initial work in 2013 and main progress during 2014 but unlikely to be adopted before 2016.
Any GB releases – even if required to meet future projected need they are likely to be relatively small incremental growth rather than large extensions – but landscape quality issues, e.g. bordering the Peak District National Park, mean that it would be impossible to satisfy the current projected need.

2. Population projections

- SCC query whether past internal migration trends will continue given changing capacity of Sheffield (e.g. reduced migration from the city in recent years coincides with high completions in city centre). Is using last 10 years’ data robust? Expect higher out migration to neighbours and trends similar to position 10 years ago
- SCC – housing completions plummeted from 1,800 net dwellings in 2009/10 to 630 net dwellings in 2010/11.
- Is future household formation likely to continue existing trends given current economic downturn?
- Roland Lovatt at Sheffield working on population forecasts with PCT
- Area for future joint work – household formation rates and pop projections
- Reference made to Notts/Derbys population and household projection study by Edge Analytics – SV to circulate – bid into transitional funds to extend this work across city region
- Transitional funds – meeting before Christmas regarding bids, SV preparing paper and is looking for support of neighbouring authorities, funding will be for next financial year therefore implications for timetable re: publication / submission
- SCC looking for an objective assessment which could feed into any future local strategy statement
- Key concern from Sheffield is that past trends not a guide to the future – concern about reliance on past migration trends – causal factors need to be considered and whether they may continue in future – SCC consider causal factors re: migration won’t be same in future
- Area of joint work – scenarios – different migration trends, consideration of whether should go back beyond last 10 years trends for something more realistic
- Needs to be a shared narrative / statement of common ground. SCC aware of implications for Rotherham of housing issue and not looking for Rotherham to be disadvantaged because of the stage of preparation we are at – looking towards joint working to inform Rotherham’s publication / submission CS. RMBC/SCC joint working likely to be more achievable given timescales than any wider SCR joint work
3. **SHLAA**

- RMBC – numbers in database by end of week, update finished early new year
- Nothing yet from Roland Bolton (DLP) therefore go with what we have and any issues arising to be dealt with at our next update
- Sheffield – last update was March 2011, on with their next update (primarily adding in additional sites, updating phasing/build rates)
- In future need to aim for joining up timescales and publishing updates together
- NW to speak to NR re changes needed to fields in LDF database for SHLAA data

4. **Housing requirement**

- Sheffield looking for some flexibility that we could deliver higher housing if required – just allocating to meet 850 / year may not be enough – may need to consider some reserved land in case needed in plan period (Mosborough approach in Sheffield UDP cited)
- Will need clear phasing / safeguarding / reserved land policy
- SCC argued at PE that windfalls provided flexibility (which was accepted by the Inspector) – more work needed in Rotherham to look at quantifying small sites / future windfalls
- If Rotherham can demonstrate sufficient flexibility to meet the original requirement figure if needed, i.e. safeguarded land, then Sheffield should be able to offer more support for our approach and potential to put up a united front cf. to pressure from housebuilders on both Sheffield and Rotherham
- SCC would welcome a more detailed note from RMBC regarding housing supply in comparison to housing requirement and also RSS target

5. **Local strategy statement**

- Mike Hayden at Chesterfield leading on this for LEP but no progress to date. Draft due mid 2012?
- West Yorks – already published but focused on retaining spatial elements of RSS except housing numbers
- SCR statement would need to blend Y&H and East Midlands strategies
- SCRPOG best placed to take forward strategy statement?

6. **Localised cross boundary issues**
• SCC looking at sites close to boundaries and would like some joint meetings to discuss possible implications with relevant planners:
  o Attercliffe / Tinsley / Brinsworth (likely to be priority)
  o Mosbrough/Rother Valley
  o North of Tinsley / Blackburn
  o Thorpe Hesley / Chapeltown

7. Actions

• Sheffield to produce an equivalent version of Rotherham’s housing numbers paper
• NR and Roland Lovett – contact to look at some joint working re: population projections etc.
• SV to email Edge Analytics report
• RMBC – note for Sheffield on housing supply versus requirement / RSS target
• Look at arranging some cross boundary site meetings
• Arrange another joint meeting towards end of Jan 2012

8. Any other business
None.

9. Date of next meeting
TBC late Jan 2012.
Appendix 9: Meeting between RMBC and Sheffield CC (2)
Wednesday, 28 March 2012, Riverside House, Rotherham

Note of meeting

Present:
Simon Vincent Principal Planning Officer Sheffield CC
Peter Rainford Principal Planning Officer Sheffield CC
Andy Duncan Strategic Policy Team Leader Rotherham MBC
Ryan Shepherd Senior Planner Rotherham MBC
Neil Rainsforth Senior Research Officer Rotherham MBC

Apologies:
Maria Duffy Forward and Area Planning Manager Sheffield CC
Nick Ward Planner – Housing Rotherham MBC

1. Introductions, minutes and matters arising

   Minutes of previous meeting accepted. Devt. Management colleagues to arrange further meetings re cross boundary site specific issues.

2. LDF timetables


3. Population projections

   NR and RL have looked at population projections via work being done with Sheffield health authority. No strong evidence to differ from ONS projections. Census data expected July 2012.

4. Rotherham SHLAA

   Rotherham SHLAA complete and published. Discussion of 5 year supply figures and implications of NPPF. Would be useful to show greenfield/Green Belt breakdown in Table 2 of summary data.

5. Housing requirement

   Discussion of emerging Rotherham housing requirement. Target now endorsed by LDF Steering Group, ie 850 pa over 15 years, 12,750 over 15 year plan period. Shortfall from 2008 to be added to reflect plan start date from 2008-based CLG household figures. Safeguarded land to be identified to provide 5 year supply beyond plan period as a result of Green Belt review. To look at NPPF
requirement for 5% or 20% contingency on 5 year supply.

Sheffield note the shortfall allowance from 2008 that Rotherham are proposing but would prefer a shortfall allowance running from 2004 to coincide with the RSS and Sheffield CS base date. This particular issue is noted as a point of difference between the two authorities which it is hoped can be resolved in further work on a memorandum of understanding.

Sheffield to publish modelling on housing supply prior to publishing the City Policies and Sites document. Theoretical supply available to meet CS target but may not be deliverable in current market conditions.

Potential requirement for review of Sheffield Green Belt discussed with Cabinet Member and Scrutiny Committee. Core Strategy and GB review possible 2014.

6. Rotherham Core Strategy emerging policies

Discussion of Rotherham CS policies. NPPF terminology to be reflected. Comparison of affordable housing policy with Sheffield's example on wording of requirements for target. Additional employment land sites have been identified to meet the target in Rotherham CS.

7. Local Strategy Statement

Progress agreed at SCR Housing and Regen group. HoS and SCRPOG to lead. Draft to CX meeting then SCR then LEP.

Spatial mapping exercise underway, SYPTE to lead.

8. NPPF and new regulations

Local Plan rather than LDF. Discussion of status of UDP saved policies in light of 12 month transition arrangements. Emerging policies have some weight in decision making. Sheffield updating website to be clear that local plan constitutes CS and saved UDP policies.

9. Any other business

Rotherham/Sheffield migration flow figures discussed.

10. Actions

Check progress on transition funding bid for SCR household projection modelling and set up steering group.
Forward note on Sheffield housing requirement to Rotherham.

Draft Memorandum of Understanding on housing requirement for consideration and eventual endorsement by Rotherham and Sheffield senior officers and elected members.

Forward Green Belt methodology and advice from Baker Assoc. to Sheffield.

Discuss Parkway employment land site with Sheffield colleagues with a view to maintaining a sufficient area of Green Belt to secure separation of settlements.

Check Rotherham/Sheffield migration flow figures.

11. Date of next meeting
   TBC May 2012.
Note of meeting

Present:
Simon Vincent Principal Planning Officer Sheffield CC
Nick Ward Planner – Housing Rotherham MBC
Ryan Shepherd Senior Planning Officer Rotherham MBC
Neil Rainsforth Senior Research Officer Rotherham MBC

1. Memorandum of Understanding and Rotherham’s Housing Target
SV indicated that Sheffield were still considering the draft MoU and would circulate comments back to us next week. It was confirmed that we would continue working to agree wording by the end of September.

SV noted that there was no objection to Rotherham’s proposed housing target providing that it can be demonstrated that there is flexibility to review the Core Strategy and allocate additional housing land if the market picks up. Sheffield are keen to demonstrate that across the housing market area, commitments, allocations and safeguarded land would provide sufficient land to enable the RSS target to be met. SV indicated that Sheffield would prefer Rotherham’s Core Strategy to account for housing under-supply (against the RSS target) back to 2004, however understand Rotherham’s reasoning for going back to 2008.

SV circulated a table showing Sheffield and Rotherham housing figures against the RSS target. It was agreed that Rotherham would complete the table as far as possible to demonstrate how commitments, allocations and safeguarded land would contribute to the RSS target. It was acknowledged that further work would be undertaken by Rotherham to consider the sites currently within the green belt which could come forward early if they are allocated for development, although this is unlikely to be available to inform the MoU.

RS clarified that the information previously circulated on capacity of safeguarded land was incorrect; homes expected to be delivered beyond the plan period at Bassingthorpe Farm and Waverley (1600 dwellings) would be on allocated sites, not safeguarded land. Therefore the 1600 homes would be in addition to 5 years supply of housing and employment land on safeguarded land beyond the plan end date (2028).

There was discussion about the contribution that Barnsley and Doncaster’s housing targets would make towards the RSS target. It
was agreed that Barnsley makes a greater contribution to the Sheffield/Rotherham housing market area than Doncaster, although it was acknowledged that Doncaster would impact on the northern and eastern areas of Rotherham. It was noted that Barnsley’s planned provision exceeds the RSS target and, depending on the location of their allocated sites, this could contribute to the Sheffield/ Rotherham SHMA. However, SV noted that NE Derbyshire were proposing a lower housing target and that Local Plan consultation closes on 13th September (but will extend deadline for adjoining LAs to end of Sept).

It was agreed to include reference to neighbouring authorities and their contribution to the housing market in the MoU and to contact Barnsley to identify housing numbers and how they contribute towards the RSS target for the SHMA. It was also agreed that the MoU should make reference to the current financial and economic situation, indicating that at present the amount of land supply is not the main factor affecting housing delivery and highlighting the importance of access to mortgages.

There was discussion around the distribution of sites and impacts on rates of delivery. NW noted that we are continuing to work with the land owners at Bassingthorpe Farm however remaining development is well distributed around the borough and build rates in specific locations are unlikely to be a constraint on delivery within Rotherham.

2. **Rotherham’s Core Strategy**
RS noted the intention to include more detail in the Core Strategy supporting text indicating that the Plan will be reviewed if the housing market picks up and housing demand increases.

There was discussion around the merit of including a table in the Core Strategy or background documents clearly setting out the different elements of housing supply.

3. **Wider Strategic Issues**
SV noted that Sheffield are keen to get a paper to Chief Executives regarding a strategic planning forum to deal with wider strategic issues in the longer term. It was noted that there is a need for a commonly agreed evidence base across the City Region.

4. **Sheffield Progress Update**
SV indicated that Sheffield are continuing work on site allocations and are likely to sound out PINS/ DCLG before deciding whether to progress the draft City Policies and Sites document through to public examination. An alternative approach may be to cease work on allocations and undertake an early review of the Core Strategy with a view to preparing a single local plan. This would involve a consideration of sites within Sheffield’s green belt.
5. Actions
   Circulate comments on draft MoU
   Complete housing numbers table and return to SV
   Talk to Barnsley regarding their housing numbers

6. Date of next meeting
   TBC
Appendix 11: Meeting between RMBC and Sheffield CC (4)
Wednesday, 5 Sept 2012, Howden House, Sheffield

Note of meeting

Present:
Dave Caulfield         Head of Planning         Sheffield CC
Maria Duffy            Forward and Area Planning Manager   Sheffield CC
Simon Vincent          Principal Planning Officer         Sheffield CC
Peter Rainford         Principal Planning Officer         Sheffield CC
Bronwen Knight         Planning Manager               Rotherham MBC
Andy Duncan            Planning Policy Manager          Rotherham MBC

Apologies:
None

1. Introductions

Introductions and recap of previous discussions on Rotherham Core Strategy housing target, Sheffield’s comments on the Publication Core Strategy and the draft Memorandum of Understanding between the two authorities.

2. Rotherham Core Strategy

Update on timetable and intention to submit end Nov 2012. Feedback on PINS pre-submission advisory visit to Rotherham.

3. Rotherham/Sheffield MoU

Discussion of areas of agreement and areas of difference still to be resolved. Safeguarded land considered, amount and trigger for potential release – agreed this should only be through Local Plan review. Potential wording changes to CS policies to clarify position on safeguarded land to enable Sheffield to withdraw objection to CS. Sheffield to provide comments on draft MoU soon. Intention to agree final wording by end Sept to enable approval by respective cabinet members in Oct. Potential for some of housing provision in Barnsley in excess of RSS target to contribute to Sheffield/Rotherham housing market area target – Rotherham to discuss with Barnsley.

4. Sheffield Sites and Places DPD

Update on timetable for Sheffield Sites DPD and approach taken to housing allocations.

5. Any other business
None.

6. Actions

Sheffield to return comments on draft MoU.

Rotherham to discuss housing figures with Barnsley.

Rotherham to include CS policy amendments in Schedule of Changes as outlined in draft MoU to enable Sheffield to withdraw objection.

Both to agree final MoU wording by end Sept.

Both to gain cabinet member approval of MoU during Oct.

7. Date of next meeting

TBC as required.
Appendix 12: Meeting between RMBC and Barnsley MBC (2)
Thursday, 20 Sept 2012, Westgate Plaza One, Barnsley

Note of meeting

Present:
Paula Tweed  LDF Group Leader  Barnsley MBC
Alan Hart    Senior Planning Assistant  Barnsley MBC
Andy Duncan  Planning Policy Manager  Rotherham MBC
Ryan Shepherd Senior Planning Officer  Rotherham MBC

Apologies:
None

1. Note of meeting

Introductions and update on respective Local Plans.

Barnsley Development Sites & Places DPD and Town Centre DPD consultation

Outline on consultation draft DPDs produced by Barnsley. Comments accepted until 15 Oct. Outlined economic challenges for Barnsley to set context for DSAP reflecting new economic strategy for Barnsley.

Town Centre Area Action Plan Key Points:

- Includes a vision for a uniquely distinctive town centre, and a range of general policies relating to such things as the daytime and evening economies, public spaces, landmark buildings, building heights, gateways, cycling, and the green sprint which we will use to consider planning applications.

- It considers the town centre in terms of 10 Districts and reflects the individual character of each through district policies.

- Within these Districts 14 Development Sites have been identified and site specific policies are included for each of these identifying our aspirations for them and acting as a guide to development. The approach to implementation and how the sites and policies are to be delivered, along with monitoring arrangements are also included in the document.

- The 5 Inset Maps included in the document relate to the Districts, Movement, Public Spaces, Development Sites and the Primary Shopping Area and Shopping Frontages and form part of the Proposals Maps for the borough
Development Sites and Places Key points:

- Shows 3 types of proposed housing allocations (current density; mixed density and low density, high value)
- Asks for Green Belt sites to be put forward for low density, high value housing
- Shows 681ha of land as potential employment options (544ha currently Green Belt)
- Indicates 2 potential Gypsy and Traveller sites (Darfield and Carlton)

Discussion of housing densities, safeguarded land, potential employment land allocations compared to Core Strategy target, 6 premier employment sites, Green Belt, Dearne Valley Eco Vision, gypsy and traveller provision, Dearne and Dove Canal.

Discussion of specific proposed housing and employment allocations in Barnsley settlements near to the local authority boundary with Rotherham in particular employment option D1.

**Rotherham/Sheffield MoU**

Outline of the work undertaken to date between Rotherham and Sheffield to produce a Memorandum of Understanding on housing targets. Discussion of Barnsley Core Strategy housing target compared to RSS target. Discussion of Kirklees approach to cross-boundary agreement on housing numbers and Sheffield City Region modelling work currently in progress.

Barnsley consider that it is not unreasonable for Rotherham/Sheffield MoU to refer to some element of Barnsley’s housing provision providing some flexibility to meet housing needs in the Sheffield/Rotherham housing market area. Some of Rotherham’s need could be accommodated in Barnsley. As this would only amount to approximately 250 homes over the 15 year Rotherham Core Strategy plan period (ie 17 homes a year), it was not felt necessary to specify exact figures/trajectories nor identify specific sites.

2. **Any other business**

None.

3. **Actions**

Consider Barnsley consultation documents and respond by 15 Oct if comment necessary. Check wording on Dearne Valley Eco Vision.

Forward final draft of Rotherham/Sheffield MoU to Barnsley for any comment before being signed of by Rotherham and Sheffield cabinet.
members.

4. **Date of next meeting**
   TBC as required.
Appendix 13: Meeting between RMBC and Sheffield CC (5)
Monday, 24 Sept 2012, Riverside House, Rotherham

Note of meeting

Present:
Simon Vincent  Principal Planning Officer  Sheffield CC
Andy Duncan  Planning Policy Manager  Rotherham MBC
Ryan Shepherd  Senior Planning Officer  Rotherham MBC
Neil Rainsforth  Senior Research Officer  Rotherham MBC
Nick Ward  Planner – Housing  Rotherham MBC

Apologies:
None

1. **Introductions**

   Introductions and update on discussions with Barnsley.

2. **Rotherham Core Strategy**

   Barnsley – have agreed in principle to the Sheffield/Rotherham MoU referring to Barnsley housing provision in excess of RSS contributing to wider Sheffield/Rotherham housing market area. MoU to be sent to Barnsley to confirm wording before finalising and reporting to members for approval in Oct.

   Safeguarded land – Rotherham would prefer to stick to setting this capacity at 5 years housing and employment land supply. Sheffield in agreement providing flexibility to meet RSS figures can be found from commitments/ allocations/ windfalls.

   Windfalls – MoU to include a conservative estimate of windfalls on small sites to contribute to meeting any shortfall against RSS figures.

   Employment figures – table in MoU to be expanded to clarify year on year rate of job creation in both authorities.

   Migration trends – wording change to MoU para 7.2 agreed.

   Market conditions – some reference to market reports to be added to MoU to illustrate why market conditions are not expected to improve in the short term.

   Effective demand – wording change to MoU para 8.2 agreed in principle – SCC to suggest detailed wording.

   Contingency – table 8 amended to show 10% contingency
allowance that will be added to allocations in Rotherham Sites & Policies DPD when allocating sites (but excluding Waverley and Bassingthorpe Farm). This is to allow for flexibility on a settlement by settlement basis in meeting the Core Strategy target if, for example, an allocated site does not come forward in the expected time frame.

SCC questioned whether policy CS1 should be amended to include allowance for latent demand (2008-2013) and additional 10% contingency. RMBC felt this would be addressed through responses to other representations.

Barnsley provision – check and amend figures for Barnsley’s provision and commitments. Sheffield have latest data from Barnsley and will send to RMBC.

Further minor consequential amendments to the MoU text agreed.

3. **Any other business**

   None.

4. **Actions**

   SCC to suggest revised wording for para 8.2
   
   Rotherham to check proposed wording in MoU with Barnsley.
   
   Both to agree final MoU wording by end Sept.
   
   Both to gain cabinet member approval of MoU during Oct.

5. **Date of next meeting**

   TBC as required.
Appendix 14: Meeting between RMBC and English Heritage  
Tuesday, 25 September 2012, Riverside House, Rotherham

Note of meeting

Present:
Ian Smith  English Heritage
Andy Duncan Planning Policy Manager  Rotherham MBC
Ryan Shepherd Senior Planning Officer  Rotherham MBC
Helen Sleigh Senior Planning Officer  Rotherham MBC
Jon Bell Assistant Conservation Officer  Rotherham MBC

1. Following introductions IS indicated that English Heritage were generally happy with the Core Strategy policies subject to the concerns raised in the consultation response.

2. RS and JB indicated that RMBC are happy to include more detail regarding heritage in the Core Strategy challenges and opportunities section and to include a new heritage related issue, based on the wording suggested by English Heritage.

3. RS indicated that RMBC are happy to amend Objective 11 and Policy CS26 as suggested.

4. There was discussion around the suggested amendment to criterion f. of Policy CS3. IS indicated that the suggested amendment would provide a more positive approach to site selection. Whilst RS and HS indicated that the broad issues raised are considered to be addressed through Policies CS21 and CS28, it was agreed that its addition to CS3 would be helpful. Consideration will therefore be given to including the suggested wording as an additional criterion.

5. There was discussion around the inclusion of specific reference to the listed Guest and Chrimes building in Policy CS13. RS set out concerns around repeating national guidance and making specific reference to individual buildings in Core Strategy policies. It was agreed however that it would be appropriate to include reference to the building in paragraph 5.4.64 of the supporting text. IS indicated that this approach would be welcomed and would enable English Heritage to withdraw their objection. It was also suggested that the Schedule of Minor Amendments should explain the approach of not mentioning specific sites in Core Strategy policies.

6. IS set out English Heritage’s concerns regarding the broad location for growth at Bassingthorpe Farm. The key issue is the absence of evidence assessing the impact of development on key heritage assets, rather than a fundamental objection to development in this location. English Heritage is looking for comfort that development and safeguarding of heritage assets can be achieved. IS indicated
that such evidence needs to consider various issues including: key views into and out of heritage assets (including the main rooms at Wentworth Woodhouse), the significance of and relationship of buildings to each other and to proposed development, and assessment of what is important in the landscape, sensitivity to change and how they can be safeguarded. Mitigation options need to be considered along with identification of the public benefits of development.

IS noted that a similar approach had been taken with other local authorities and that if appropriate evidence is provided then this would enable English Heritage to support development proposals at the Examination in Public.

AD and HS set out the Council’s current position and work relating to Bassingthorpe Farm. It was noted that existing strands of work had been or are being completed which could be helpful, including the Landscape Character Assessment, landscape assessment submitted to the Council on behalf of the Newbold family, and landscape sensitivity testing. It was also noted that landscape assessment work was underway to support development of the Bassingthorpe Farm masterplan, however it was acknowledged that further work is likely to be required to address the concerns raised by English Heritage. HS also noted concern at the timing of when information would be available; it being more likely that information would be ready for the Examination in Public rather than on submission of the Core Strategy. The intention is to have as much information as possible ready to inform the Examination. Further consideration will be given to ensuring that an appropriate evidence base is produced which addresses the concerns raised by English Heritage.

Issues of access to Wentworth Woodhouse were discussed. It was agreed that in discussions with the owners that it should be emphasised that the work is being undertaken on the advice of English Heritage.

IS referred to a Heritage Impact Assessment undertaken by East Riding which may be useful to look at, and that he would be happy to email with further details of the aspects which it is considered any assessment should cover.

IS indicated that English Heritage were happy to provide further information or assistance in order to take the Core Strategy forward.
Appendix 15: Meeting between RMBC and Sheffield CC (6)

Thursday, 7 March 2013, Howden House, Sheffield

Note of meeting

Present:
Maria Duffy Forward and Area Planning Manager Sheffield CC
Simon Vincent Principal Planning Officer Sheffield CC
Bronwen Knight Planning Manager Rotherham MBC
Andy Duncan Planning Policy Manager Rotherham MBC
Ryan Shepherd Senior Planning Officer Rotherham MBC
Nick Ward Planner – Housing Rotherham MBC

Apologies:
None

1. **Introductions**

   Introductions and general update on Local Plan progress.

2. **RSS revocation**

   AD noted that RSS has now been revoked by the Government. The issue of the weight and relevance of the RSS evidence base was discussed. The RMBC view is that now the housing target has gone there is more weight to be given to the local housing target and supporting evidence. SV noted that Sheffield still consider the RSS housing requirements and supporting evidence as important given that they provided the rational and strategy for Sheffield’s Core Strategy requirement. It was agreed that any Memorandum of Understanding should still make reference to the RSS target and evidence base.

   SV noted that Sheffield’s adopted Core Strategy does not support a review of the Green Belt, however the most recent evidence indicates that there will need to be a Green Belt review when the Core Strategy is reviewed.

   Discussion took place around the possibility of a consistent review of Green Belt across the City Region, using common assessment criteria.

3. **Sheffield objection to Rotherham Publication Core Strategy**

   SV and MD re-iterated that Sheffield would be willing to withdraw their objection to Rotherham’s Publication Core Strategy providing that a Memorandum of Understanding can be agreed between the two Council’s regarding Rotherham’s housing target.

4. **Sheffield City Region housing growth report**
Discussion took place regarding the draft report, including how the findings may be presented. It was noted that further discussion would take place in the forthcoming meeting with other SCR representatives, and that the intention was to take the report to the SCR Heads of Service meeting in March. AD indicated support for the report being published and utilised as evidence base.

5. Draft Rotherham/Sheffield Memorandum of Understanding

Discussion took place around the previous work to progress towards a MoU. AD noted that the previous work was paused following legal advice which recommended waiting until the revocation of the RSS to submit Rotherham’s Core Strategy.

It was agreed that the previous draft MoU provides a starting point for revisiting the details in light of changed circumstances (in particular revocation of the RSS and the most recent SCR population and household projections work). AD indicated a preference for a shorter, more focused MoU however SV noted the importance of the detail to provide evidence for any MoU statements. It was agreed that a short MoU would be pursued accompanied with relevant background evidence in an appendix. RMBC would prepare a draft and circulate to SCC for comment.

6. Rotherham Core Strategy Focused Changes consultation

RS set out the current position regarding the focused changes consultation, noting that it had now closed and that the majority of concerns repeated representations already received at Publication stage. It was noted that Sheffield had not submitted representations as part of the consultation. RS noted that subject to Member approval the Council intended to submit the Core Strategy for examination in June. It was also noted that RMBC intended to consult on a draft Sites and Policies document in May.

7. Sheffield Local Plan City Policies and Sites document – progress

SV indicated that subject to Member approval at full Council consultation on a pre-submission City Sites and Policies document would take place starting in May.

8. Timescales for Sheffield Local Plan review (including Green Belt review)

SV indicated that the Council intends to progress towards adoption of the Sites and Policies document (expected in summer 2014). It was noted that advice was being sought from DCLG /
9. **Green Belt review criteria**

Discussion took place regarding RMBC’s approach to Green Belt review. NW briefly set out the approach taken to the Strategic Green Belt review and indicated the more detailed Green Belt review at site level would take place as a component of selecting sites for allocation. NW to send information regarding the Green Belt review to SV.

10. **Actions**

Rotherham to circulate revised draft MoU for comment.

Rotherham and Sheffield to agree final MoU wording by end March.

Rotherham and Sheffield to gain cabinet member approval of MoU during April.

Rotherham to

11. **Date of next meeting**

TBC as required.
Appendix 16: Meeting regarding minerals between RMBC, DMBC and Derbyshire CC
Tuesday, 7 May 2013, Riverside House, Rotherham
Note of meeting

Present:
Ryan Shepherd (RS) Senior Planning Officer Rotherham MBC
Steve Butler (SB) Planning Policy Manager (Natural Environment) Doncaster MBC
Helen McCluskie (HM) Planning Officer (Policy) Doncaster MBC
Michelle Spence (MS) Team Leader Development Plans Derbyshire CC
Richard Stansfield (RSt) Senior Planner Derbyshire CC
Andrew Hollyer (AH) Planner Derbyshire CC

Apologies:
None

1. Introductions

RS welcomed everyone and introductions were made. RS explained the ongoing work between Rotherham and Doncaster in relation to minerals and the duty to co-operate, and the need to continue engagement with neighbouring authorities, which was the purpose of the meeting.

2. Update on Local Plan positions

RS indicated that RMBC are working towards submission of the Core Strategy in early June and that consultation on the Sites and Policies document starts on 20 May. This focuses on housing and employment sites and any mineral allocations would be addressed in further future consultation as necessary.

SB noted that the DMBC Core Strategy and Joint Waste Plan are already adopted and that Publication of the Sites and Policies document would take place in June.

MS stated that consultation would take place this summer on the top part of the Derby and Derbyshire Minerals Local Plan (equivalent to the Core Strategy) with consultation expected later in the year on a full Minerals Local Plan. Publication was expected to take place in 2014.

Discussion took place around the apportionment figures used,
noting the guidance set out in national planning policy. SB noted that Doncaster’s Core Strategy was based on the RSS apportionment and was considered to be NPPF compliant at examination. MS noted that the apportionment set out in the draft Derby and Derbyshire Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA) may change as a result of consultation feedback. HM noted that the 2010 monitoring in the draft Doncaster/Rotherham LAA identifies the land bank using average sales over a 7 year period, as agreed at the Yorkshire and Humber RAWP meeting in March 2011. The 2011 monitoring will be calculated as outlined above; however the 2012 monitoring will be calculated using 10 year average in line with NPPF requirements. An interim Aggregate Minerals Working Group took place on the 12th June 2012 where it was agreed that the sub-regional approach was still the most appropriate option, primarily because some of the available data is only available in a sub-regional format and certain areas have well established working relationships.

3. **Update on Local Aggregate Assessment positions**

It was noted that a draft Doncaster/Rotherham LAA is being produced to support publication of DMBC Sites and Policies document and submission of the RMBC Core Strategy. In the longer term it was expected that both authorities would contribute to a wider regional LAA, possibly including south and west Yorkshire.

Derby and Derbyshire’s Draft LAA (including the Peak National Park) is currently out for consultation until 17 May.

Discussion took place around the re-establishment of RAWPs in Yorkshire and the East Midlands, with HM indicating that this is in its early stages in Yorkshire and MS noting that several LAAs have been through the East Midlands RAWP.

4. **Cross Boundary Issues (sand and gravel, crushed rock and coal)**

Discussion took place regarding crushed rock, and sand and gravel resources, with RSt confirming that most of the sand and gravel exports from Derbyshire go to Derby, Nottinghamshire and Leicestershire, and that the draft LAA shows a steady drop in sand and gravel production. SB noted that DMBC reserves are predominantly of soft sand rather than sharp sand & gravel. The Core Strategy identifies the sub regional apportionment but
indicates that with the representations received to date the provision for 1m tonnes of sand and gravel is more likely over the plan period. It was noted that Nottinghamshire have historically supplied sand and gravel into the Yorkshire and Humber region (from the Idle Valley) and will continue to do so, but it was also noted that these reserves are declining.

With regard to crushed rock, RSt highlighted the reserves within Derbyshire and that the County exported supplies across the UK. RSt set out that Derbyshire’s landbank of aggregate grade crushed rock is over 750 million tonnes, sufficient to provide for over 80 years production. It was noted that Derbyshire quarries will continue to compensate for the declining output from quarries in the Peak District. Given the size of the landbank, it was agreed that there would be potential for exports of crushed rock from Derbyshire to meet any deficiencies in the quality and landbank of crushed rock within Doncaster and Rotherham.

It was noted that Creswell Crags in Derbyshire produces mainly industrial aggregate, and that Derbyshire are working with Nottinghamshire in respect of 4 extensions. HM confirmed that the non-operational quarries are:

Harry Croft and Lindrick Dale (Rotherham) and Sutton Field, Stainton (Marshalls Block Plant) (Doncaster)

operational quarries are:

Holme Hall (Stainton), Hazel Lane and Barnsdale Barr (North Yorkshire on the edge of Doncaster) and Cadeby (or architectural limestone / dimension stone only),

RS noted that Rotherham and Doncaster Core Strategies are aligned in terms of meeting a joint crushed rock apportionment.

SB noted that it was envisaged that the requirement could be met from existing landbank and permitted reserves. SM agreed that in terms of demonstrating flexibility, Derbyshire would be in a position to assist meeting any shortfall. It was noted that although this was an issue, it was unlikely to represent a problem.

It was noted that in terms of addressing any shortfall in sand and gravel supply DMBC would be looking towards Nottinghamshire. It was confirmed that a meeting between RMBC, DMBC and Nottinghamshire CC was taking place on 13 May.

It was also noted that the issue of minerals supply across the City Region required greater consideration by constituent authorities. SB indicated that the issue has been suggested as an item for further consideration at a future meeting of the
Sheffield City Region Planning Officers Group.

Discussion took place on coal related issues. SB indicated that the DMBC Core Strategy policy covers energy minerals and that a small safeguarded area for shallow coal around Mexborough has been identified. RS noted that coal safeguarding within Rotherham covers the majority of the borough except for an area to the east.

SM noted that it would be useful to establish complementary positions/policies regarding safeguarding. SB indicated that DMBC Core Strategy minerals policy refers to shallow coal. RS confirmed that the Core Strategy minerals policy covers prior extraction of minerals. It was noted that in Rotherham and Doncaster there had been little interest in recent years in surface coal extraction.

5. Joint minerals position statement

Discussion took place around the previously circulated draft joint position statement. It was agreed that sign off at head of planning service level, rather seeking formal member approval, was an appropriate approach given to the nature of the content. The statement is also to be discussed with Nottinghamshire CC with a view to securing agreement from all four authorities.

It was agreed that Derbyshire CC comments would be provided along with any suggested amendments. It was agreed that it would be helpful to provide reference to coal as discussed in the meeting – HM to add.

6. Any other business

No further items were raised for discussion.

7. Date of next meeting

TBC as required.
Appendix 17: Meeting regarding minerals between RMBC, DMBC and Nottinghamshire CC

Monday, 13 May 2013, County Hall, Nottingham

Note of meeting

Present:
Ryan Shepherd (RS) Senior Planning Officer Rotherham MBC
Steve Butler (SB) Planning Policy Manager (Natural Environment) Doncaster MBC
Helen McCluskie (HM) Planning Officer (Policy) Doncaster MBC
Lisa Bell (LB) Team Manager, Planning Policy Nottinghamshire CC
Steve Osborne-James (SO-J) Senior Planning Officer Nottinghamshire CC
Eilidh McCallum Nottinghamshire CC

Apologies:
None

1. Introductions

RS explained the ongoing work between Rotherham and Doncaster in relation to minerals and the duty to co-operate, and the need to continue engagement with neighbouring authorities, which was the purpose of the meeting.

2. Update on Local Plan positions

RS indicated that RMBC are working towards submission of the Core Strategy in early June and that consultation on the Sites and Policies document starts on 20 May. This focuses on housing and employment sites and any mineral allocations would be addressed in further future consultation as necessary.

SB noted that the DMBC Core Strategy and Joint Waste Plan are already adopted and that Publication of the Sites and Policies document would take place in June. SB noted that Doncaster’s Core Strategy was based on the RSS apportionment and was considered to be NPPF compliant at examination.

LB stated that a ‘preferred approach’ was being prepared for the Minerals Local Plan, which would be biodiversity restoration led (building on existing partnership working with Derbyshire County Council). The intention is to consult in September, subject to any implications arising from the outcome of recent local elections.
Work is currently underway on the Sustainability Appraisal and deliverability of sites.

3. **Update on Local Aggregate Assessment positions**

HM noted that a draft Doncaster/Rotherham LAA is being produced to support publication of DMBC Sites and Policies document and submission of the RMBC Core Strategy. The intention is for this to be published as evidence base in June. In the longer term it was expected that both authorities would contribute to a wider regional LAA, possibly including south and west Yorkshire. It was agreed to circulate the draft LAA for comment.

HM noted that the 2010 monitoring in the draft Doncaster/Rotherham LAA identifies the land bank using average sales over a 7 year period, as agreed at the Yorkshire and Humber RAWP meeting in March 2011. The 2011 monitoring will be calculated as outlined above; however the 2012 monitoring will be calculated using 10 year average in line with NPPF requirements. An interim Aggregate Minerals Working Group took place on the 12th June 2012 where it was agreed that the sub-regional approach was still the most appropriate option, primarily because some of the available data is only available in a sub-regional format and certain areas have well established working relationships. HM also referred to the ongoing Marine Aggregates study.

LB indicated that Nottinghamshire’s LAA is going to committee in June for adoption. This would include greater reference to South Yorkshire. A percentage increase on apportionment was considered but is not being taken forward due to lack of evidence.

Discussion took place around AWPs, with LB indicating that their AWP had continued without a secretary and that the LAA has been to through the AWP for comments.

4. **Cross Boundary Issues**

Discussion took place regarding sand and gravel resources. HM noted that the draft LAA refers to Nottinghamshire’s role in supplying sand and gravel to South Yorkshire, primarily from the Idle Valley, but it was also noted that these reserves are declining. SO-J indicated that account has been taken of South Yorkshire, noting the role of the Idle Valley in supplying sand and

**ACTION**

HM to circulate draft LAA to NCC for comments to be received by the end of May.
gravel to South Yorkshire. It was noted that in the call for sites few had been put forward in the north of the County. LB indicated that dependant upon the market supplies from elsewhere in the County may also move northwards.

Discussion took place regarding Finningley Quarry and HM noted that Tarmac Lafarge are looking for an extension. SO-J noted that Nottinghamshire had recently met with Tarmac Lafarge and would provide Neil Beard’s contact details.

SO-J referred to the limited limestone resources within Nottinghamshire. It was noted that Nottinghamshire are working jointly with Derbyshire regarding Cresswell Crags, with a view to producing a joint paper.

SB noted that DMBC reserves are predominantly of soft sand rather than sharp sand & gravel. The Core Strategy identifies the sub regional apportionment but indicates that with the representations received to date the provision for 1m tonnes of sand and gravel is more likely over the plan period.

SB noted that the issue of minerals supply across the City Region required greater consideration by constituent authorities.

5. **Joint minerals position statement**

Discussion took place around the previously circulated draft joint position statement. It was noted that Derbyshire had requested the addition of statements regarding coal, and amendment of paragraph 3 to note that whilst reserves in Doncaster and Rotherham should meet requirements over the Plan period, Derbyshire’s limestone reserves provide flexibility should issues of supply arise.

LB expressed support in principle for the agreement providing the wording was appropriate. It was suggested that paragraph 3 bullet 2 requires rewording, and that reference could be made to sharing information at an early stage to ensure early identification of cross boundary issues.

6. **Any other business**

No further items were raised for discussion.

7. **Date of next meeting**

TBC as required.
Appendix 18: Sheffield City Region Planning Officers Group
Terms of Reference

1. Purpose

   a. to champion the sharing of information and approaches on spatial planning issues and to work collaboratively to help ensure consistency of planning related strategies and policies across the Sheffield City Region (including sub-regional strategy, local authority development plans and supplementary guidance)

   b. to co-ordinate and develop Sheffield City Region planning responses, and input into SCR groups, in terms of cross boundary strategies, plans and programmes

   c. to consider, develop and undertake joint working and research initiatives where beneficial and feasible (including joint funding and commissioning of consultants where appropriate)

   d. to share best practice and consider opportunities for shared services to help improve operational efficiency

   e. to advise the Sheffield City Region Heads of Service meeting and the Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire Heads of Planning meetings on relevant planning issues including policy and resource implications

   f. to develop a forward work programme in consultation with Heads of Service focusing on Sheffield City Region priority issues

   g. to share and develop information and joint evidence bases in order to satisfy and meet requirement under the ‘Duty to Co-operate’ in relation to planning of sustainable development

2. Membership

Core membership will consist of representatives of the Sheffield City Region local planning authorities with responsibility for strategic planning issues:

Barnsley MBC
Bassetlaw DC
Bolsover DC
Chesterfield BC
Derbyshire Dales DC
Doncaster MBC
North East Derbyshire DC
Peak Park National Park
Rotherham MBC
Sheffield CC
Meeting invitations and minutes will also be sent to:

Sheffield City Region
South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE)
The Highways Agency
Derbyshire County Council
Nottinghamshire County Council

Membership will be reviewed from time to time as appropriate.

3. Reporting

The Group will report to the Sheffield City Region Heads of Service meeting. Reports/requests for reports which do not coincide with meeting cycles will be considered by the Chair of the Group and the Chair of the Sheffield City Region Heads of Service meeting.

4. Meetings

The Group will meet every two months. In addition, one off meetings may be called when needed to deal with specific time-critical issues.

5. Chair, minutes and organisation

The meeting will be chaired by one of the Sheffield City Region local planning authorities and will rotate on an annual basis in conjunction with arrangements for the Chair of Sheffield City Region Heads of Service meeting. Responsibilities of the authority holding the Chair will include:

• organising a forward programme of meetings
• producing an agenda ahead of each meeting
• chairing the meeting
• co-ordinating the production of reports for Sheffield City Region Heads of Service meetings

The South Yorkshire Joint Secretariat will provide support by minuting the meeting and circulating minutes, agenda and papers to the Group distribution list.

*Revised May 2012*
### Appendix 19: Other statutory bodies and agencies consulted on the Core Strategy via the Infrastructure Delivery Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Name &amp; Role</th>
<th>consulted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPATIAL PLANNING</td>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>David Edwards, Team Leader, Planning &amp; Regeneration &amp; various team members</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT (ROADS/PUBLIC TRANSPORT)</td>
<td>SYPTTE South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive</td>
<td>Matt Reynolds; Transport Planner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT (ROADS/PUBLIC TRANSPORT)</td>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>Tom Finnegan Smith; Transportation Team Manager &amp; various team members</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT (ROADS/PUBLIC TRANSPORT)</td>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>Ian Ashmore; Traffic Manager</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT (ROADS/PUBLIC TRANSPORT)</td>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>Daniel Gaunt; Network Planning Manager (Y&amp;NE)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL BUDGET - CW&amp;C FINANCE</td>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>Andrew Bedford; Strategic Director Finances</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH PCT (STRATEGIC)</td>
<td>NHS Rotherham</td>
<td>Joanna Saunders, Public Health Strategic Development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH PCT (GP)</td>
<td>NHS Rotherham</td>
<td>Duncan Smales, Asset Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH (HOSPITALS)</td>
<td>Rotherham General, Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust</td>
<td>Mike Pinkerton, Chief of Strategic Development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>Dean Fenton &amp; Chris Stones, School Organisation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>Andy Parry Asset Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION -EARLY YEARS</td>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>Aileen Chambers, Manager</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICE</td>
<td>South Yorkshire Police</td>
<td>Mary Verity, Business Manager</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE</td>
<td>South Yorkshire Fire &amp; Rescue</td>
<td>Neil Hessell, T/Assistant Chief Fire Officer, Service Delivery Directorate. Alternative: Steve Makepeace</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBULANCE</td>
<td>South Yorkshire</td>
<td>Duncan Smales, Asset Management</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE</td>
<td>South Yorkshire Community Forest</td>
<td>Flora Parkin, GI Project Officer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEISURE AND RECREATION &amp; GI</td>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>Phil Gill, Green Spaces Manager</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>Lizzy Alageswaran, Principal Officer Community Arts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARIES</td>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>Bernard Murphy; Manager, Library and Information Service</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOOD DEFENCE</td>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>Ryan Shepheard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOOD &amp; DRAINAGE</td>
<td>Environment Agency</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENT AGENCY Sally Armstrong; Planning Liaison &amp; various EA officers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE</td>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>Graham Kaye; Drainage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATER SUPPLY &amp; SEWAGE</td>
<td>Severn Trent Water</td>
<td>Peter Davies, Senior Commercial Development Advisor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEWAGE &amp; WATER SUPPLY</td>
<td>Yorkshire Water</td>
<td>Stephanie Walden / Matthew Naylor; Development Planner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Company/Project Information</td>
<td>Contact Person(s)</td>
<td>Available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELECOMMUNICATIONS / BROADBAND</td>
<td>Digital Region South Yorkshire</td>
<td>James Gardner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICITY</td>
<td>Northern PowerGrid (formerly) CE Electric Ltd</td>
<td>David Van Kesteren, Asset Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTRICITY</td>
<td>National Grid c/o Indigo Planning Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASTE &amp; RENEWABLES</td>
<td>RMBC</td>
<td>Adrian Gabriel; Team Leader Waste Management</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENEWABLE ENERGY</td>
<td>Wardell Armstrong</td>
<td>Haydn Scholes; Rotherham Low Carbon and Renewables Study including some viability assessment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>National Grid (Gas)</td>
<td>Stuart Richards / Paul Cudby</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 20: Letter from Civil Aviation Authority

Safety Regulation Group
Aerodrome and Air Traffic Standards Division

Ryan Shepherd
Senior Planning Officer
Planning Policy Team
Planning & Regeneration
Environment & Development Services
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Riverside House, Main Street
Rotherham, S60 1AE

8 May 2013

Your Ref: Duty to Co-operate: Rotherham Core Strategy

Dear Mr Shepherd

CONSULTATION ON PLANNING MATTERS

While the CAA has a duty to provide aviation safety advice when requested, it is not a statutory consultee for planning applications (unless its own property is affected). In order to reduce the time devoted to unnecessary consultations, the following guidance aims to clarify requirements.

Other than the consultation required by Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011, it is not necessary to consult the CAA about:

- Strategic Planning Documents (e.g. Local Development Framework and Core Strategy documents) other than those with direct aviation involvement (e.g. Regional Renewable Energy Plans);
- Waste Plans;
- Screening Options;
- Low-rise structures, including telecommunication masts. With the exception of wind turbine developments, the CAA is unlikely to have any meaningful input related to applications associated with structures of a height of 100 feet or less that are situated away from aerodromes or other landing sites;
- Orders affecting Rights of Way or Footpaths;
- Sub-surface developments;
- General planning applications not affecting CAA property.
- Solar Photovoltaic Panels (SPV)

In all cases where the above might affect an airport, the airport operator is the appropriate consultee. Where the above might affect a NATS installation the consultee is:

NATS
Mailbox 27
NATS Corporate and Technical Centre
Please be advised that we will no longer respond to future correspondence received regarding the above subjects. Where consultation is required under Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011 the CAA will only respond to specific questions (but will nevertheless record the receipt of all consultations).

It is necessary to consult the CAA in the following situations:

- When a Local Planning Authority is minded to grant permission for a development to which a statutorily safeguarded airport or NATS Plc has objected, write to:

  Aerodrome and Air Traffic Standards Division
  Civil Aviation Authority
  Aviation House
  Gatwick Airport
  West Sussex RH6 0YR

- When a Local Planning Authority is considering a proposed development involving wind turbines, write to:

  Renewal Energy Project Officer
  Directorate of Airspace Policy
  Civil Aviation Authority
  CAA House
  45-59 Kingsway
  London WC2B 6TE
  email: windfarms@caa.co.uk (preferred option)

- When a development involves structures of a height of 90 metres or more, lasers or floodlights, write to:

  Off Route Airspace 5
  Directorate of Airspace Policy
  Civil Aviation Authority
  CAA House
  45-59 Kingsway
  London WC2B 6TE
  Email: marks.smailes@caa.co.uk

Further information on consultation requirements can be found on the CAA website, including document entitled Guidance on CAA Planning Consultation Requirements.

Further information on Solar Photovoltaic Panels can be found on the CAA website including document entitled Guidance on Photovoltaic systems.

Please could you ensure that your Planning Officers are aware of these principles and the revised policy and that any associated procedures are amended with immediate effect.
Appendix 21: Confirmation of Withdrawal of Objections from The Coal Authority, English Heritage and Sheffield City Council

From: Rachael Bust [mailto:RachaelBust@coal.gov.uk] On Behalf Of The Coal Authority-Planning
Sent: 22 February 2013 11:55
To: Shepherd, Ryan
Subject: UNCLASSIFIED: Rotherham Core Strategy - Focused Change 126

Ryan,
I can confirm that we can Conditionally Withdraw our objection to paragraph 5.6.131 of the Publication Core Strategy as the Focused Change 126 will correct this drafting error in relation to coal safeguarding.
Regards
Rachael

Miss Rachael A. Bust  B.Sc.(Hons), MA, M.Sc., LL.M, AMIEnvSci., MInstLM, MRTP
Chief Planner / Principal Manager - Planning and Local Authority Liaison
T: (01623) 637 119
E: planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk
W: coal.decc.gov.uk

All images are subject to © Crown copyright and database right. Ordnance Survey Licence number 100020315.
Save resources, think before you print

From: Shepherd, Ryan [mailto:Ryan.Shepherd@rotherham.gov.uk]
Sent: 19 February 2013 16:28
To: The Coal Authority-Planning
Subject: Rotherham Core Strategy

Dear Miss Bust

Many thanks for your recent representations to Rotherham's Core Strategy Focused Changes consultation (your letter of 11 February). We welcome your comments of support.

The Council intends to submit its Core Strategy for examination later this year following revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber. All representations and Council responses to the Publication Core Strategy and Core Strategy Focused Changes will be submitted to the Inspector when the Council submits its Core Strategy for examination.

I note that your letter indicates that the changes overcome your previous objection to the mineral safeguarding supporting text. I would be grateful if you could confirm whether this would enable you to withdraw the objection to the Publication Core Strategy (our reference PCS9)?

If you would like to discuss this matter further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards

Ryan Shepherd
Senior Planning Officer
Mr R Shepherd,
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Planning Policy, Planning and Regeneration Service
Riverside House, Main Street
ROtherham S60 1AE

Our Ref: HD/PS097/02

Dear Mr Shepherd,

Rotherham Local Plan – Publication Core Strategy - Focused Changes

Thank you for your letter of 19th February. I can confirm that, as a result of the proposed Focused Changes we would be able to withdraw the following Objections to the Publication Core Strategy:-

PCS37;
PCS20;
PCS73
PCS38
PCS70
PCS80

In terms of our representation in respect of PCS69, Bassingthorpe Farm, as you will be aware we are currently in discussions with the Consultants who are producing the Heritage Impact Assessment. Until that work is completed and the likely effects which that development might have upon the historic environment properly evaluated, we wish to maintain our Objection to that proposal within the Plan.

If you have any queries regarding any of the matters raised above or would like to discuss anything further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Smith
Historic Environment Planning Adviser (Yorkshire)
Telephone: 01904 601977 e-mail: ian.smith@english-heritage.org.uk
From: Rainford Peter [mailto:Peter.Rainford@sheffield.gov.uk]
Sent: 04 June 2013 12:30
To: Duncan, Andy
Cc: Vincent Simon; Duffy Maria; Caulfield David
Subject: Rotherham Core Strategy: Objections by Sheffield City Council.

Andy

Thanks for your call confirming the amended text of the Memorandum of Understanding. We welcome your agreement to make the following proposed changes to the Core Strategy for submission for independent examination:

- Focused Change 29: Amend Policy CS1 to include a note after the table to read: “The figures above are not ceilings. Windfalls on small sites will provide additional flexibility”
- Focused Change 147: Introduce a new section on key risks and contingencies, including the following paragraphs:

“The Council is committed to joint working with other authorities within the Sheffield City Region on future development provision. If future joint working indicate a need for further development then the Council will undertake an early review of the Plan.”

“The Council recognises the current fragile nature of the economy and that recovery over the short to medium term is expected to be modest. However the Council considers that the Local Plan contains sufficient flexibility to adapt to changing economic circumstances, and acknowledges that if market recovery takes place faster than expected and monitoring indicates a need for additional land for development purposes, then an early review of the Local Plan will be required.”

- Focused Change 55: Amend Policy CS5, first paragraph, to read: “Safeguarded Land will be identified, in areas between the Green Belt and Settlements, in the Sites and Policies document to meet possible longer term development needs equivalent to 5 years beyond the current Core Strategy Plan period.”
- Focused Change 58: Amend paragraph 5.2.81 to read: “Safeguarded Land will be identified in the Sites and Policies document. On review of the Local Plan consideration will be given to the need for Safeguarded Land to be allocated for development to meet future needs. At that time technical assessment of the suitability of sites, including consideration of their sustainability credentials, will be undertaken.”

As indicated in the Memorandum, we consider these changes to be sufficient to address the City Council’s concerns and we therefore withdraw our objections to your Publication Core Strategy.

Peter Rainford
Principal Planning Officer, Forward and Area Planning

Development Services
Sheffield City Council
Howden House
1 Union Street
Sheffield
S1 2SH

0114 273 5897
Appendix 22: Joint Minerals Position Statement

Minerals:
A Joint Position Statement between Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council, Nottinghamshire County Council and Derbyshire County Council

May 2013

Introduction
The Localism Act and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places a duty on local planning authorities and other bodies to cooperate with each other to address strategic issues relevant to their areas. The duty requires continued constructive and active engagement on the preparation of development plan documents and other activities relating to the sustainable development and use of land, including minerals.

Paragraph 181 of the NPPF states that ‘Local planning authorities will be expected to demonstrate evidence of having successfully cooperated to plan for issues with cross-boundary impacts when their Local Plans are submitted for examination’. This document will help demonstrate the joint working taking place between authorities and will accompany the submission of Local Plan documents.

The ‘duty to cooperate’ is set out in Section 110 of the Localism Act. This applies to all Local Planning Authorities, National Park Authorities and County Councils in England. The new duty relates to sustainable development or use of land that would have a significant impact on at least two local planning areas or on a planning matter that falls within the remit of a County Council; It requires that councils:

- set out planning policies to address such issues;
- ‘engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis’ to develop strategic policies; and
- consider joint approaches to plan making.

Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out the strategic issues where cooperation might be appropriate. Paragraph 178 to 181 of the NPFF gives guidance on ‘planning strategically across local boundaries’, and highlights the importance of joint working to meet development requirements that cannot be met within a single local planning area.

Background
Doncaster, Rotherham, Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire councils produce ‘primary aggregate’ such as sand and gravel and crushed rock, energy minerals such as shallow coal. Derbyshire and Doncaster also have quarries which produce industrial minerals. The afore mentioned authorities span two separate Aggregate Working Party areas, and as such additional liaison is required. This paper acknowledges that all the councils are at
various stages in preparing their Local Plan documents and that there is a need for a consistent approach in terms of mineral related cross boundary issues and opportunities.

**Purpose**
The purpose of this statement is to set out how the adjoining Councils will proceed to ensure the development of a consistent and complementary policy approach towards minerals policy, development and proposals, and to undertake joint monitoring and evidence base production as required. The authorities named at the end of this document have agreed to the areas of joint or further work set out below.

**Constructive Engagement and Supporting Evidence**
The named authorities will be considering and taking account of the following points.

1. The provision and sustainable use of all minerals (including energy and industrial) ensuring the sufficient supply of material to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods

2. Sharing advice and information (including aggregate monitoring information) to complement the preparation Local Plans and Aggregate Assessments (including landbanks, locations of permitted reserves (relative to the market), and capacity of reserves)

3. Cooperating in the preparation of Local Plan policies and evidence base requirements (including identifying):
   - Mineral Safeguarding Areas and safeguarding associated infrastructure
   - Areas of Search
   - Site Proposals and extensions

4. Agreeing the following approach with Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire County Councils:
   - Derbyshire (which has a landbank of aggregate grade crushed rock of over 80 years and which currently exports over 75% of its production to other areas) could if necessary contribute toward supplying aggregate mineral to meet the development requirements identified in the Doncaster and Rotherham Local Plan.
   - Nottinghamshire (a net exporter of sand & gravel) contributes (in the short term) toward supplying aggregate mineral to meet the development requirements identified in the Doncaster and Rotherham Local Plan.
   - The Councils will pursue a coordinated approach to proposals which involve the prior extraction of coal including preparing policies and mapping shallow coal safeguarding areas.

The Council’s will continue to work together in future to prepare joint or individual Local Aggregates Assessments and also co-operate in the production of a wider regional Local Aggregate Assessments within their relevant Aggregate Working Party areas. Scope and timescales are yet to be agreed.

The Councils will share information as soon as available, including draft local plan consultation documents prior to the consultation taking place to allow early engagement.
Where no agreement can be reached on a matter related directly or consequentially arising from seeking to achieve the above objectives, a report will be taken through the Councils’ appropriate administrative processes.

Formal agreement on outcomes of this memorandum for use in development plan documents or monitoring reports will be ratified via reports to the authorities’ individual cabinet member or other reporting route as appropriate.

**Status**
This statement is not legally binding but has been agreed as an appropriate joint position by the following:

- Bronwen Knight, Planning Manager, Rotherham MBC
- Steve Butler, Planning Policy Manager (Natural Environment), Doncaster MBC
- Michelle Spence, Team Leader Development Plans, Derbyshire CC
- Lisa Bell, Team Manager, Planning Policy, Nottinghamshire CC

Dated: 31 May 2013

List of Authorities (with relevant contact officer):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Contact Officer</th>
<th>Contact details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>Steve Butler</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Stephen.Butler@doncaster.gov.uk">Stephen.Butler@doncaster.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helen McCluskie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Helen.mccluskie@doncaster.gov.uk">Helen.mccluskie@doncaster.gov.uk</a> 01302 734874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Bronwen Knight</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bronwen.knight@rotherham.gov.uk">bronwen.knight@rotherham.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan Shepherd</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ryan.shepherd@rotherham.gov.uk">ryan.shepherd@rotherham.gov.uk</a> 01709 823888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>Lisa Bell</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lisa.bell@nottscc.gov.uk">Lisa.bell@nottscc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Osborne-James</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steven.osborne-james@nottscc.gov.uk">steven.osborne-james@nottscc.gov.uk</a> 0115 9772109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>Michelle Spence</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michelle.spence@derbyshire.gov.uk">michelle.spence@derbyshire.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Stansfield</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Richard.stansfield@derbyshire.gov.uk">Richard.stansfield@derbyshire.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 23: Rotherham and Sheffield Memorandum of Understanding

Memorandum of Understanding between Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council and Sheffield City Council

Rotherham Local Plan Housing Target

Overview

Duty to co-operate

1.1 The Localism Act 2011 placed a “duty to co-operate” on local planning authorities in drawing up their local plans. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (paragraphs 178-181) elaborates on this duty. Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) and Sheffield City Council (SCC) have engaged in a continuing dialogue on the approach for determining the scale and distribution of future housing growth across the Sheffield and Rotherham Strategic Housing Market Area.

1.2 The NPPF states “each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area” and “should meet objectively assessed needs”. Development plans should also be based on evidence that is proportionate.

1.3 This Memorandum of Understanding between the two Councils has been prepared to endorse the joint working on the Rotherham Local Plan housing target undertaken by Rotherham and Sheffield. A separate Technical Note provides explanation of the housing requirement and supply figures and also explains the relationship between the targets and the various Government household growth projections.

The Sheffield/ Rotherham Strategic Housing Market Area (SHMA)

1.4 The Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and Humber (RSS) recognised Rotherham and Sheffield as a joint housing market area for the purposes of strategic planning. This was reflected in the RSS housing requirements for the two districts. The joint market area also extends into southern Barnsley and northern parts of North East Derbyshire District towards Chesterfield but, for practical reasons, the authorities agree that the administrative areas of Sheffield and Rotherham may be regarded as a reasonable proxy. Rotherham and Sheffield
Councils as planning authorities for their administrative areas have produced and maintained a joint Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to enable provision of housing land to be monitored comprehensively across the single area.

1.5 The Rotherham Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) was originally produced in 2007 and included an assessment of overall housing need, affordable housing need and housing mix and tenure requirements. The 2010 update to the SHMA used secondary national and local data to update the assessment of affordable housing need and housing mix and tenure requirements, the figures for the mix requirements being expressed as proportions of the latest ONS household projections at that time (2006 base date). The update did not seek to re-assess overall housing need, but merely reflect the latest household projections available at that time.

**The Regional Strategy and DCLG Household Projections**

1.6 The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for Yorkshire and the Humber (2008) set housing targets for each district for the period 2004 to 2026.

1.7 Sheffield’s housing requirement figure was set at a level below that which would be needed to accommodate the DCLG projected level of household growth (using either the 2003-based or 2004-based household projections). The RSS, paragraph 12.11, stated that this ‘takes advantage of economic growth whilst managing the environmental impacts arising from development’. The net housing requirement in the adopted Sheffield Local Plan (formerly Sheffield Development Framework) Core Strategy (2009) is the same as that set by the RSS.

1.8 In the RSS, Rotherham’s figure was, however, set at a level substantially higher than the trend-based figure. This implied that, over the plan period (2004-2026), a higher proportion of household growth would be accommodated in Rotherham than had been the case over the period immediately before 2004. The RSS, paragraph 12.11 stated that this ‘recognises… Rotherham’s regeneration opportunities and the relationship with Sheffield’.

**RSS revocation**

1.9 On 22 February 2013 the Secretary of State formally revoked the Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber (2008). The regional strategy is therefore no longer part of the development plan for those local planning authorities in the Yorkshire and Humber region, including Rotherham and Sheffield. It may, however, remain a material consideration in so far as Sheffield’s adopted housing target was set by the RSS and it remains the most recent comprehensive consulted on and publicly scrutinised evidence on requirements across the wider area. SCC and RMBC therefore agree that it should provide at least the starting point for considering whether the housing requirement and land supply are appropriately ‘balanced’ across the Sheffield/Rotherham SHMA. It is agreed, however, that account must also be taken of up to date projections and the significant changes in housing market conditions since the RSS was adopted.

**Setting the Rotherham Local Plan Housing Target**
The Rotherham Local Plan Publication Core Strategy sets a local housing target of 850 new homes per year. This equates to 12,750 additional new homes over the 15 year plan period of 2013 to 2028. The target is for net new dwellings not gross completions (i.e. any demolitions or changes of use away from residential would be taken into account when monitoring performance against the target). The shortfall from the plan’s base date of 2008 of 1,600 new homes will also be added to the target to create a total requirement of 14,350 new homes.

2.1 Preparation of the Rotherham Local Plan has been taking place in the knowledge of the Government’s stated intention to revoke regional strategies and the targets they contained. Having regard to the NPPF, key factors taken into account when setting the local housing target for Rotherham therefore include:

- population and household projections
- past completion rates and the need to cater for latent demand
- current and forecast economic and housing market conditions

2.2 The requirement determines the amount of land that needs to be allocated for housing and account has been taken of the need to:

- provide flexibility to cater for unforeseen circumstances
- balance housing requirements and land supply within the strategic housing market area

Population and household projections

2.3 The 2004-based projections on which the RSS figures were based have been shown to exceed actual population increases in Rotherham and are no longer a reliable basis for planning for future housing needs. Even in the “boom years” the RSS target was never achieved and there is no evidence that this could be changed in the foreseeable future.

2.4 This is reflected in the net migration flows from Sheffield to Rotherham with a consistent downward trend over the past decade. The economic downturn may have contributed to reduced flows into Rotherham, though this also coincides with a period when levels of house building in Sheffield were relatively high (meaning that the city may have retained more of its population than had been the case during the 1990s).

2.5 This changing situation has now started to be reflected in the 2008-based projections which Rotherham consider to be a more credible and robust projection and reflect both the current and likely future levels of population growth.

2.6 The most recent population projections, released by the ONS (2010-based sub-national population projections) prior to the 2011 Census data, incorporated revisions to the method by which they calculate international migration and the distribution to local authorities. These 2010-based population projections show a fall in population growth compared to the 2008-based projections in both Sheffield and Rotherham and this is likely to be reflected in the next 2010-based household...
projections. However, household growth across the two districts as a whole is still expected to be higher than the 2004-based projections and Rotherham is therefore continuing to base its local target on 2008-based projections to allow for flexibility within the joint housing market area. SCC has also stated its intention to undertake an early review of its Local Plan Core Strategy in order to review housing requirements and land supply.

**2013 Sheffield City Region housing growth work**

2.7 In April 2012, the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Housing and Regeneration Board approved the use of Government Transition Funding to enable a revised set of population and household growth forecasts to be produced for the Sheffield City Region (SCR). The objective was to create a consistent evidence base across the SCR by expanding work already undertaken in Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire to cover South Yorkshire. The output was intended to help inform the appropriate level of new housing that needs to be planned for in emerging Local Plans and future Local Plan reviews.

2.8 The forecasting work was undertaken by the Knowledge and Research Team at SCC on behalf of all the districts. A Steering Group, involving officers from each SCR district, has overseen the project. The final report, *Forecasts of Populations and Households for the Sheffield City Region*, was completed in January 2013 and has been circulated to all the SCR local authorities.

2.9 This forecasting work has considered a number of scenarios which aim to illustrate the roles and interrelationships of population drivers and constraints, including employment, dwelling completions, migration, commuting patterns, household headship rates, economic activity rates, mortality, births and household formation. One of the scenarios examined as part of this work used the ONS 2010 mid-year population estimates as its starting point but applied the assumptions on birth and death rates, migration and household formation that were used in the 2008-based sub-national population and household projections. This scenario shows annual household growth averaging just under 700 per year in Rotherham over the period 2010-2028. Growth in Sheffield over the same period is projected to average 2,305 households per year.

*Catering for latent demand*

2.10 Rotherham acknowledge that there has been a low level of completions within the Borough in the last few years due to housing market conditions which may have resulted in some element of “latent demand”. The Council is therefore making an allowance for this by adjusting the overall housing requirement during the plan period to take into account this under supply – using the shortfall of actual completions from the local housing target of 850 new homes per year target from April 2008 to March 2013. An allowance for this is therefore made by adjusting the overall requirement to take account of any shortfall in the delivery against that annual target. The total additional provision would be for 1,600 dwellings.

*Future housing market prospects*
2.11 The effect of the economic downturn on housing requirements and completions has a significant bearing on future market requirements. Net housing completions in Sheffield and Rotherham are currently well below the adopted and proposed housing targets respectively. In both districts this reflects:

- reduced access to credit for housing developers
- reduced access to mortgages for potential buyers
- reductions in demand because of lower real incomes and uncertainty about job prospects
- the lack of funding for making new housing genuinely affordable (whether as public or private subsidy)
- the relative insensitivity of land and property prices to reduced market demand.

2.12 It is possible that the proposed increased supply of land in Rotherham Borough under policies CS1 and CS6 could stimulate new demand from developers, so helping to realise the projections. However, this is by no means to be assumed, as a significant amount of greenfield land remained undeveloped even during the boom years.

2.13 Both SCC and RMBC agree that the recovery over the next five years will be modest and the 2008 projections for the Sheffield/Rotherham area as a whole exceed what the market is expected to be able to deliver. This aligns with market commentators who also predict modest recovery prospects. A requirement figure that is too far in excess of what the market can deliver would undermine the regeneration objectives of both Core Strategies, leaving the more problematic brownfield sites disused. For this reason SCC is not pressing an objection to the requirement figure of 850 per annum in policy CS6.

Housing Land Supply - flexibility to cater for unforeseen circumstances

2.14 The most recent household and population projections suggest that it may be necessary to revisit requirements and land supply in a future review of the Rotherham Local Plan. The capacity to meet longer-term needs will also be an issue when the Sheffield Core Strategy is reviewed. The question is, therefore, how flexibility can be built into the Rotherham Core Strategy to cater for an eventual recovery of the market and for other unforeseen needs, reflecting improved economic conditions in Rotherham or increased demand arising from the Sheffield part of the housing market area.

2.15 Both authorities agree that Rotherham’s Local Plan should provide flexibility at two levels:

- A margin of allocated land to provide for unforeseen constraints on availability
- Safeguarded land to be left out of the Green Belt though not allocated.

Margin of Allocated Land

2.16 The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment takes account of the availability of housing land as assessed at present but new constraints could arise and it is good practice to allow some margin.
2.17 The total requirement for the period 2013-2028 is 14,350 dwellings (see paragraph 2.10 above). Proposed commitments and allocations total 15,470 dwellings which provides a margin of 1,120 dwellings. This equates to a margin of around 8% or 10% if commitments and allocations at Bassingthorpe Farm are excluded (as a major strategic site for housing more certainty can be attached to delivery at Bassingthorpe Farm). Windfalls would provide further flexibility, with past trends suggesting that an average of 100 dwellings per year can be expected to come forward on small windfall sites.

2.18 Yet further flexibility after 2027/28 would also be provided by the major allocations at Waverley and Bassingthorpe Farm. These would not be fully complete by the plan end date and provide capacity for around 1,800 dwellings after 2027/28.

Safeguarded Land

2.19 The NPPF requires planning authorities carrying out Green Belt reviews to be satisfied that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the development plan period and, where necessary, to identify “safeguarded land” to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period.

2.20 Given Rotherham’s tight Green Belt boundaries and the need to release land from the Green Belt to meet the 15 year plan period’s housing and employment land targets, it is considered necessary for the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy to include a safeguarded land policy.

2.21 SCC considers that the safeguarded land will also provide potential flexibility up to 2028 (the end of the Core Strategy plan period) should it be needed. However, safeguarded land, like Green Belt, should only be released as part of a Local Plan review. This might be to meet unforeseen needs arising before 2028 and could include need arising from neighbouring areas that could not reasonably or sustainably be met within their boundaries. In accordance with the duty to co-operate, such decisions can only reasonably be made following an appropriate assessment of options in conjunction with other authorities within the housing market area and wider City Region.

2.22 Consequently, Core Strategy Policy CS5 sets out that:

- the Sites and Policies document will identify safeguarded land to meet possible longer term development needs equivalent to 5 years beyond the Core Strategy plan period
- safeguarded land will only be considered for development following a review of the Core Strategy, and a review of the suitability of safeguarded land to meet requirements
- within this plan period protection equivalent to green belt policy will apply to safeguarded land

2.23 Rotherham will therefore identify sufficient safeguarded land to ensure that land is available within the borough to provide a 5 year supply of land to meet development needs beyond the 15 year plan period of the Core Strategy. This would be equivalent to 4,250 dwellings.
2.24 Implementation of the Core Strategy will be monitored via the Annual Monitoring Report. If this monitoring shows that development land is being used up at a faster rate than anticipated then Rotherham will consider an early review of the Local Plan. This review would consider the areas of safeguarded land as potential allocations. Any Local Plan review would utilise joint working with neighbouring authorities in the wider city region in acknowledgement of the duty to co-operate.

**Balancing housing targets and land supply within the strategic housing market area**

2.25 A central issue of principle is how far provision within the strategic housing market area should be for projected need and how far it should take account of expectations of the future housing market. Both SCC and RMBC agree that meeting the Rotherham Local Plan housing target, let alone the higher RSS target, will be extremely challenging in the current market. The lack of effective demand for housing, rather than land supply remains the single biggest factor holding back housing delivery in both districts.

2.26 Planned housing provision in the emerging Rotherham Local Plan exceeds projected household growth under both the 2008-based projections and the growth forecasts produced jointly by the SCR local authorities via the LEP Housing and Regeneration Board (see paragraphs 2.6 and 2.9 above). This higher planned provision therefore shows flexibility in meeting a significant proportion of the wider City Region need and also factors in flexibility for a high level of employment growth. Barnsley and Doncaster are similarly planning for more than their projected needs. In contrast, to the other South Yorkshire districts, Sheffield’s target in its adopted Core Strategy is significantly below the level needed to accommodate all the projected household growth.

2.27 Despite revocation of the RSS and depressed market conditions, SCC considers that it would be premature to plan for less than RSS requirement for the strategic housing market area.

2.28 It is therefore proposed to meet the overall requirement through:

i. a reduced Rotherham requirement with flexibility to meet the shortfall if the market recovers

ii. the Sheffield Core Strategy requirement, which will be reviewed in the near future

2.29 Given the potential capacity provided by commitments, allocations, windfalls on small sites and use of some safeguarded land, SCC agrees there is enough land to meet the contingency of higher requirements should monitoring suggest an early review of the Rotherham Local Plan is required.

2.30 SCC intends to progress towards adoption of the Local Plan City Sites and Policies document (expected in late summer 2014). However, the report to the Council’s Cabinet on 27 February 2013 seeking approval for the Pre-Submission Draft City Sites and Policies document drew attention to the need for early review of the Sheffield Core Strategy (including Green Belt review). This is in response to the latest assessments of land supply by SCC which suggest that, due to the
concentrated nature of the supply and market conditions, not all commitments and allocations will be deliverable by 2026. The Local Plan review is currently expected to start immediately following adoption of the City Sites and Policies document. The review will take into account new research into changes in nationally produced projections, assessment of local housing markets in the City Region, appraisals of the sustainability of additional site options and negotiations with neighbouring authorities (including Rotherham).

3. **Amendments to the Rotherham Core Strategy**

3.1 Acknowledging the concerns of SCC, RMBC proposes to clarify the flexibility in its approach by the following changes which are set out in the Council’s Core Strategy Focused Changes (2013), on which it has consulted and which it intends to submit with the Core Strategy for independent examination:

- **Focused Change 29**: Amend Policy CS1 to include a note after the table to read: 
  “The figures above are not ceilings. Windfalls on small sites will provide additional flexibility”

- **Focused Change 147**: Introduce a new section on key risks and contingencies, including the following paragraphs:

  “The Council is committed to joint working with other authorities within the Sheffield City Region on future development provision. If future joint working indicate a need for further development then the Council will undertake an early review of the Plan.”

  “The Council recognises the current fragile nature of the economy and that recovery over the short to medium term is expected to be modest. However the Council considers that the Local Plan contains sufficient flexibility to adapt to changing economic circumstances, and acknowledges that if market recovery takes place faster than expected and monitoring indicates a need for additional land for development purposes, then an early review of the Local Plan will be required.”

- **Focused Change 55**: Amend Policy CS5, first paragraph, to read: “Safeguarded Land will be identified, in areas between the Green Belt and Settlements, in the Sites and Policies document to meet possible longer term development needs equivalent to 5 years beyond the current Core Strategy Plan period.”

- **Focused Change 58**: Amend paragraph 5.2.81 to read: “Safeguarded Land will be identified in the Sites and Policies document. On review of the Local Plan consideration will be given to the need for Safeguarded Land to be allocated for development to meet future needs. At that time technical assessment of the suitability of sites, including consideration of their sustainability credentials, will be undertaken.”

3.2 RMBC considers that these amendments would improve the clarity of the Core Strategy and not fundamentally alter the thrust of either the overall strategy or individual policies. SCC considers them to be sufficient to address its concerns and
is therefore prepared to withdraw its objections to Rotherham’s Publication Core Strategy subject to the amendments above.

4. Future co-operation

4.1 RMBC will continue to engage with SCC and other partners in the City Region on strategic planning and the technical work required to underpin such decisions. The Sheffield City Region local authorities, having completed initial work on population and household growth forecasting intend to:

- review the housing projections in light of 2011 Census and any effects of changes in the housing market
- collectively review housing requirements across the City Region in light of the forthcoming SCR Growth Plan

4.2 Both RMBC and SCC are committed to co-operating with other districts within the SCR with regard to the development of consistent criteria for evaluating the purposes and value of land within Green Belts. Where appropriate this may involve independent external consultancy support.
Agreement

It is agreed that:

1. The approach followed by Rotherham MBC in setting a housing target for the Rotherham Local Plan is an appropriate one.

2. The Rotherham Local Plan housing target with the flexibility set out above is an appropriate target for both Rotherham Borough and its contribution to the wider Rotherham and Sheffield housing market area.

3. Existing housing commitments, proposed new allocations, windfalls and safeguarded land in the Rotherham Local Plan provide sufficient long-term flexibility for Rotherham to fulfil its own housing needs and contribute to possible increases in those of the wider Rotherham and Sheffield housing market area.

4. In order to make this flexibility clear, the amendments outlined above will be made to the Rotherham Core Strategy prior to submission to government. On this basis, Sheffield will withdraw the objections made to the Rotherham Publication Core Strategy.

Dated 3 June 2013

Signed for Rotherham MBC: 

Signed for Sheffield CC:

Cllr Gerald Smith
Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Development

Cllr Leigh Bramall
Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development
Appendix 24: Draft Sheffield City Region Duty to Co-operate Matrix of Issues (June 2013)

The purpose of this table track and provide a pro-active approach to cross boundary and strategic planning collaboration that can be used as evidence of the Duty to Co-operate requirement. The table demonstrates a “diligent” approach taken at the City Region level and provides evidence of co-operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Barnsley</th>
<th>Bassetlaw</th>
<th>Bolsover</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Derbyshire Dales</th>
<th>Doncaster</th>
<th>NE Derbyshire</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Sheffield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only issues likely to be inter-regional, possibly such as traffic in relation to the M1. However, none identified at present. Any issues likely to be addressed through SCR work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared comments on transport links from Goldthorpe to A1. <strong>Status:</strong> initial comments made, awaiting outcome of Barnsley options consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement to consider alignment of possible future reinstatement of heavy rail link between Barnsley and Doncaster in RMBC Sites DPD drafting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions required on possible future SY and NE Derbyshire Green Belt review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule as an adjoining local planning authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Aggregates Study for Yorkshire and Humber (led by Leeds but funded by LPAs) currently being procured. Will assist with NPPF requirement that each mineral planning authority, individually or collectively, has to produce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>Bassetlaw</td>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Derbyshire Dales</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>NE Derbyshire</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Bassetlaw** | | **ISSUES:** | | \begin{itemize} 
- The protection of the possible future world heritage site at Creswell Crags and its setting which straddles the district/county boundary.
- The quality of water leaving waste water treatment works in Bolsover district, and its impact on SSSI's in Bassetlaw district.
- The leakage of retail expenditure from the north-east of Bolsover district.
\end{itemize} | \begin{itemize} 
- Shared approach to Strategic Warehousing in A1 corridor working through Logistics Group
\end{itemize} | | | | \begin{itemize} 
- Discussion on future policy relating to Meadowhall and the network and hierarchy of centres in the city region.
- Future review of waste management strategy (SCR rather than S Yorks?)
\end{itemize} |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barnsley</th>
<th>Bassetlaw</th>
<th>Bolsover</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Derbyshire Dales</th>
<th>Doncaster</th>
<th>NE Derbyshire</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Sheffield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross boundary cooperation progressed through: Formal consultation; Shared evidence base on some topics, for example SHMA; Joint methodologies, for example SHLAA; The SCR; The MoU between authorities in the Northern HMA and meetings at officer level between planning policy officers in the HMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td>Joint working to produce SHMA and Design SPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion on future policy relating to Meadowhall and the network and hierarchy of centres in the city region.

Future review of waste management strategy (SCR...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barnsley</th>
<th>Bassetlaw</th>
<th>Bolsover</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Derbyshire Dales</th>
<th>Doncaster</th>
<th>NE Derbyshire</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Sheffield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint working to produce SHMA and Design SPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion on future policy relating to Meadowhall and the network and hierarchy of centres in the city region. Future review of waste management strategy (SCR rather than S Yorks?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ISSUES:**
- The development of the Markham Vale Enterprise Zone, so that developments in each authority area complement the others;
- The cumulative impact of development on the local highway network and the M1 particularly Junctions 29a and 30;
- The need to protect the setting of Bolsover Castle, given the strategic proposals along the M1;
- The level of housing proposed in Chesterfield Borough as the district falls within the same Housing Market Area as Bolsover;
- The level and location of...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barnsley</th>
<th>Bassetlaw</th>
<th>Bolsover</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Derbyshire Dales</th>
<th>Doncaster</th>
<th>NE Derbyshire</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Sheffield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>housing proposed by CBC particularly in Mastin Moor and Duckmanton which are close to the shared boundary; The need to reduce out commuting from Bolsover town into Chesterfield to access jobs, in order to develop a more sustainable settlement, and reduce congestion on roads in Chesterfield; The leakage of retail expenditure; The need to increase tree cover along the Doe Lea catchment area in Bolsover; The cumulative impact of wind turbines on Bolsover district given the potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>Bassetlaw</td>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Derbyshire Dales</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>NE Derbyshire</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Derbyshire Dales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE Derbyshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

search area identified by CBC.

**MECHANISM FOR CO-OPERATION:**
Cross Boundary co-operation progressed through:
- Joint highways meetings/studies/approaches in relation to transport:
- Shared evidence base in relation to some topics, for example the SFRA;
- Formal consultation;
- The SCR;
- Through the MoU between authorities in the Northern HMA and meetings at officer level between planning policy officers in the HMA.

**Derbyshire Dales**
No issues identified. DD are not in the same HMA as Bolsover. Any common issues likely to

Discussion on future policy relating to Meadowhall and the network and hierarchy of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barnsley</th>
<th>Bassetlaw</th>
<th>Bolsover</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Derbyshire Dales</th>
<th>Doncaster</th>
<th>NE Derbyshire</th>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>Sheffield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be identified through the Derbyshire Planning Policy Officers' Group and/or SCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>centres in the city region. Future review of waste management strategy (SCR rather than S Yorks?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>Discussed transport links from Goldthorpe to A1, particularly around Marr and Hickleton. Barnsley to keep Doncaster colleagues informed when progress made on determining which site options are to be taken forward</td>
<td>Shared approach to Strategic Warehousing in A1 corridor working through Logistics Group</td>
<td>No issues identified. Any common issues likely to be identified through the SCR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoU/position statement being agreed on minerals. Liaison on land for potential housing allocation within Doncaster at Maltby.</td>
<td>Discussions required on possible future SY and NE Derbyshire Green Belt review. Marine Aggregates Study for Yorkshire and Humber (led by Leeds but funded by LPAs) currently being procured. Will assist with NPPF requirement that each mineral planning authority, individually or collectively, has to produce an annual Local Aggregate Assessment. Discussion on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>Bassetlaw</td>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Derbyshire Dales</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>NE Derbyshire</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;!--future policy relating to Meadowhall and the network and hierarchy of centres in the city region.--&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Derbyshire</td>
<td>Joint working to produce SHMA and Design SPD</td>
<td>ISSUES: The development of the Markham Vale Enterprise Zone, so that developments in each authority area complement the others; Development of the former Coalite works which crosses the district boundary and need to have complementary development; The cumulative impact of development on the local highway network and the M1 particularly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement on policy treatment/protection of line of Chesterfield Canal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>Bassetlaw</td>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Derbyshire Dales</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>NE Derbyshire</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Junctions 29a and 30; The need to protect the setting of Bolsover Castle, given the strategic proposals along the M1; The level of housing proposed in the district as it falls within the same Housing Market Area as Bolsover; The future development of Renishaw, due to the possible potential for flooding on both sides of the district border; The need to jointly plan two identified core green infrastructure assets that overlap the shared boundary at the Doe Lea corridor and Hardwick Landscape Area; The outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>Bassetlaw</td>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Derbyshire Dales</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>NE Derbyshire</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the Green Belt Review and possible impacts on Bolsover; MECHANISM FOR CO-OPERATION: Cross Boundary co-operation progressed through: Joint highways meetings/studies/approaches in relation to transport: Shared evidence base in relation to some topics, for example the SFRA; Formal consultation; The SCR; Through the MoU between authorities in the Northern HMA and meetings at officer level between planning policy officers in the HMA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Agreed a reference in MoU being prepared</td>
<td>Identify issues relating to capacity on A57 corridor</td>
<td>ISSUES: The development of a housing</td>
<td>MoU being agreed on minerals. Liaison on land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoU being agreed on Rotherham Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>Bassetlaw</td>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Derbyshire Dales</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>NE Derbyshire</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between Rotherham and Sheffield to it not being unreasonable to expect a small part of Rotherham’s housing requirement to be delivered on sites within Barnsley</td>
<td>target for Rotherham and its impact on the Green Belt MECHANISMS FOR CO-OPERATION Formal consultation; Officer level meeting; Through the SCR</td>
<td>within Doncaster at Maltby.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>housing target. Liaison on delivery of Tinsley Link Road. Stakeholder comments sought on the Employment Land Review as part of the single Sheff-Roth Economic area. Consultation on CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule as an adjoining local planning authority. Discussions required on possible future SY and NE Derbyshire Green Belt review. Marine Aggregates Study for Yorkshire and Humber (led by Leeds but funded by LPAs) currently being...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>Bassetlaw</td>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Derbyshire Dales</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>NE Derbyshire</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procured. Will assist with NPPF requirement that each mineral planning authority, individually or collectively, has to produce an annual Local Aggregate Assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion on future policy relating to Meadowhall and the network and hierarchy of centres in the city region.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Future review of waste management strategy (SCR rather than S Yorks?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MoU on housing numbers in RMBC Core Strategy drafted. Discussions ongoing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ISSUES: Mainly inter-regional, and concerned with understanding any wider consequences of decisions made about housing and employment in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnsley</td>
<td>Bassetlaw</td>
<td>Bolsover</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>Derbyshire Dales</td>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>NE Derbyshire</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheffield: <strong>MECHANISMS FOR CO-OPERATION:</strong> Through the SCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>