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Introduction

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 Nov 2011. The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (part 2) and the National Planning Policy Framework (paras 178-181) elaborate on this duty in relation to plan making.

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 Publication Core Strategy. This paper summarises the main conclusions of these discussions. Notes of meetings held are also included as appendices.

This paper represents the position at time of writing. However, it is recognised that cross boundary co-operation is an ongoing process. Areas identified for further work will be progressed between publication and submission of the Core Strategy. Ultimately, once the Core Strategy has been adopted by the Council, cross boundary co-operation will continue via the established groups working at South Yorkshire and Sheffield City Region to ensure successful monitoring and implementation of the plan.

Cross boundary discussions

Meetings to discuss cross boundary issues 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)
North East Derbyshire District Council (27/1/12)
Sheffield City Council (7/12/11 & 28/3/12)

Consultations with other bodies and agencies

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 the amount and distribution of future growth within Rotherham borough. This has been accomplished via the various consultation stages undertaken on the Core Strategy. More detail is available in the Consultation Statement accompanying the publication of the Core Strategy.

In addition to this ongoing consultation, the Council has recently completed an Infrastructure Delivery Study to support the Core Strategy. 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 will be made available alongside the publication of the Core Strategy. For convenience, the list of bodies consulted is given at Appendix 11.
Existing cross boundary working

The Council plays a full part in existing cross boundary working structures, including the bi-monthly Sheffield City Region Planning Officers Group and the South Yorkshire/Sheffield City Region Heads of Planning meetings. 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 LPAs within the Sheffield City Region in response to the demise of regional planning. Spatial planning leads from the SCR 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. The Council is also represented on the South Yorkshire Planning and Transportation Steering Group meeting of elected member portfolio holders from each authority.

The Council also attends and contributes to the SCR Population and Household Growth Forecasting Steering Group, a task and finish group led by Sheffield CC to consider modelling on population and household projections for the city region and each constituent LPA and how these might be accommodated. At time of writing this work was ongoing and had reached no firm conclusions. In addition, the Council has provided data and feedback on a spatial priorities mapping exercise being led by the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive. Both these areas of work are intended to feed into a local strategy statement for the city region, although this work is still at an early stage.

Along with Barnsley and Doncaster, the Council has recently adopted a Joint Waste Core Strategy DPD (8/3/12). 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.

Key conclusions

The cross boundary 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 majors 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 Sites DPDs to be considered in drafting these documents.

**Bassetlaw** no majors 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** î 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.

**Doncaster** î no majors 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.

**North East Derbyshire** î no majors 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** î 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 over two subsequent meetings considering housing targets, population projections and land supply issues in Sheffield and Rotherham. Agreement 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.

**Areas for further work**

**Housing targets**

Rotherham and Sheffield are working on a memorandum of understanding on Rotherham’s Local Plan Housing Target. The memorandum is currently with Sheffield in draft form for consideration. The intention is for the memorandum to be agreed and signed by the respective Cabinet Members of Rotherham and Sheffield. The memorandum will then be made available to the inspector considering the Core Strategy as evidence of co-operation on the issue of housing targets between the two local planning authorities. The memorandum will set out areas of agreement and any remaining areas of difference.

**Employment**

Rotherham and Barnsley will look at cross boundary employment issues, particularly around the Dearne Valley and associated connectivity issues related to public transport provision.
Transport

Rotherham and Barnsley will continue liaising on drafting of respective Sites DPDs 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 supply

Rotherham and Doncaster are in discussion relating to future aggregates supply and any joint evidence base that may be required to support the Core Strategy. Rotherham and Doncaster will continue joint working on a study to look at future long-term mineral supply towards the end of and beyond the current core strategy plan period. 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

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.

For more information you can contact Forward Planning by the following means:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>01709 823869</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>01709 372419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:forward.planning@rotherham.gov.uk">forward.planning@rotherham.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning">www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Post       | Forward Planning  
Planning and Regeneration Service  
Environment & Development Services  
Riverside House  
Main Street  
ROtherham S60 1AE |
Appendix 1: Meeting between RMBC and Barnsley MBC
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  
Manager  
Andy Duncan Strategic Policy Team Leader Rotherham MBC  
Ryan Shepherd Senior Planner Rotherham MBC

Apologies:  
None

1. Note of meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 ĭ inspector advised against including housing commitments in calculating housing target as cannot guarantee delivery.  
Chesterfield Canal discussed ĭ 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

### ACTION

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.**

   **RMBC**

   | 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) involves 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) involves 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 in 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:
Jeremy Johnson  Economy & Commissioning Manager  Doncaster MBC
Richard McKone  Principal Planner Housing  Doncaster MBC
Richard Dobson  Planning Officer  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 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 i.e. 1230 pa i.e 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 Barnsley-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 ų start on site is envisaged in 2012. Airport Masterplan used as evidence base for CS ų 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 ų do their bit ų RMBC updated on current approach to this issue in LDF ų 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 ų 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 or 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 i.e. 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.

ACTION
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 ì noted speculation about possibly being published around Feb 2012, potentially extending transitional arrangements.

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

Sheffield ì identified land supply issues relative to their housing requirement ì lost city centre capacity, supply against requirement is very tight, donît have a 5 year supply due to housing market conditions affecting ìachievability of development.

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

Sites DPD programme ì 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 ì 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 ï¬¼ 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 ï¬¼ 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 ï¬¼ just allocating to meet 850 / year may not be enough ï¬¼ 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) ï¬¼ 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 ï¬¼ 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:
  - Attercliffe / Tinsley / Brinsworth (likely to be priority)
  - Mosbrough/Rother Valley
  - North of Tinsley / Blackburn
  - Thorpe Hesley / Chapeltown

7. **Actions**

- Sheffield to produce an equivalent version of Rotherham’s housing numbers paper
- NR and Roland Lovett to contact to look at some joint working re: population projections etc.
- SV to email Edge Analytics report
- RMBC to 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 i 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.
Appendix 10: 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 11: 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>Category</td>
<td>Company Name</td>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Status</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>