Core Strategy Focused Changes 2013: Representations Not Concerning Specific Focused Changes
Core Strategy Focused Changes 2013:
Representations Not Concerning Specific Focused Changes

The Council made clear in the consultation document and on its consultation website that representations were invited in relation to the ‘legal compliance’ and ‘soundness’ of the Focused Changes but not the Publication Core Strategy itself. It was emphasised that the consultation was not an opportunity to repeat or raise further points about the original plan, or to seek further changes. It was also re-iterated that all objections which have already been duly made to the Publication Core Strategy will be forwarded to the Inspector appointed to undertake the independent examination of the Core Strategy. Therefore there is no need to re-submit any documentation again.

During the Core Strategy Focused Changes consultation period the Council received representations from eight individuals or organisations which set out a range of issues but which were not related to specific Focused Changes in the consultation document.

As such the Council has not included these representations on its Objective Online consultation website, nor has it considered the issues raised in detail. However the representations received are attached as appendices to this document for the Inspector’s information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Consultee Name</th>
<th>Representation Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mrs Christine Fuller</td>
<td>CSFC 332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mrs L Tingle</td>
<td>CSFC 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mr Anthony Bacon</td>
<td>CSFC 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Diane Walker (Save Our Greenbelt Dinnington &amp; Anston Action Group)</td>
<td>CSFC 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elaine Frost</td>
<td>CSFC 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mrs Jennifer Perry</td>
<td>CSFC 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr Charles Perry</td>
<td>CSFC 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mr Jonathan Perry</td>
<td>CSFC 339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of the main issues raised are set out below along with the Council’s response to these.

Main Issues Raised

- Objection to building on Green Belt land
- Objection to development of specific sites (including some within the Green Belt)
- Objection to building houses when Council homes remain empty and many people can’t sell their houses
- The Focused Changes consultation has not complied with the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement / meaningful consultation has not taken place
- Proposals have ignored evidence base documents / previous concerns have not been reflected in feedback reports from past stages of Core Strategy preparation
- Objection to development of the Broad Location for Growth at Dinnington East.
- Objection to new development in Dinnington
- Farm land should not be built on
- Brownfield sites should be developed first
- Council properties should be occupied first
- Only build homes for people from Rotherham
Council’s Response
The majority of the issues raised have been considered previously as part of preparation of the Core Strategy.

Details of the consultation undertaken in preparing the Core Strategy are set out in the consultation statement which accompanies submission of the Core Strategy. The Council considers that this demonstrates that it has satisfied the requirements of the adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

National planning guidance requires Rotherham to meet its objectively assessed needs. The Council can robustly demonstrate exceptional circumstances exist for altering Rotherham’s Green Belt boundary to enable the identification of suitable development opportunities to meet housing, employment and other development needs. The evidence base prepared to support development of the Core Strategy has demonstrated the lack of brownfield sites available to help meet the borough’s future housing, employment and other needs. The release of green belt land in a number of locations will therefore be required, including the identification of the two broad locations for growth. The choice of which specific sites should be allocated for development will be made through the Sites and Policies DPD which will be subject to further consultation.

The growth hierarchy set out in the Core Strategy seeks to direct growth to the most sustainable settlements whilst also ensuring that settlements across Rotherham will meet their own local needs. It is considered that the distribution of growth between settlements is appropriate having regard to their locations and their capacity to accommodate further change and growth. The Council considers that the robust evidence base which underpins the Core Strategy supports the identification of Dinnington, Anston and Laughton Common as a Principal Settlement for Growth, and Dinnington East continues to be considered the most appropriate location to be identified as a broad location for growth due to its better connectivity to existing communities than land to the West of Dinnington.

The Core Strategy contains policies which seek to encourage the re-use of brownfield sites (Policy CS3) and minimise the loss of ‘best and most versatile’ soils (Policies CS3 and CS20).
Appendix 1:

Representation CSFC 332
Mrs Christine Fuller
Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) 2013
Focused Changes Representation Form

Please read the guidance notes in chapter 2 of the Focused Changes consultation document carefully before completing this response form – if you need any help or advice please contact the Planning Policy team using the contact details at the end of the form.

This form has two parts:
Part A – Personal Details & Part B – Your Representation(s).

Please copy and fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make

PART A

Personal Details:  Agent's Details (if applicable):
Title: MRS
First Name: CHRISTINE
Last Name: FULLER
Job Title: (where relevant)
Organisation: (where applicable)
Address Line 1
Line 2
Line 3
Line 4
Postcode
Telephone
E-mail Address

PLEASE NOTE THAT YOU MUST PROVIDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR YOUR COMMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED. THESE REPRESENTATIONS CANNOT BE TREATED AS CONFIDENTIAL, HOWEVER ONLY YOUR NAME AND COMMENTS WILL BE MADE PUBLIC.
PART B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation: ........................................

Q1. To which Focused Change does this representation relate?
Please refer to the Focused Changes consultation document for details.
Focused Change reference number: ........................................

Q2. Are you objecting or supporting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. Do you consider the Focused Changes to be legally compliant*? (please tick relevant box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4. Do you consider the Focused Changes to be sound*? (please tick relevant box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The considerations in relation to the Core Strategy being ‘sound’ and ‘legally compliant’ are explained in the accompanying guidance notes.

Q5. If you consider the Core Strategy is ‘unsound’ please identify the test of soundness to which your representation relates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively Prepared</th>
<th>Justified</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Consistent with National Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and any suggested change.

Q6. Please give the reasons for your objection or support.

I object to you building on Green Belt, if it was the other way round that we wanted to build on green belt you wouldn’t let us but because it is you the council you can do what you want. The one that I am talking about is the land that overlooks my house, the fields which go to Todwick, you have

(Continue on next page if necessary)
to Small woods there where 1 wish.

There is no facility to Accomodate these houses you wish to Build in Kiveton the Schools are not big enough, and a Small Road, and little shops.

Q7. If you are objecting please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve your objection.

I am objecting it all I don't see why you should Build New houses when you have Council Houses empty and also people who are trying to sell there houses can't, if you want to spend your money why not make the Roads more better to Drive on instead of Botching them up.

Yours Sincerely
Q8: Would you like to be notified of future stages in preparing the Core Strategy? (please tick all relevant boxes)

- Please notify me when the Core Strategy DPD has been submitted for independent examination
- Please notify me of the publication of the recommendations of the person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the Core Strategy DPD
- Please notify me of the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD

Signature: ___________________________ Date: 6/2/13

Completed forms should be returned by 5pm on 25 February 2013 to:
Planning Policy, Rotherham MBC, Riverside House, Main Street, Rotherham, S60 1AE

or by e-mail planning.policy@rotherham.gov.uk

(Tel: 01709 823869 or Fax: 01709 372419)
Appendix 2:

Representation CSFC 333
Mrs L Tingle
11th February 2013

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Forward Planning
Riverside House
Main Street
ROtherham
S60 1AE

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Objection to LDF Proposals for Dinnington East on grounds of soundess

I am writing to set out my objection to the current LDF proposals. I believe that the current proposals are unsound because the consultation process has not/does not conform with the Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement (“SCI") and also on the grounds that the proposals have ignored salient points made in the Council’s own evidence base documents. I attach a letter dated 12th August 2012 which sets out in detail the reasons behind my objections.

I further object to the proposals on the grounds that it is not in the public’s best interests to develop Dinnington East (being currently still in the greenbelt I believe and which is highest grade agricultural land, adjoining an area of high landscape value and SSI sites). I believe that the main aim of the development of Dinnington East is not to improve the housing requirements for local people or even people currently living in the Rotherham Borough, but rather it is intended that a sizeable proportion of the proposed housing is to be taken up by Sheffield’s overspill of population. This displacement of population and unnecessary development of Dinnington East is not in the public’s best interests and is a flawed policy which is reflected by a flawed and unsound set of proposals. I would argue that it is in the public’s best interests for Sheffield City Council to make available housing for it’s population within its own local authority boundaries rather than making use of Rotherham’s prime greenbelt land.

Lorraine Tingle
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Forward Planning
Riverside House
Main Street
ROtherham
S60 1AE

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Consultation - LDF Proposals for Dinnington East

I am writing to set out my objection to the current LDF proposals. I believe that the current proposals are unsound because the consultation process has not/does not conform with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement ("SCI").

The essence of my argument is that the development of Dinnington East goes to the heart of the LDF proposals for the borough and is fundamental to the borough housing target being achieved. Without other major sites in the area identified as "the Principal Town" of Dinnington being proposed for widespread development (such as Dinnington West or Dinnington St Johns) the Council really has no choice but to keep to its plans to develop Dinnington East in order to achieve its housing targets and in order to adhere to the underlying theme raised in the LDF proposals being that the Principal Town of Dinnington is to be a major source of development. I therefore believe that the SCI has not been adhered to as the views of the local community of Dinnington East, having been sought, can only be rejected/ignored (which is exactly what is happening).

Generally the SCI's theme is that the Council should give proper consideration to addressing issues and concerns raised. I do not believe that the Council have been (in 2009) or are now able to give proper consideration to addressing issues and concerns raised as regards Dinnington East.

The SCI states that the Council "is ready to listen and consider all views and adapt it's ideas". Again, for the reason I have argued above, in relation to Dinnington East, I do not believe that the Council have been or are now prepared to "consider all views" or "adapt it's ideas". Indeed it is clear that this has not happened given that the proposals have remained largely unchanged.
despite an exceptionally high level of objections raised and even despite the findings of the Council’s own evidence base documents citing alternative sites in the area as being preferential to Dinnington East. I attach an Appendix to this letter which refers to evidence base documents which point to alternative sites being more preferential for development than Dinnington East.

I believe that, having made it’s decision to plough ahead with their proposals for the development of Dinnington East in preference to other large identified sites in the area (namely Dinnington West and Dinnington St Johns) the Council has placed itself in the position that it has no alternative but to continue down the route it has set and therefore is unable to react properly to the consultation process.

I do not believe that the SCI has been met because the consultation process has been ineffectual as there has never been a possibility of the proposals for Dinnington East being fundamentally altered following consultation.

Notably, on page 9 of the SCI it states that the Council will “only ask your views on matters... when there is a genuine opportunity to alter the content of a planning document”. The SCI later repeats a similar point when it states “It is not enough for the Council to focus on providing information and consulting on proposals that have already been developed to the point where it is difficult to take your views on board”. For the reason stated above, I do not believe that the SCI has been adhered to in respect of these points.

I wish my objection to the soundness of the LDF proposals to be formally noted by the Council.

I look forward to receiving confirmation that my objection has been duly noted.

Yours sincerely

Lorraine Tingle

Appendix

The CSRO identifies North Anston as an “Area of Limited Growth” and therefore “a significant amount of new growth would not be sustainable”. The Dinnington East proposals are largely sited in North Anston’s greenbelt.

On page 28 of the CSRO under the heading “Potential urban expansion to freestanding
communities” it states “Although the sites to the east could link well with existing housing, the landscape nearby is of high value. Alternatively, sites to the west would not have such a negative impact on the landscape. Also more job opportunities could be provided here to improve the choice of sites in the Borough. Developing to the west could also link to the proposed improvements to the A57 (M1-Todwick Crossroads).” “Development to both the east and west of Dinnington would support the town’s status as a Principal Town.”

The Allocations Development Plan Document Settlement Surveys (Addendum to LDF612) states that an expansion to the west of Dinnington (as opposed to the East) “although impacting on green belt, would not compromise areas of High Landscape Value.”.

The Landscape Character Assessment states that the Dinnington St John’s site (site 15) has a greater capacity to build on than the fellow sites along the East of Dinnington (sites 9 and 10).
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Representation CSFC 334
Mr Anthony Bacon
Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD)
Focused Changes Representation Form

Ref: [Blank]
(For office use only)
To be returned by: 5pm on 25 February 2013

Please read the guidance notes in chapter 2 of the Focused Changes consultation document carefully before completing this response form – if you need any help or advice please contact the Planning Policy team using the contact details at the end of the form.

This form has two parts:
Part A – Personal Details & Part B – Your Representation(s).

Please copy and fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

**PART A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Details:</th>
<th>Agent’s Details (if applicable):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title (where relevant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (where applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postcode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE NOTE THAT YOU MUST PROVIDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR YOUR COMMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED. THESE REPRESENTATIONS CANNOT BE TREATED AS CONFIDENTIAL, HOWEVER ONLY YOUR NAME AND COMMENTS WILL BE MADE PUBLIC.
**PART B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation**

Name or Organisation: .................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. To which Focused Change does this representation relate? Please refer to the Focused Changes consultation document for details.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused Change reference number:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q2. Are you objecting or supporting? |
|---|---|
| Object | ☑ | Support | ☐ |

| Q3. Do you consider the Focused Changes to be legally compliant*? (please tick relevant box) |
|---|---|
| Yes | ☐ | No | ☐ |

| Q4. Do you consider the Focused Changes to be sound*? (please tick relevant box) |
|---|---|
| Yes | ☑ | No | ☐ |

*The considerations in relation to the Core Strategy being ‘sound’ and ‘legally compliant’ are explained in the accompanying guidance notes.*

| Q5. If you consider the Core Strategy is ‘unsound’ please identify the test of soundness to which your representation relates. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Positively Prepared: | ☐ | Justified: | ☑ | Effective: | ☐ | Consistent with National Policy: | ☐ |

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and any suggested change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6. Please give the reasons for your objection or support.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I DO NOT SUPPORT BUILDING ON GREENBELT LAND. THIS PARTICULAR ONE IN QUESTION IS THE LARGE FIELD IN RAVENFIELD! Our apartments are yards away from HERALD BROOK WHICH IS ON THE FIELD BOUNDARY. WE WOULD BE SUBJECT TO FLOODS FROM THE NATURAL SLOPE, WHEN THE FIELD IS FLOWN WITH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6. Continued

CONCRETE THE FIELD IS NESTING SITE FOR SKYHAR, PARTRIDGE, GREEN PLOVER, ALSO HARES IN SPRING, FOOD FOR ALL THE BIRD FROM SURROUNDING HEDGE ROWS, ALL THIS WILL BE LOST IF BUILDING GOES AHEAD, FURTHER WE WILL LOSE RAVENFIELD AS A VILLAGE IT WILL BECOME PART OF THE URBAN SHAWL FOR US THAT BOARDER THE FIELD IT WILL BECOME AN EYESORE IT IS THE LOSS OF PART OF ENGLAND WE LOVE AT A TIME WHEN WE HAVE TO IMPORT MORE OF OUR FOOD THE FIELD PROVIDED CORN AND RAPE SEED THIS WILL BE LOST FOREVER

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

Q7. If you are objecting please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve your objection

1. USE ALL THE BROWNFIELD SITES IN THE ROTHERHAM AREA,

2. MAKE SURE ALL COUNCIL HEED PROPERTIES ARE OCCUPIED

3. CHARGE EXTRA RATES ON ALL EMPTY PROPERTIES

4. STOP BEING THE AREA WHERE OTHER COUNCILS SEND THEIR PEOPLE TOO.

5. ONLY BUILD HOUSING FOR PEOPLE FROM THE ROTHERHAM.

6. BE MORE HONEST IN DEALING WITH THE RATEPAYERS OF ROTHERHAM

7. BE MORE ACCOUNTABLE TO THE PEOPLE OF ROTHERHAM AFTER ALL WE PAY YOUR WAGES.

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)
Q8: Would you like to be notified of future stages in preparing the Core Strategy? (please tick all relevant boxes)

☐ Please notify me when the Core Strategy DPD has been submitted for independent examination

☐ Please notify me of the publication of the recommendations of the person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the Core Strategy DPD

☐ Please notify me of the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD

Signature: ___________________________ Date: 20-2-13

Completed forms should be returned by 5pm on 25 February 2013 to:
Planning Policy,
Rotherham MBC,
Riverside House,
Main Street,
Rotherham,
S60 1AE

or by e-mail planning.policy@rotherham.gov.uk

(Tel: 01709 823869 or Fax: 01709 372419)
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Representation CSFC 335
Diane Walker
(Save Our Greenbelt Dinnington & Anston Action Group)
20th February 2013

Dear Sir


The group objects on the following grounds.

Legality

1 Consultation document 2012 - CS1 refers to para 8.1.2, which doesn’t exist.

Soundness (Justified)

1 Meaningful consultation didn’t take place from 2011 onwards. Evidence:
a) When the Constituency MP requested, 11 July 2012, “what changes have taken place relating to Dinnington East have been made since last year’s consultation process” RMBC replied in a quite lengthy reply, 29 October 2012, “In light of the group’s concerns, prior to publication we amended the vision statement in the Core Strategy to remove reference to Dinnington East”.

b) RMBC claim to have consultations with the group. Whilst there were meetings between RMBC and group representatives these were not consultations. The aims for the meeting set by the group did not indicate consultation of any kind.

c) RMBC declared in the presence of the Constituency MP that the term “Dinnington East” would be removed from the 2012 consultation document and be replaced by “the Dinnington area” consistent with the ‘Maltby area’ terminology used in other parts of the document. This change was not made.

d) No visible attempt has been made to involve the local community in the current Core Strategy Focused Changes 2013’ consultation process. Evidence: local parish councils (Anston and Dinnington) requested RMBC to hold consultation meetings with the local community and give guidance in completing the online consultation document. No consultation meetings have taken place.
e) Residents concerns regarding ‘flooding to the Wentworth Way area and emergency services’ were not reported in the consultation feedback document (2011) or the Core Strategy (2012), although the flooding of River Ryton in the same passage of the concern of flooding was. Evidence: implicit in the above.

2 The local community object to the development of the Greenbelt. Evidence:
   a) Over 2000 letters of objection and opposition sent to RMBC.
   b) The three local councils confirm opposition:
      Letwell Parish Council have objected to building on the Greenbelt
      Anston Parish Council have objected also
      Dinnington Town Council have objected to the Core Strategy.

3 RMBC claim that it is not required to make evaluations of the effects of the following items as a consequence of pursuing the strategy:
   Flood risk
   Changes to educational attainment
   Safety of the community (policing)
   Changes in house values
   Effects on social services and other ancillary service budgets
   Projected growth rates for businesses in the ‘high street’.

**Soundness (consistent with national policy)**

1 The document attempts to circumnavigate government policy of ‘building on Greenbelt only in exceptional circumstances’. Evidence: RMBC have stated intent to release far more Greenbelt than is required for identified potential development needs.

As the Constituency MP has asked to be ‘kept in the loop’ a copy of this letter has been sent to the Rt Hon Kevin Barron MP.

Yours sincerely

Diane Walker
Secretary
Save Our Greenbelt Dinnington & Anston Action Group

email address:
web address: http://www.saveourgreenbelt.info
Appendix 5:

Representation CSFC 336
Elaine Frost
Shepherd, Lesley

From: Peter Frost
Sent: 25 February 2013 10:27
To: Planning, Policy
Subject: Core Strategy Focused Changes 2013

Dear Sirs

With reference to the above document, I would like to register my objection on the basis of soundness

How can you justify taking the greenbelt status from such a vast area of Dinnington and North Anston when there are brown field sites available?

Over 2000 letters of opposition have been disregarded. In addition the 3 local parish councils have also confirmed their opposition

Yours faithfully

Elaine Frost

26/02/2013
Appendix 6:

Representation CSFC 337
Mrs Jennifer Perry
Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD)
Focused Changes Representation Form

Ref:

(For office use only)

To be returned by: 5pm on 25 February 2013

Please read the guidance notes in chapter 2 of the Focused Changes consultation document carefully before completing this response form – if you need any help or advice please contact the Planning Policy team using the contact details at the end of the form.

This form has two parts:
Part A – Personal Details & Part B – Your Representation(s).

Please copy and fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make

PART A

Personal Details:

Agent's Details (if applicable):

Title

MRS

First Name

JENNIFER

Last Name

PEERY

Job Title
(where relevant)

Organisation
(where applicable)

Address Line 1

Line 2

Line 3

Line 4

Postcode

Telephone

E-mail Address

PLEASE NOTE THAT YOU MUST PROVIDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR YOUR COMMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED. THESE REPRESENTATIONS CANNOT BE TREATED AS CONFIDENTIAL, HOWEVER ONLY YOUR NAME AND COMMENTS WILL BE MADE PUBLIC.
PART B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation: .................................................................

Q1. To which Focused Change does this representation relate? Please refer to the Focused Changes consultation document for details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focused Change reference number:</th>
<th>building on greenbelt land as a member of the general public. You shouldn't make it so complicated for people to have their say. Greenbelt land is there for a reason and you don't have good enough reasons to ruin it by building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q2. Are you objecting or supporting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q3. Do you consider the Focused Changes to be legally compliant*? (please tick relevant box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q4. Do you consider the Focused Changes to be sound*? (please tick relevant box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*The considerations in relation to the Core Strategy being ‘sound’ and ‘legally compliant’ are explained in the accompanying guidance notes.

Q5. If you consider the Core Strategy is ‘unsound’ please identify the test of soundness to which your representation relates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively Prepared:</th>
<th>Justified:</th>
<th>Effective:</th>
<th>Consistent with National Policy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and any suggested change.

Q6. Please give the reasons for your objection or support.

This form is too complicated. You need a library card to access the information needed. I don't know the terms used. I simply want to object to building on greenbelt land as a member of the general public. You shouldn't make it so complicated for people to have their say. Greenbelt land is there for a reason and you don't have good enough reasons to ruin it by building.
Q6: Continued

more housing estates on it. There are numerous estates and little pockets of houses/flats going up all over
Dinnington and Langthorpe - when will you stop? Dinnington can't cope with them - You refer to it as a tour -
no it is not - it is just one housing estate after another with no facilities to justify it. Every town I know has
a proper swimming pool and a McDonald's! The land you
want to ruin is used everyday by dog walkers and families
wanting to see some countryside - it's the best we have.
You can't make up for this by giving us a bit of grass to replace
it.

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

Q7: If you are objecting please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve your objection

1/ Stop building houses in Dinnington now - there
is only so much we can take - hence you now
want our green spaces. This is wrong, we are full.
2/ Think of the people this will effect - we
vote for you and deserve your cooperation and
loyalty rather than people you intend to ship in.
3/ Farm land should never be built on - we
need to be put to its best use - stupid to
build on our best farm land!
4/ Look elsewhere for brownfield sites and stop
listening to the companies who want this greenbelt
because it's easier to build on and makes them
more money.
5/ Listen to your constituents who live here - Give
us some respect - we know what Dinnington needs
and it is not this! It is us who would be
affected by this not you.

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

6/ Make your forms a website easy to use for us mere
mortals!
Q8. Would you like to be notified of future stages in preparing the Core Strategy? (Please tick all relevant boxes):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Please notify me when the Core Strategy DPD has been submitted for independent examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Please notify me of the publication of the recommendations of the person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the Core Strategy DPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Please notify me of the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: ___________________________ Date: **20.2.2013**

**Completed forms should be returned by 5pm on 25 February 2013 to:**

Planning Policy,
Rotherham MBC,
Riverside House,
Main Street,
Rotherham,
S60 1AE

or by e-mail planning.policy@rotherham.gov.uk

(Tel: 01709 823869 or Fax: 01709 372419)
Appendix 7:

Representation CSFC 338
Mr Charles Perry
Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD)
Focused Changes Representation Form

To be returned by: 5pm on 25 February 2013 (For office use only)

Please read the guidance notes in chapter 2 of the Focused Changes consultation document carefully before completing this response form – if you need any help or advice please contact the Planning Policy team using the contact details at the end of the form.

This form has two parts:
Part A – Personal Details & Part B – Your Representation(s).

Please copy and fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make

PART A

Personal Details:

Title       MR
First Name   CHARLES
Last Name    PEARY
Job Title    (where relevant)
Organisation (where applicable)
Address Line 1
Line 2       
Line 3       
Line 4       
Postcode
Telephone
E-mail Address

Agent’s Details (if applicable):

PLEASE NOTE THAT YOU MUST PROVIDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR YOUR COMMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED. THESE REPRESENTATIONS CANNOT BE TREATED AS CONFIDENTIAL, HOWEVER ONLY YOUR NAME AND COMMENTS WILL BE MADE PUBLIC.
PART B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation: .................................................................

Q1. To which Focused Change does this representation relate?
   Please refer to the Focused Changes consultation document for details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focused Change reference number:</th>
<th>Building on Lakeland Dr Dining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAN'T FIND REF NO!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2. Are you objecting or supporting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. Do you consider the Focused Changes to be legally compliant*? (please tick relevant box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4. Do you consider the Focused Changes to be sound*? (please tick relevant box)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The considerations in relation to the Core Strategy being ‘sound’ and ‘legally compliant’ are explained in the accompanying guidance notes.

Q5. If you consider the Core Strategy is ‘unsound’ please identify the test of soundness to which your representation relates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positively Prepared:</th>
<th>Justified:</th>
<th>Effective:</th>
<th>Consistent with National Policy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and any suggested change.

Q6. Please give the reasons for your objection or support.

I don't want you to build houses on our field because there is very few we take our dogs on walks. Also there is lots of wildlife such as mice and butterflies. There are no other fields around where we live and they look more than a lot of houses. My school is already small as kids we live a round here. I like our fields so please don't spoil them.

Yours faithfully

(Continue on next page if necessary)
Q7: If you are objecting please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve your objection.

Yes, we need to move to another site to build houses.
Q8: Would you like to be notified of future stages in preparing the Core Strategy? (please tick all relevant boxes)

- [ ] Please notify me when the Core Strategy DPD has been submitted for independent examination
- [ ] Please notify me of the publication of the recommendations of the person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the Core Strategy DPD
- [ ] Please notify me of the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD

Signature: ___________________________ Date: 20/2/13

Completed forms should be returned by 5pm on 25 February 2013 to:
Planning Policy,
Rotherham MBC,
Riverside House,
Main Street,
Rotherham,
S60 1AE

or by e-mail planning.policy@rotherham.gov.uk

(Tel: 01709 823869 or Fax: 01709 372419)
Appendix 8:

Representation CSFC 339
Mr Jonathan Perry
Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD)
Focused Changes Representation Form

Ref:

(For office use only)

To be returned by: 5pm on 25 February 2013

Please read the guidance notes in chapter 2 of the Focused Changes consultation document carefully before completing this response form – if you need any help or advice please contact the Planning Policy team using the contact details at the end of the form.

This form has two parts:
Part A – Personal Details & Part B – Your Representation(s).

Please copy and fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make

PART A

Personal Details:

Title
First Name
Last Name
Job Title
(when relevant)
Organisation
(when applicable)
Address Line 1

Agent's Details (if applicable):


Line 2
Line 3
Line 4
Postcode
Telephone
E-mail Address

PLEASE NOTE THAT YOU MUST PROVIDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR YOUR COMMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED. THESE REPRESENTATIONS CANNOT BE TREATED AS CONFIDENTIAL, HOWEVER ONLY YOUR NAME AND COMMENTS WILL BE MADE PUBLIC.
PART B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation: ...........................................................................................................

Q1. To which Focused Change does this representation relate?
   Please refer to the Focused Changes consultation document for details.

   Focused Change reference number: .................................................................

Q2. Are you objecting or supporting?

   Object      ☐

   Support     ☐

Q3. Do you consider the Focused Changes to be legally compliant*? (please tick relevant box)

   Yes     ☐

   No      ☐

Q4. Do you consider the Focused Changes to be sound*? (please tick relevant box)

   Yes     ☐

   No      ☐

*The considerations in relation to the Core Strategy being ‘sound’ and ‘legally compliant’ are explained in the accompanying guidance notes.

Q5. If you consider the Core Strategy is ‘unsound’ please identify the test of soundness to which your representation relates.

   Positively Prepared: ☐

   Justified: ☐

   Effective: ☒

   Consistent with National Policy: ☐

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and any suggested change.

Q6. Please give the reasons for your objection or support.

I can not really understand this form as the terminology is a bit behind me.

The simple fact of the matter is that building on Green Belt land is wrong and building more houses in the so called “Town” of Dinnington where there

(Continue on next page if necessary)
Q6. Continued

are limited facilities like schools, swimming pools, sports halls, parks etc. and on this Green Belt Land is unjustifiable. Where will these extra people go?? The current planning consent for Brown Field Sites in this area is more than enough for this Village.

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

Q7. If you are objecting please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to resolve your objection

Only Build on Brown Field Sites

Ensure all council properties are inhabited or empty as many are.

3. High Quality Farm Land should never be built on under any circumstances.

4. Any houses built should be for core people only.

5. We do not want Sheffield people coming to our area - send them to Orgreave.

6. Social Housing will degrade the area we do not want it.

7. Many people of Dinnington - the ones who voted you in - will leave the area.

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)
Q8. Would you like to be notified of future stages in preparing the Core Strategy? (please tick all relevant boxes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Please notify me when the Core Strategy DPD has been submitted for independent examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Please notify me of the publication of the recommendations of the person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the Core Strategy DPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Please notify me of the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: ____________________________________________  Date: 20/7/13

Completed forms should be returned by 5pm on 25 February 2013 to:
Planning Policy,
Rotherham MBC,
Riverside House,
Main Street,
Rotherham,
S60 1AE

or by e-mail planning.policy@rotherham.gov.uk

(Tel: 01709 823869 or Fax: 01709 372419)