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Introduction

This document will form an annex to the main Feedback Report on Rotherham’s Core Strategy Revised Options to be completed in due course. As an interim measure the Council is publishing the notes of all workshops / focus groups, public meetings and drop-in sessions held during the June and July 2009 consultation period, including the Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension proposals.

You may already be aware that all the comments made by members of the public and key stakeholders such as Government agencies, parish councils, environmental groups, developers, planning consultants / agents, and other interested bodies and groups, to the Core Strategy Revised Options are available from the LDF Consultation Portal: http://consultation.limehouse.co.uk/rotherham/drafts/12/index.html

Our detailed response to the comments received will not be available until the Feedback Report is published. The Final Feedback Report will be published on our web site when it is completed; and hard copies of the Feedback Report will be made available in the following libraries:

- Rotherham town centre
- Dinnington
- Wath
- Swinton
- Maltby
- Rawmarsh
- Kiveton Park
- Wickersley
- Greasbrough, Kimberworth and Kimberworth Park.

All documents relating to the preparation of Rotherham’s Development Plan are available at www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning. This information can be accessed via any computer with internet access including those within your local library.

Hard copies or CD's can also be made available on request. A small charge to cover printing and postage may be made at our discretion. Please contact us at the following address if you require a hard copy or CD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>01709 823869</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>01709 823865</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>Minicom</td>
<td>01709 823536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Regeneration Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment &amp; Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bailey House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rawmarsh Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotherham S60 1TD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Events held throughout the Borough during the consultation period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Consultation event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 June 2009</td>
<td>Internal Council drop in session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 June 2009</td>
<td>Discussion at LDF steering group followed by open drop in for all Members of the Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 June 2009</td>
<td>Rotherham North Area Assembly workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 June 2009</td>
<td>Wentworth Valley Area Assembly workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 June 2009</td>
<td>Wentworth South Area Assembly workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 June 2009</td>
<td>Presentation to Maltby Environment Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 June 2009</td>
<td>Consultation event for key stakeholders Bailey Suite, Bailey House – 10 to 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 June 2009</td>
<td>Rotherham South Area Assembly workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 July 2009</td>
<td>Local Strategic Partnership Achieving theme board presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 July 2009</td>
<td>Women’s planning / strategy group workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 July 2009</td>
<td>Rother Valley South Area Assembly workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 July 2009</td>
<td>Bramley Parish Council public meeting Bramley Parish Hall – 7 to 9pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 July 2009</td>
<td>Wentworth North Area Assembly workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 July 2009</td>
<td>Bassingthorpe Farm public drop in session at Thornhill youth club – 1 to 4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 July 2009</td>
<td>Bassingthorpe Farm public drop in session at Wingfield Comprehensive – 3 to 6pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 July 2009</td>
<td>Presentation to Parish Liaison meeting Rotherham Town Hall – 7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 July 2009</td>
<td>Public drop in session for the south of the borough at Dinnington Resource Centre – 2 to 6.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 July 2009</td>
<td>Public drop in session for the north of the borough at Montgomery Hall, Wath – 2 to 6.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 July 2009</td>
<td>Public drop in session for the centre of the borough at the Bailey Suite, Bailey House – 2 to 6.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 July 2009</td>
<td>Bassingthorpe Farm public drop in session at Greasbrough Town Hall – 2 to 5.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 July 2009</td>
<td>Rother Valley West Area Assembly workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 July 2009</td>
<td>Public drop in session at Wickersley library – 2.30 to 6.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 July 2009</td>
<td>Tenants and Residents workshop with Rotherfed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 July 2009</td>
<td>Black and Minority Ethnic communities workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 August 2009</td>
<td>Ravenfield Parish Council public meeting Ravenfield Parish Hall – 6 to 8.30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary Initial Feedback Received

The information provided in the tables and pie charts in the next section provides initial feedback on the number of responses received as part of the consultation process. This is a snapshot in time (31/10/09) and the final report may show some revised figures. We have received 6,155 representations to the Core Strategy proposals.

The Council is currently analysing all the representations (comments / objections) that have been received to the Core Strategy Revised Options, this analysis along with the Council’s response will be made available in due course. The outcomes from this analysis will assist the Council in preparing a further draft of Rotherham’s Core Strategy (prior to formal ‘submission’ to the Government and public examination by an independent Inspector).

At the same time we are proposing to consult in greater detail on sites (in the Allocations Development Plan Document) as options that could make up the housing target of 24,500 new homes in Rotherham Borough up to the year 2026 and between 250 and 300 hectares of employment land to meet job needs.

Between now and the next round of community consultations we will undertake a refresh of our employment land review. We will look again at our future employment land requirements and reflect on the changes that have taken place in our local economy. The Employment Land Review will look at the suitability of existing and proposed employment sites for future economic development. Where sites could be suitable for alternative uses, such as housing, we will thoroughly investigate this.

Further work is being done on preparing a Landscape Character Assessment and investigations are ongoing into the bio-diversity / habitat and species on proposed development sites. The infrastructure needs of new development, such as transportation and the ability of the local road networks to cater for new growth, is also being looked at.

Having taken into account all the comments received and evidence from these supporting studies, the Council will select an option (or a hybrid option) to decide what development should go where.

The next round of consultation will enable local communities to comment further on this approach and the proposed vision for the future of Rotherham Borough. It will also provide opportunities to comment on detailed policies and (in a separate document) to comment on potential ‘Allocations’ –sites for new development in the future.
Representations Received to date

We have received a high number of representations (objections / comments) and signatures to petitions where it has been impossible for us to identify the full name and address of the respondent. We have made every effort to add the objector to the database; however in some instances this has not been possible. The following table summarises the area or issue of concern and the number of representations where we are not able to include the representation in the database for the reasons outlined above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Area / General Issue</th>
<th>Number of Representations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bassingthorpe Farm</td>
<td>594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenfield Bramley</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Anston</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy and Traveller site</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Loss of Green Belt</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails received with insufficient details</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total the number of people we have been unable to add to the database is 861 people. In addition a number of petitions have been submitted where not all the supporters have supplied their addresses. In particular the two allotment Societies at Clough Road and Kimberworth Park have submitted petitions but the supporters of the petition have not added any contact details. In these instances we have captured the number of people signing the petition and inserted the issue and the number against one of the Allotment Society members.

All other responses received have been registered as being valid unless their content has been considered too defamatory, obscene or racist or otherwise likely to cause offence.

The Council has a statutory duty to carry out its functions with due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful race discrimination, promote equality of opportunity and promote good relations between people of different racial groups (Race Relations Amendment Act 2000). Furthermore, our Equality and Diversity Policy commits the Council to demonstrate fairness, equality and diversity as essential to achieving our vision of building a cohesive community.

As all valid representations will be published on the Council’s website we asked people to resubmit a revised version of their comments where comments could potentially be perceived by certain members of Rotherham’s communities as offensive. Due to the efforts of the Council and the willingness of the majority of people to amend their comments only five representations have been rejected.

The following table summarises the number of representations received to each chapter of the Core Strategy Revised Options document. Objections to development on specific sites have been registered against question 13 “If you do not support any of the options suggested, please tell us why not. Can you suggest an alternative approach?”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Support with Conditions</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document / Introduction</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Stages</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Sustainability Appraisal</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives and Policies</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of Growth</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Growth</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Options</td>
<td>5,080</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,303</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Land Strategy</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Town Centre</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,413</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6,155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LDF Core Strategy Revised Options (May 2009) Consultation -
representations received by type

Letter: 5,211; 84.7%
Web: 305; 5.0%
Email: 639; 10.4%

LDF Core Strategy Revised Options (May 2009) Consultation -
representations received by nature of response

Object: 5,413; 87.9%
Support: 241; 3.9%
Support with conditions: 137; 2.2%
Observations: 300; 4.9%
Other: 64; 1.0%
LDF Core Strategy Revised Options (May 2009) Consultation - representations received per document chapter / section.

Representations - Site / Area specific objections (Under Q13 / Q11)

- Bassingthorpe: 3,020
- Ravenfield / Bramley: 810
- North Anston / Dinnington: 460
- Thurcroft: 130
- Wickersley: 60
- Whiston: 40

Representations - Duly Made Objections (approximate numbers)
One of the key aims of the planning reforms introduced by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 is to achieve wider community participation in the planning process.

The Act establishes minimum requirements for involving the community are set by planning regulations. Under the new arrangements the Council has prepared a document called the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Following several periods of consultation and an independent examination by the Planning Inspectorate, the SCI was formally adopted by the Council on 14 June 2006.

The SCI can be found in libraries across the Borough, as well on the internet via the RMBC website at:

www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning

The SCI sets out the Council's policy for community participation, including the engagement of traditionally excluded groups, together with the standards of community involvement to be achieved in the preparation, alteration and review of the various documents in the new Local Development Framework (LDF) and in consultations over planning applications. It is intended to ensure the active, meaningful and continued involvement of local communities and key stakeholders throughout the development plan preparation process.

In addition to outlining the general approach to enhancing community participation, the SCI details specific arrangements for the involvement of appropriate stakeholders and local communities in the preparation of LDF documents including the Core Strategy.

Methods of involvement vary depending upon the desired outcomes, the issue under consideration and the stage of the development plan preparation process that has been reached. Section 3 of the SCI promotes a wide range of methods of involvement with varying benefits and resource implications that can be used by the Council to engage stakeholders in the preparation of its LDF.

The table below (adapted from that found under paragraph 3.12 of the SCI) illustrates the range of measures employed to engage with the community and stakeholders. This table analyses the methods of involvement used to consult on the Core Strategy Revised Options against those outlined in the SCI.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of involvement</th>
<th>Used as part of the Core Strategy Revised Options consultation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circular letters/e-mails</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site notices</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/website</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media – Local TV, Radio and Press</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitions</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to one meetings</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public meetings</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Assembly Forums</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Aid</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To enable greater understanding a more detailed explanation of the different methods used is provided within the following table (adapted from Table 1, pages 20-23 of the SCI). It is also important to note that in future consultation programmes, additional meetings or participation exercises may be included as new issues emerge. There is a need for a flexible approach to enable new techniques to evolve from experience learned.
### Core Strategy Revised Options (CSRO) Assessment of Conformity of Consultation Activity with Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Steps taken to implement/achieve this</th>
<th>Have we satisfied the SCI?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Documents available for inspection at our offices during set consultation period | It will be clear how and when you should respond. Offices and documents will be accessible to disabled people.                                                                 | Copies of the following documents:  
- Core Strategy Revised Options Document  
- Sustainability Appraisal  
- Sustainability Appraisal Appendix  
- Sustainability Appraisal non-technical summary  

were made available at libraries located throughout the Borough and at customer service centres in Rotherham Civic Building, Maltby, Dinnington and Swinton.  

Copies were distributed to elected Borough Councillors, Parish Councils and key stakeholders (as identified in the Regulations*) including Government Office for Yorkshire & the Humber, Environment Agency, Natural England, English Heritage, Highways Agency, Sport England and other identified organisations such as adjacent local authorities and the Regional Development Agency.  

A copy of the documents was also provided to each Area Assembly geographic office, throughout the Borough.  

<p>| Site notices, posters                      | It will be clear how and when you should respond.                      | A Statutory Notice was published in the Rotherham Advertiser (29/05/2009), Dinnington &amp; Worksop Guardian (29/05/2009) and the South Yorkshire Times (05/06/2009). In combination, these three publications offer Borough-wide distribution and coverage. (The | ✓ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Steps taken to implement/achieve this</th>
<th>Have we satisfied the SCI?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Circulars and Letters to statutory bodies</td>
<td>We will identify bodies we consider necessary and inform them in writing.</td>
<td>Statutory Notice is attached at the end of this table as Supporting Item 1). Posters were used to advertise drop-in sessions in appropriate community buildings. Letters and appropriate documents were sent to all key stakeholders: - general and specific consultees and other people who had confirmed to the local authority that they wished to be consulted on the preparation of the Borough Development Plan. The letters detailed the purpose of the consultation and the timeframe within which comments were to be made. Information was also provided as to where to view the documents. A copy of the letter sent to consultees is attached to this table as Supporting Item 2.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet (website, email)</td>
<td>Should be user friendly and include all relevant Documents in PDF format.</td>
<td>All documents and supporting evidence base were made available on the Forward Planning section of the RMBC website in PDF format. The Core Strategy Revised Options Document was also published on our LDF Consultation Portal as a web based document on the internet. All comments on the CSRO can be made directly into this system. Once validated by officers of the Council, these comments are made available for viewing by all interested parties. Rotherham’s Online Application for Mapping (ROAM) was used to illustrate the location of potential development sites investigated to date. Local libraries provide internet access to the Council’s web site.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media (local press, email)</td>
<td>Use of local</td>
<td>Press release published within the June edition of Rotherham News</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Steps taken to implement/achieve this</td>
<td>Have we satisfied the SCI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information via community newsletters, TV, radio etc)</td>
<td>newspapers/community Radio to carry articles and stories about proposals. Produce a LDF video/DVD. Possible production of cartoon/comic style leaflets or promotional Videos.</td>
<td>to publicise the commencement of the consultation. A further article appeared in the October edition summarising the numbers of people who have responded and outlining the next steps in the preparation of the Core Strategy. A short (8 minute) film entitled ‘Planning Rotherham’s Future’ provides an introduction to the planning system in an easy-to-understand form. This is available on the RMBC website. Interviews on local radio include: Rother FM and BBC Radio Sheffield (June / July 2009). Attached (refer to Supporting Item 3) is a list demonstrating the extent of media exposure, including enquiries, press releases and statements issued by RMBC’s communication team relating to the Core Strategy Revised Options.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets/ brochures</td>
<td>Used to publicise an outline of a proposed Document or application. Published in Plain English.</td>
<td>The Core Strategy Revised Options document summarises the outcomes from a number of technical background studies. It presents three distinct options and identifies the pros and cons of the different strategies. Each chapter includes questions to assist consultees in examining the planning issues raised. As far as possible the document is written in a “plain english” style and a comprehensive glossary is available to aid understanding of the issues raised. To publicise the four drop in sessions (see text below for further details) 1000 printed flyers were produced. In addition an e-flyer was created that was sent to each of the seven Area Assemblies to distribute via their network of contacts.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Steps taken to implement/achieve this</td>
<td>Have we satisfied the SCI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation events/Public exhibitions/displays/stalls/roadshows</td>
<td>Held in accessible locations that are relevant to the subject under discussion. Held over a number of days and at varying time to ensure all sections of the community have an opportunity to attend. Material should be presented in a format that is easy to understand e.g. providing colourful resource boxes of LDF leaflets and publications which could be made available to individuals and groups for reference or loan.</td>
<td>Additional flyers were also used to publicise events in the communities surrounding the Bassingthorpe Farm Urban Extension. 500 flyers were sent to each of the Area Assemblies directly affected (i.e. Wentworth South &amp; Rotherham North). A further 1000 flyers were distributed to local communities by a group of volunteer local activists. Public drop-in sessions for the north (Wath - 22 July), south (Dinnington – 21 July) and centre (Bailey Suite – 23 July) of the Borough were organised. In response to a request from Wentworth Valley Area Assembly an additional event was also arranged in Wickersley (28 July). The intention of these sessions was to provide an informal opportunity for members of the public to meet with planning officers face to face and discuss issues of interest. Each event was scheduled for afternoon/early evening and lasting approximately 4 hours. Information was presented graphically on display boards demonstrating the 3 options for the distribution of housing growth throughout the Borough. The display also included the employment land and Rotherham town centre strategies. Large scale AO sized maps detailing the potential development sites included within each Option were also available at each of these events. Tailored events for the communities potentially affected by the proposals for Bassingthorpe Farm Urban Extension were undertaken in partnership with Yorkshire Planning Aid (please refer to last entry in this table for more details).</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Steps taken to implement/achieve this</td>
<td>Have we satisfied the SCI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-to-one meetings with selected</td>
<td>Requires senior staff involvement together with expectation that</td>
<td>Upon request, meetings took place with any member of the public who wished to engage with a planning officer outside of a more open forum.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stakeholders</td>
<td>commitments will be made and fulfilled.</td>
<td>Discussions with infrastructure providers including Yorkshire Water, Network Rail, Environment Agency, South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive and the Highways Agency have also been held.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public meetings</td>
<td>Meetings must be carefully prepared and effectively chaired.</td>
<td>Two public meetings were held following requests from Bramley and Ravenfield Parish Councils. These took place on the evenings of 7 July and 11 August 2009 respectively. A formal presentation by a representative of Forward Planning was followed by a question and answer session. Attendance was such that each venue was filled to capacity.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups (selected groups of</td>
<td>Provides an opportunity to explore issues in depth. It may need to</td>
<td>Within each of the seven Area Assemblies, a workshop/focus group was organised. Specific aspects of these discussions were tailored to the relevant issues of that particular area and the potential direct</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Steps taken to implement/achieve this</td>
<td>Have we satisfied the SCI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared interests/experiences) or citizens panels (randomly selected participants)</td>
<td>be complemented by other methods.</td>
<td>implications of the options presented. Over a period of approximately 2.5 hours, officers representing Forward Planning introduced and explained the options. Following this a number of questions were asked of the attendees which provoked debate with the hope that a broad consensus of opinion could be reached. The dates for each of the Area Assembly workshops was: Rotherham North – 24 June Wentworth Valley - 25 June Wentworth South – 25 June Rotherham South – 29 June Rother Valley South – 7 July Wentworth North – 8 July Rother Valley West – 27 July Key stakeholder workshops were also scheduled throughout the consultation period. This allowed direct engagement with the following organisations: Women’s Planning / Strategy Group (6 July) local biodiversity forum (14 July), Black and Minority Ethnic community (29 July) Rotherfed (29 July), Older People’s Forum (30 July), Youth Cabinet (21 July).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Steps taken to implement/achieve this</td>
<td>Have we satisfied the SCI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Briefs</td>
<td>Needs to detail key planning issues that affect the area. Needs to be complemented by other methods.</td>
<td>This type of exercise is not applicable to the broad strategic consultation that is necessary for the Core Strategy. However consideration will be given to this method being used as and when appropriate.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Assembly Forums</td>
<td>Tailor made to discuss issues relevant to particular areas</td>
<td>Refer to comments regarding workshops</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Planning Aid             |                                                                                                                                   | Within the context of Rotherham’s position amongst the top ten most deprived authorities in the Region, Yorkshire Planning Aid approached RMBC at an early stage of the Council’s Local Development Framework programme and offered assistance, in relation to the engagement of priority communities and groups. These include people on low incomes; unemployed people; minority ethnic communities; women’s groups; disabled people and disability groups; older people; children and young people; tenants groups; community groups and voluntary organisations.  

YPA’s work in relation to the current consultation stage of the Rotherham Core Strategy falls within the context of this general approach. In line with this and available resources/capacity, YPA’s work has focussed on eligible communities around the proposed Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension, Rotherham Youth Forum, Rotherfed and Rotherham’s black and minority ethnic communities.  

YPA’s undertaking at the outset of this Core Strategy consultation stage was to faithfully report, verbatim, the comments made by the individuals and groups attending the events which YPA facilitated. | ✓                         |
PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT
2004

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN
DOCUMENT REVISED OPTIONS

NOTICE OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 (Regulation 25) the following provides information about the Core Strategy Development Plan Document Revised Options and consultation process.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

Title of document: Core Strategy Revised Options.

Subject matter: Revised options for the Core Strategy which will set out the Council's proposed planning framework for the Borough. The revised options comprise refined strategic objectives and policy outlines; and alternative options for a spatial strategy for the overall amount and distribution of development in the Borough.

Area covered by the document: Rotherham Metropolitan Borough.

Consultation period: Comments on the Core Strategy Revised Options are invited during the statutory consultation period which will run from Friday 29th May 2009 to Friday 31st July 2009. Comments should be made using the Council’s online consultation system accessible from www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning

or in writing to: Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, Forward Planning (CSRO), Planning and Regeneration Service, Bailey House, Rawmarsh Road, ROTHERHAM S60 1TD

or by e-mail to: forward.planning@rotherham.gov.uk

Comments must be received by 5pm on Friday 31st July 2009.

INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS

The following documents are available for inspection at the venues and times shown below:

- Core Strategy Development Plan Document Revised Options
- Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document Revised Options

Bailey House, Rawmarsh Road, Rotherham (8:30am to 5:30pm, Monday to Friday)
Customer Service Centre Civic Building, Walker Place, Rotherham (8:30am to 5:30pm, Monday to Friday)
Customer Service Centre Station Street, Swinton (8:30am to 5:30pm, Monday to Friday)
Customer Service Centre New Street, Dinnington (8:30am to 5:30pm, Monday to Friday)
Customer Service Centre Braithwell Road, Maltby (8:30am to 5:30pm, Monday to Friday)
All libraries in the Borough (normal opening times)

Further supporting background reports and details of consultation events are available on the Council's website at www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning

Paul Woodcock
Director of Planning and Regeneration,
Rotherham Borough Council, Bailey House, Rawmarsh Road, Rotherham, S60 1TD
20 May 2009
Dear Sir/Madam

Rotherham Local Development Framework – Core Strategy Revised Options

We are to publish revised options for Rotherham’s Local Development Framework Core Strategy for consultation on 29 May 2009.

The Core Strategy will set out the broad planning framework for the Borough to 2026 by choosing the towns and settlements for new development. It will set out the broad amount of new development required and the strategic policies to make this happen.

Since we last consulted you on Core Strategy Preferred Options in January 2007 there have been a number of significant changes. These changes require us to consult you again before we finalise the document and submit it to the Government for examination. The most important changes include a 50% increase in the amount of new homes that should be provided in the Borough; and the award of New Growth Point status for South Yorkshire which has further increased the amount of new homes required. Taken together, these require us to plan for 24,482 new homes by 2026.

The revised options build upon the earlier preferred options but we now need to know your views on which option is best to guide the broad distribution of new development around the Borough. This is important because the Core Strategy will influence later decisions on exactly where individual development sites should be located – to be identified in a supporting Site Allocations Document.

You are now invited to make comments on the Core Strategy Revised Options, and the sustainability appraisal report that accompanies them.

Comments should be made using our online consultation system which you can access from our website at www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning or in writing to be received by 5pm on Friday 31st July 2009 at the address below.

The following consultation documents are available for inspection at the venues and times shown below:

- Core Strategy Revised Options
- Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy Revised Options

Bailey House, Rawmarsh Road, Rotherham (8:30am to 5:30pm, Monday to Friday)
Customer Service Centre, Civic Building, Walker Place, Rotherham (8:30am to 5:30pm, Monday to Friday)
Customer Service Centre, Station Street, Swinton (8:30am to 5:30pm, Monday to Friday)
Customer Service Centre, New Street, Dinnington (8:30am to 5:30pm, Monday to Friday)
Customer Service Centre, Braithwell Road, Maltby (8:30am to 5:30pm, Monday to Friday)
All libraries in the Borough (normal opening times)
The consultation documents, supporting background reports and details of consultation events are available on our website at www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning. Hard copies of any of these documents are available on request using the contact details below.

Since January 2007, we have invited the submission of sites for consideration as new development sites or “allocations”. These have helped inform the Core Strategy Revised Options by enabling us to understand the overall capacity and broad environmental limitations of the Borough’s towns and settlements to accept new development.

We are now no longer actively seeking the submission of new sites but should you wish to be kept informed of future preparation and consultation on the Site Allocations Document please let us know using the contact details below. Consultation on specific sites will start later in 2009.

For any further information or to be removed from our database please let us know using the contact details below, quoting reference number: «ContactID»

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone:</th>
<th>01709 823869</th>
<th>Post:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td>01709 823865</td>
<td>Rotherham MBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:forward.planning@rotherham.gov.uk">forward.planning@rotherham.gov.uk</a></td>
<td>Forward Planning (CSRO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minicom:</td>
<td>01709 823536</td>
<td>Planning and Regeneration Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning">www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning</a></td>
<td>Bailey House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rawmarsh Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROTHERHAM  S60 1TD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yours faithfully

Paul Woodcock
Director of Planning and Regeneration
SUPPORTING ITEM 3
Core Strategy Revised Options Media Exposure

For information, the enquiries relate to the calls received on this subject from the media, both written and oral; press releases refer to pro-active releases issued to the media; while statements are the reactive responses made to enquiries from the media.

Press Releases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Release Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 May 2009</td>
<td>Have your say in shaping Rotherham’s future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 July 2009</td>
<td>Core Strategy consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 July 2009</td>
<td>More comments welcome on Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 August 2009</td>
<td>Core Strategy consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enquiries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Nature of Enquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 July 2009</td>
<td>Rotherham Advertiser</td>
<td>Questions regarding the Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 August 2009</td>
<td>BBC Look North</td>
<td>Wanting information on the Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 August 2009</td>
<td>Sheffield Star</td>
<td>Wingfield Ward Independent Campaigners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 August 2009</td>
<td>BBC Look North</td>
<td>Wanting response to demonstration outside Rotherham Town Hall as petition is handed in ref: the Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 August 2009</td>
<td>BBC On-line</td>
<td>Wanting information on the Core Strategy consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 August 2009</td>
<td>Rotherham Advertiser</td>
<td>Has RMBC gone back on its word after leader said a second meeting could be arranged in Ravenfield.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Statement Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 July 2009</td>
<td>Core Strategy – follow up Q &amp; A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 August 2009</td>
<td>Core Strategy – frequently asked questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 August 2009</td>
<td>Core Strategy &amp; Growth Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 August 2009</td>
<td>Michael Sylvester – Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 August 2009</td>
<td>Gypsy site in Thurcroft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 August 2009</td>
<td>Core Strategy &amp; Allotments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 August 2009</td>
<td>Ravenfield Meeting ref: Core Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 August 2009</td>
<td>Core Strategy &amp; Gypsy Sites x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 September 2009</td>
<td>Local Development Framework Consultation - Leader’s statement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Strategy Revised Options Consultation
Notes of Rotherham North Area Assembly Workshop – 24 June 2009

Forward Planning officers welcomed those present and explained the background to the current consultation – chiefly resulting from increased housing targets, improved survey data and changes to the Local development Framework (LDF) preparation process, and then went through consultation issues, options and questions forming the basis for discussions summarised below:-

REVISED GROWTH OPTIONS

OPTION 1

A community representative noted Bassingthorpe Farm was a common feature in all options which needed to be handled sensitively and emphasised the need to maintain green corridors within the landscape as well as facilities for recreational access, the need for quality design and amenity provision. Need a vision for accompanying retail/service facilities and support to Rotherham Town Centre as a result of housing increases. She supported improvement of principal towns to increase their vibrancy but felt that this option had limited overall flexibility.

A community representative pointed out the importance of transportation corridors serving Waverley and Bassingthorpe Farm – should look at revival of proposed supertram extensions.

A community representative was concerned about urban sprawl between Kimberworth Park and the Town centre and Greasbrough losing its identity.

OPTION 2

A community representative again emphasised the importance of strengthening the role of principal centres and thought that there was scope to mix and match growth amongst settlements. This option reduces urban sprawl and better reflects public transport corridors and potential solutions to transport issues.

A community representative supported a combination of Options 1 and 2 emphasising the importance of transport strategy, a balanced approach to assigning housing numbers including an assessment of windfalls and more high density housing development in the Town Centre.

A community representative supported re-designation of the former Thorpe Hesley housing allocation as Green Belt but recognised that there would still be a need for some housing. The Forum had put forward sites to be looked at in the LDF Allocations Document. There were concerns about the adequacy of the A629 corridor to safely accommodate pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders – new development roads to be appropriately designed to avoid such problems particularly with anticipated traffic resulting from Bassingthorpe proposal.

There are outstanding proposals for an A629 Quality Bus Corridor which could look at some of these concerns.

The resident considered that housing growth in sustainable locations within public transport corridors was desirable in addition to park and ride facilities. The importance of liaison with SYLTE was acknowledged.

A community representative supported Option 2 as the most flexible with emphasis on Town Centre development and sustainable public transport links.
A community representative favoured Option 2 as infrastructure was already in place, needing enhancement rather than large investment, reducing the need for cooperation between partners and re-alignment of their budgets. The need for options to reflect Transform South Yorkshire’s programme was mentioned.

**OPTION 3**

General feeling that there needed to be safeguards against urban sprawl and the importance of increasing designations of quality greenspaces and high quality design appropriate to localities. The importance of green infrastructure, play areas and safe community facilities was generally highlighted. There was concern about maintaining minimum distances between settlements. A community representative felt that this Option was seeking to provide too many homes.

A community representative felt that greenspace standards were important and emphasised the benefits to sport and recreation and the need to combat obesity. Facilities adopted by the local community were particularly valuable.

A resident mentioned the need to incorporate renewable energy technologies into new development.

Forward Planning officers explained the need to operate for all Options a strict monitoring regime with brownfield urban land being given priority to provide a readily available 5 year housing supply, an additional 5 year site specific supply and broad areas of potential to make up the final tranche the 15 year supply required by Government guidance. Windfalls could not be used in the debate about housing numbers but would be monitored to influence the timing of development with more sensitive greenbelt sites delayed until the longer term.

**OPTION CONSENSUS**

It was generally felt that Option 2 was preferable subject to the caveats covered above but that the best option may well be a hybrid, locating growth were it can be best accommodated to satisfy sustainability issues.

**EMPLOYMENT LAND STRATEGY**

A community representative thought there was merit in convenient local jobs involving less travel.

A community representative was critical of call centres and favoured innovative industries like those at the Advanced Manufacturing Park. She favoured strategic areas, particularly at gateways to Rotherham, rather than local provision due to concerns over loss of residential amenity and settlement character.

A community representative felt that 90 ha of employment land was far too low and favoured the provision of larger sites to assist the attraction of any remaining or future footloose inward manufacturing investment dependent on changes in the global market. It was important to work with Sheffield to attract new employment and adopt a flexible strategy.

A community representative pointed out that employment was a regional issue and supported links with the Sheffield Universities and provision for new innovative industries, working from home and the inevitable increase in personal leisure time. We needed to attract more skilled and higher educated workers to assist in developing the local economy and moving away from Rotherham’s working class ethos.
A community representative considered the closure of Sheffield Airport was a lost opportunity and that it could have been revived as an air freight distribution centre. A community representative was supportive of increasing provision of employment land particularly for new innovative green industries linked to universities. He also favoured the utilisation of former rail lines for new public transport systems. Concerning strategic sites, the importance of the Sheffield Road corridor with its established transport links was emphasised and it was considered there might be additional potential for new employment land within underutilised parts of the Aldwarke Corus complex.

**OPTION CONSENSUS**

*No overall consensus achieved but neither was a hybrid approach rejected subject to caveats about quality of development and amenity safeguards for employment opportunities integrated within local communities*

**TOWN CENTRE**

**OPTION 3**

This option did not receive any support and it was generally felt that it would accelerate the further decline of Rotherham Centre. The town centre should be developed in preference to further development of retail parks. Two community representatives considered Parkgate Retail Centre to be pure commercial retail set in a vast area of car parking without any vitality and character associated with traditional centres which were more diverse in accommodating a range of ancillary service facilities together with residential accommodation.

**OPTIONS 1 AND 2**

A community representative supported expansion of the town centre and felt that the Renaissance agenda remained important for the future of the town as the Borough’s principal centre, particularly through encouraging high density residential development and establishing core uses in the town centres to support the future development and economic prosperity of the town. A community representative thought that it was important to reflect on the success or otherwise of recent residential developments particularly as Rotherham had come to town centre living later in the game than Leeds and Sheffield where apartments were experiencing a downturn. The existing retail offer in Rotherham is inferior without any branded coffee shops and even Primark did not measure up to its branches in the other South Yorkshire centres. A community representative thought the river corridor was important and that the town was affected by an adverse image (could do more to support Rotherham FC) with questionable clientelle making visitors feel threatened. Concerns about drug abuse, general law and order issues and the lack of civic pride were also raised. A community representative shared concerns about the lack of civic pride and thought it was vital to reverse the Town’s downward spiral. Clifton Park was a joy and there was a need to introduce more colour into the centre, improvements to the river corridor and proposals to lay out a new area of open space adjacent to the Minster following the demolition of All Saints Buildings were supported. There was also support for direct
intervention by the Council to stimulate new businesses, offices and a broader social clientele.
A community representative favoured Option 2 to expand the Town Centre consistent with the Renaissance goals. She also suggested an area of temporary civic space adjacent to the Minster pending eventual redevelopment of the demolition site together with a “Rotherham Timeline” Trail and improvements to poor quality buildings on Corporation Street. She felt that it was important to focus development on the part of the Guest and Chrimes site nearest to the town centre.

**OPTION CONSENSUS**

No support for Option 3 but no clear consensus achieved for the other options although there appeared to be a reluctance to consider a reduction in the size of the Town Centre, general support for the Renaissance initiative and agreement that something needs to be done to stem further decline.
Introductions & context

Everyone thought that it was disappointing that more people did not attend given the importance of the subject matter. More people need to be involved. When we run events like this again we need to look more carefully at how they are advertised and promoted, and improve ways of getting people involved. May need to look at the format of the events and which will best engage people.

Exploring the 3 Options

- Questions were raised of the high level regionally determined housing targets which Rotherham is looking to make land available for.
- Maltby & Hellaby should be seen as distinct settlements as opposed to simply being grouped together for ease of reporting.
- The Maltby Masterplan work (completed in 2008 by Lathams associates on behalf of Housing Market Renewal) was raised and it was noted that this should have been better related to the LDF process.
- It was generally felt that Maltby could not achieve the level of growth which the options indicate. If this level of growth was seen then there would need to be improvements to Maltby town centre. The issue of heavy traffic running through Maltby would remain an issue unless radical accompanying infrastructure solutions were introduced.
- It was felt that the expansion of Maltby would potentially have extremely damaging environmental impacts, particularly on limited magnesium limestone reserves.
- Have we taken account of the local community plan – Maltby Plan?
- It was recognised that place shaping was important but it was not felt that decisions affecting local areas were being taken by local people.
- Noted that the Quality Bus Corridor was now a SMART route and that bus frequency had declined. It is important that South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive is involved with the Local Development Framework process.
- Option 2 raises issues of local distinctiveness and identity as this and option 3 would close the gap between Maltby and Hellaby.
- It was felt that there is a lack of capacity for the traffic which would arise from new development. Roads are at capacity at present and it would need some radical solutions to address this in the future.
- Have we taken into account the uplift in housing numbers that may arise through increases in density from redeveloping existing sites – an example of a site at Braithwell Road was used.
• If we have policies in the future which guide development / phasing and release of sites then will communities have less say on which sites will be developed in future?
• It was suggested that option 1 was favoured, possibly with the colliery coming forward in the future, as this would have less impact on Maltby. Alternatively option 3 would offer the most flexibility in the choice of sites.
• What will be the impact on high quality agricultural land? How is this sustainable in relation to climate change?
• Options 2 and 3 were not felt to be feasible for Maltby given local infrastructure constraints, and the impact on agricultural land and woodland.
• Overall, whichever option is chosen, some areas will have big problems. Therefore an option which increases the flexibility of site choices may potentially be best.
• What would the mix of housing be? Affordable housing needs to be fully integrated within new residential schemes to avoid the problems experienced elsewhere with concentrations of poorer social groups.
• It was noted that some survey sites included ancient woodland or other sensitive species and such issues need to be fully considered in advance of deciding whether it is appropriate for future development.
• The role of the Core Strategy in the determination of planning applications was also raised.

Employment Land Strategy

• Greenfield sites at Bramley should not be promoted in advance of the opportunities that exist on the previously developed sites at Waverley & Dinnington.
• To what extent have we explored the potential of land that surrounds the colliery site at Thurcroft?
• Recognition was made of the importance of distributing sites around the Borough.
• Before further employment development takes place, consideration should be given as to how best to utilise the currently unoccupied vacant floorspace.
• Extension of Hellaby industrial estate was not popular, with a preference for Maltby’s colliery site to be redeveloped once (or if) operations cease. This could make use of the existing minerals railway.
• Greater emphasis should be placed upon mixed-use development.
• Targeting of emerging industries such as Green technology was appreciated as being important for securing the economic future of Rotherham.
• Questions were raised as to the impact of the Sheffield City Region upon the Core Strategy revised options.

Rotherham Town Centre

• As time was running short, limited debate took place surrounding this topic, but all were in agreement that improvements to the quality of the retail offer were crucial to ensure its long term viability. However, consensus on agreeing the best mechanisms to achieve this was not reached.
Core Strategy Revised Options Consultation

Wentworth South Area Assembly

Rawmarsh High Street Centre, 25.06.09

Housing Options

The Planner began the evening by setting out the background to the Local Development Framework and its relationship to the previous Unitary Development Plan of 1999. He then explained the reasons for the increased housing targets from Government and South Yorkshire Growth point, resulting in this further round of consultation on the new housing and employment land targets. The revised options were then described and the reasons for the differences under each option were outlined to the group. The first part of the discussion focused on the options for housing.

Comment: The initial reaction from one participant was that the release of Green Belt land would get a lot of people ‘up in arms’. The way forward is to listen to groups of people, such as those represented at the meeting, and talk to them about the issues involved, as his group’s experience of talking to Councillors has proved relatively successful in resolving issues.

Question (Q): What if there is a change of Government?
Answer (A): No one yet knows what a different Government will decide to do, as policies were not yet clear. Things may change further down the line but no one can predict this. It would be better if there was flexibility on the release of land in the future, to allow for any future changes in policy.

The Planner discussed the three options separately and described the process of Borough-wide surveys that led to the development of the revised options.

Comment: One of the consultees felt that part of the problem is developers only being interested in profit. They need to be controlled by the Council and policies need to be developed to force developers to talk to community groups and work out plans for the area which will benefit the community and create beneficial places for people to live in.
Answer: It is very difficult to force developers to do exactly what we want them to although we will aim to develop policies to protect green spaces where appropriate and allow for green areas in new developments. There are also affordable housing policies in place for developments over 15 dwellings, although developers are saying they find this very difficult to meet in the current economic climate.

The planners then described the reasons for each of the options and the differences between them, and asked if people from the group would be prepared to go back to their community groups and discuss the options with the communities. We would be very grateful if their groups could then respond to the consultation with their comments, either individually or collectively.
**Town Centre Options**

Planners described the Town Centre Options in more detail, going through the reasoning for each of the different options.

Comment: The group were not in favour of the dual town centre Option C. People felt there should only be one designated town centre and that was the current one, although it has to be accepted that a lot of people do their shopping at Parkgate Retail World. That should not be classed as the town centre because it is more like an out of town retail outlet.

There was appreciation from the group of the buildings recently going up in the town centre and this would attract people into the centre to live and benefit the town centre.

People felt the town centre would benefit from going for more niche markets and smaller shops, as it was clear the big retailers preferred to go for Meadowhall and Parkgate.

The cost of parking was felt to be a major issue that affected the town centre, when parking is free at places like Meadowhall and Parkgate.

Discussing the need for more small retailers in the town centre, it was suggested that the Wellgate Area was becoming more used, because of the spread of multicultural shops which were opening along the road.

The three options were discussed in detail and people were asked to return and discuss with their representative groups and consider their views on the Town Centre Options, and respond to the consultation document and questions.

**Employment Options**

Comment: Suggestions were made from the group for the Council to encourage the start up of small engineering firms and associated trades, which tend to employ more workers than warehousing firms. People were against the creation of more warehousing sheds that take up a large area and only employ a few members of staff, however these could be unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled jobs.

Answer: We are required to provide employment land for the market and although we may not want a large number of warehousing sheds, if this is what private industry requires and wants to create, there is a limit to our ability to prevent this. Although the policies which we provide for development control, can have influence on the design and impact of any buildings.

Comment: People felt that if there were to be more large shed-like buildings, then these should be kept in designated areas where they would have least impact on overall views and away from residential areas.

The people attending were asked to take the consultation document back to their own groups and discuss with them, before responding to the consultation, either individually or as a group. People were also reminded that all the information is available on the Council Website, and responses can be made on-line if they have access to a computer, or paper forms can be made available on request.
A brief introduction to the Local Development Framework and the new development plan was delivered to the attendees. It was explained how the Core Strategy will outline the vision for the future of Rotherham.

Referring to the requirement for 24,500 new houses for the Borough, a question from the audience about where numbers came from and are they reliable. The population in Rotherham has not changed in 40 years from 250,000 so why are we planning for more houses. Surely we should be looking at how many people will be coming into Rotherham.

It was indicated that the figures are from the Regional Spatial Strategy and came out of detailed investigation and forward predictions of population. The figures were produced prior to the recent credit crunch and recession but as a planning authority we have no alternative other than to work with the current figures.

**Core Strategy Options for Rotherham Town Centre**

The attendees were split into two groups and the three options were outlined.

A. Consolidation – keeping current Town Centre boundary
B. Expansion of Town Centre – including Drummond Street, to the north and south to include Guest & Chrimes site.
C. Contraction/dual node – reduction in Town Centre this reduces role of shopping. Limits the potential of Rotherham Town Centre to perform its role as the Borough’s principal centre.

Three questions were then put to the group;

1. Should we keep the town centre broadly the same as it is at the moment?
2. Expand the town centre, with a larger boundary and shopping area.
3. Enable the town centre to become complementary to Parkgate Shopping complex

Questions were then put to the facilitator by the attendees.

**Comments from Group One**

What will it mean for places outside the town centre boundary? For example supermarkets? It was suggested that the town be opened up further, people want quality, the former All Saints complex (now a vacant site), should not be built on. The Minster has become a more prominent feature now the All Saints buildings have been demolished. People felt this should be made a feature for the town centre with seating areas etc.
The High Street desperately needs to be redeveloped. Rotherham is a small town we need quality to bring people back into the town centre.

Questions were asked regarding the aspirations of the Council regarding the use of Forge Island. It was explained that the Council Offices will eventually be going onto the Guest & Chrimes site which will release the area now housing the Library and Arts Centre, Norfolk House and Civic Building. It is intended that staff will move to the new Civic Centre. It is proposed that Tesco move to the Walker Place area and Forge Island will be redeveloped as the new Arts and Culture area.

Questions were asked about the B & Q site whether this would be an appropriate site for housing Rotherham United and what will be the implication for the Town centre when B & Q move?

A question was raised ‘why do we persist in putting flats in the town centre?’ We are not encouraging families into the town and it is not conducive to building communities.

Discussion took place around town centre living i.e. night clubs / noise etc and the potential conflict between residents and the night-time economy.

The Civic Society is opposed to the knocking down of Norfolk and Civic Buildings and the Art Centre and feels they should be refurbished. Arguments surrounding the sustainability of demolishing buildings that are not at the end of their useful life and that are Architect designed buildings of the 1970’s / 1980’s.

What interest is there in businesses coming back into the town centre?

Points were made about the recession and how it is likely to be a long time before changes take place.

Option C: does it involve any expansion of Parkgate; there is land beyond the site (commonly known as Stadium land) why can’t we consolidate Option A with Parkgate, not allowing expansion to Parkgate Shopping complex onto the Stadium land but encouraging better (free) transport links between the town centre and Parkgate?

Transport options were then discussed, it was pointed out that the bridges over the canal etc were not adequate. The point was made that transport needs to be free and frequent to Parkgate. It was pointed out that until there is something to attract people back into the town centre then people will go straight to Parkgate.

The Minster View was again brought up – could it be landscaped into an upmarket Town Plaza and then be redeveloped if and when the boom starts again.

The Civic Society has handed in a 400 signature petition asking for this. A point was made that until the town centre is occupied there is no point in expansion.

The facilitator informed the group that due to the current economic situation redevelopment of the All Saints site is unlikely in the short term, it was agreed that the area needs something dramatic and the workshop agreed to recommend that the All Saints site be developed as an open plaza.
The facilitator also informed the group that negotiations with landowners and occupiers on High Street regarding the listed buildings was ongoing.

The point was made that the attraction of Parkgate and Meadowhall is impacting on Rotherham town centre; the facilitator pointed out that Rotherham town centre offers service facilities not available at Parkgate or Meadowhall.

**Comments from Group Two**

It was suggested that the site of the current civic buildings has been offered to Tesco but that Tesco are not going to budge from where they are.

The point was made that when Rotherham Renaissance began, they wanted to put Council buildings on Forge Island but now they are moving to Guest & Chrimes. It was suggested that Renaissance is already going ahead and these plans seem different. We were involved in the Renaissance Planning Consultation and the plan was for development at side of river. Renaissance projects wanted to expand activities along the riverside and canal.

Why are we going to build more houses when the population isn’t growing? It was also suggested that 3 storey high buildings are already being built and contain flats which can come off the housing target figure.

It was queried whether LDF policy would not be enacted until 2026? It was made clear that policy and allocations would be from when the documents were adopted by the Council and run until 2026.

It was suggested that the problem in town centre is car parking and that the Council seems to be against cars. If there is no car parking, you will have no town centre.

Would be better to do parking, shops and buildings all at once, but it seems that you are always stopped from doing things together.

All Saints Building has been knocked down and it may not be built on as it may not be viable. Is that a possibility? – Yes

Will council be building houses? Not at present.

Shopping habits have changed. People are using cars and not coming into town. Need to know what sort of town we are going to have. It was suggested that if you don’t put the shops into town then people won’t come into town, and that competition is needed to keep shops going.

What’s happening on High Street? All plans seem to have come to nothing.

Events are already happening in the town centre but people don’t use it. Rotherham needs to put on more things to attract people.

Don’t like town centre and they won’t come in to use it.

Wellgate is congested and dirty.
Lighting in town centre needs to be improved as it is very dark and intimidating for people at night-time.

Suggest removal of pedestrianisation on High Street and turn back into a thoroughfare. Before Rotherham was pedestrianised it was much busier and a number of people visited the town centre.

Rotherham is on its last breath.

Expansion of the town centre would be better for town and encouraging people to enjoy the Riverside.

Would like to say option B is the better option and will bring in extra land at Guest & Chrimes.

Would extending town centre allow people to come in and build 20 storey buildings? It was indicated that the type of development would not be decided by this document, but would be controlled by separate policies.

With regard to option C (dual node option):
- Don’t want two town centres. The town centre is very compact and easy to get round
- Have to accept Parkgate will not go away and need to develop transport links
- Parkgate very difficult to get to by foot and bus. Will it be feasible in view of river and canal constraints to improve buses?
- Difficult to get to Parkgate on foot or by bus due to busy roads to cross
- Rotherham market is very important and not being improved
- The town centre is dying because people are not coming in to support it. Nothing in town centre to come in for
- Opening another supermarket would kill off many shops in town centre

Core Strategy Options for Housing and Employment.

Comments from Group One

Discussion ensued around the taking of green belt land on the edge of Rotherham’s urban area.

If there is a change of government in the next election; a conservative Government will take away the regional tier of planning. The facilitator explained the migration into and around the country and the fact that targets for population growth and commensurate housing need have been set and need to be met.

24,500 new homes are needed between now and 2026. In addition 300 hectares of employment land are needed to meet the anticipated demand for jobs.

Questions regarding Council housing were put to officers “why isn’t the waiting list relevant to this discussion?”
The facilitator talked about the Housing Needs Assessment which is completed periodically and gives an indication of the number of affordable homes required.

Questions arose – why is there a mix of sites? Where have the figures come from? The facilitator informed the group that the figures are actual and can be seen on page 28 of the document. The target for brown field sites should be 60% but in Rotherham Borough this cannot be achieved.

The old Leisure Centre site was brought up and the proposal to build on the land, it was made clear that the building will take place only on the piece of land where the Leisure Centre stood and not on the playing fields.

The release of land in other areas of the borough was highlighted i.e. Bassingthorpe Farm and the Waverley site. Questions around the flood plain and drainage of this site were asked and whether the properties will be private and or social housing.

Questions were asked about the education facilities etc for all the proposed new houses, it was agreed that this is a priority for any new housing estates and land would have to be found for new schools if necessary.

Will the new housing take into account the need for social housing? The facilitator informed the group that at current levels 25% of all new homes need to be affordable however due to the recession the targets are being challenged elsewhere in the country. It was suggested that affordable housing should have the same appearance as private properties.

The Bassingthorpe development was discussed a point was made regarding the belt of green currently perceived as an attribute when coming into Rotherham and losing this would have a major visual impact.

The facilitator talked about the need for a landscape character assessment in this area and how through good design and landscaping this could give the perception of greenery.

Questions were asked at to whether the drainage system would be updated to accommodate new properties. The facilitator informed the group that there are plans for a flood elevation scheme to serve the town centre and that there will have to be a drainage system capable of carrying water away from new developments or for dealing with surface water arsing from any new developments within the site to be developed.

A question was asked about the community living nearest to the town centre i.e. the Asian community; have the Asian community been invited to the workshop. The facilitator informed the group that the Asian community have been approached and will be attending a similar event with translators.

A question was asked if there are any plans to knock down substantial housing to rebuild new properties. The facilitator informed the group that there are few plans for demolition. The Housing Market Renewal and Rotherham Renaissance Initiatives are trying to encourage the development of apartments and town centre living.
The facilitator told the group that the Local Development Framework is encouraging new housing development and is looking at green space provision and or enhancement as part of any new development.

A question was asked regarding provision for play areas in new builds, the facilitator informed the group that generally with new developments consideration will be given to the provision of new or enhancement of the Council’s existing green spaces near to the development scheme.

The facilitator informed the group that they will be consulting on appropriate sites and detailed policies next year, and that the Core Strategy Document can be seen on the Council’s Forward Planning web page at present.

The group were not happy to vote on the 3 options they felt they need to look deeper into the proposals.

Comments from Group Two

It was noted that the numbers for Rotherham urban area are very similar for all three options. It was suggested that 24,500 houses was ridiculous for a town of this size. Does the figure include demolitions? Partly, but no large scale demolition schemes are proposed.

Why do we need all these houses? It was noted that single households comprise a larger proportion of the population and this will increase the need for more houses even if the population remains static.

It was suggested that using large sites first is better than taking many smaller sites. It was noted that proposed development at Waverley contributes to the housing figures and that the Bassingthorpe Farm area is mainly owned by Wentworth Estates.

Any new development would need to improve transport links

Have to attract employment before we build houses for people

There is too much office development and not enough opportunities for manual work. We need to create jobs where people go to work, work hard, get tired, and go to bed. There are already loads of empty offices at Templeborough. We need to attract manufacturers - need more manufacturing and manual work for the local workforce.

Why is there a pelican crossing at bottom of Mansfield Road?

General comments made

People expressed the view that they were cynical about consultation. Is the consultation going to be taken account of, have we made a decision? If we think it’s a good idea, then it’s not. If they think it’s a good idea, it is. Council staff are getting paid for not doing anything.

Council officers noted that the next stage of consultation will look at sites which are suitable for development taking account of factors such as drainage etc - need improved drainage because of recent floods.
It was noted that feedback from previous consultation was put on the website and that feedback from this consultation would also be put on there.

The meeting closed at 5.30pm.
Discussion of Core Strategy Revised Options

Issues raised concerning Bassingthorpe Farm included:
- There were drainage concerns at Bassingthorpe Farm area. Especially concern regarding flooding at Scrooby Lane.
- The need for a new school was raised.
- Questions were raised about the bus and highway provision for development at Bassingthorpe Farm and general transportation issues for that area. The bottleneck of traffic at Parkgate was noted. Other transport problems raised included the road through Greasbrough which is horrendous.
- Farm viability needs to be retained; if part of the farmed area was to be lost around Bassingthorpe Farm, would the farm still be viable?
- Possible conflict with development and the retention of allotments in the area?
- Comment was made that development at Bassingthorpe Farm area is a bad idea and should not be pursued.

General Discussion points

General Housing issues raised:
- There is a need to provide affordable housing.
- There is concern that affordable housing may be provided in the most undesirable areas and not integrated into the development.
- It was queried if the houses will sell under the current economic climate. Problems of raising mortgages noted.
- Concern was noted over the maintenance and functioning of greenspace areas that were associated with the development, into the long term eg SUDS (sustainable urban drainage scheme) maintenance.
- Are ECO homes being built?
- Issues around road provision with new housing. There were problems of congested roads and emergency vehicles not being able to pass along them.
  - What will the road width be in new developments?
  - Houses need drives for parking.
  - Will there be any provision for improving road width in older areas? (health & safety issues arise from people parking on pavements).

Concern about Flooding
- Queries were raised regarding the consideration of flooding matters in planning
  - There is a need to check drainage functioning post development and ensure that problems are promptly and satisfactorily dealt with.

There is a need to create new communities rather then simply providing areas for housing:
- Areas of new development need to be inclusive and integrated.
- Housing must not be an “add on” (eg. gated community).
- Integration is facilitated by schools, community buildings etc.
- Need to try and prevent social isolation within new developments e.g. family with young kids
- There is a need to promote community cohesion
- Rotherham was listed as one of the best areas to live in a survey.

Public Transport
- Will public transport improve?
  Specific areas in need of improvement were noted eg. Rawmarsh and Wath/Swinton. Parking at Swinton station to enable commuting, this is a major issue.
- A number of train connections/changes are needed to get out of Rotherham; this is a disincentive to people to use the trains.

Economic issues
- Local people need local jobs (which brings training/skills issues)
- Fitzwilliam Industrial estate looks a mess and is on a main gateway into Rotherham.

Rotherham’s Station concerns raised
- Dark
- Safety
- Crime issues/fear
- Layout
- Train lines
- Toilets
- Poor Image
- Grim to use

Waterways
- Any plans to improve them in Rotherham?
- Water buses?

Green space provision
- There are issues with the development of green spaces a case study of Allocation site LDF 290 was made:
  - This Green space is valued - can it be retained?
  - The site is used for sport, volley ball it enhances the community feel in the area
- The surrounding houses have only small gardens
- Green space is needed within new developments
- Brownfield re-use will be bad if local informal green space is lost to the new development.

Option 1- 3 Record of Voting Choices

Option 1 Urban Extensions and more Principal Towns – 1 vote
(Voter liked urban extension focus not satellite villages that are not connected to existing communities).

Option 2 Development in public transport corridors– 7 votes
(Concern expressed over sensitive sites)

Option 3 Dispersed development – 2 votes

**Discussion on Town Centre Options**

- Most people want to shop at Parkgate.
- Rotherham markets are very good but not enough diversity to attract people into the town
- Primark is a good shop but lots of other shops have been lost.
- Can M&S food come back to Rotherham?
- Tesco are high street killers
- Rotherham needs to be a specialised shopping area. However current town centre users want value and not necessarily catered for by specialised shops
- There is not much to attract folks into the town centre
- The closing times of shops is too early for free parking
- Consider cinema provision in Rotherham?
- The Arts Centre needs to be by bus station and safe to walk to at night (7pm onwards)
- Subways are unpopular

**Civic office change**

- Not in favour of demolition of current civic offices
- Current facilities are seen as a home from home
- Current facilities are considered good. Why build new ones? Why not refurbish current buildings? Why have new Council buildings when we have Civic, Norfolk House etc? What would happen to existing RMBC buildings?
- There are cost and sustainability issues. RMBC is short of funds. Can RMBC afford the new build?
- It is news that RMBC is renting back offices from developer (poor advertisement of what’s going on).

**Rotherham Town Centre Options**

The result of voting for the different options for the Town Centre were as follows

Options -
- A Consolidation - (5 votes)
- B Expansion - (5 votes)
- C Contraction – dual node - (0 votes)

**Comments on Option B**

- Land can be better used, offices distant/disjointed. Better together even if out of town. There are empty shops now why spread them out further?
- Parking a nightmare now, hope it will improve

**Comments on Option C**

- Dependent on transport. A worse option if transport not provided.

**Thanks and Close**
Group One

Housing and Employment Land Targets

- Taking allotment sites will be going against national trends, they bring the community together.
- Is privately owned land to be released?
- Concern was raised about the number of immigrant people that we are providing homes for.
- Need to look after pensioners and to provide for their needs.
- Young people leave home earlier than in previously, creating a need for more housing; they only used to leave home to get married.
- Why is RMBC not turning voids and vacant housing in its ownership around quickly?
- Is new housing for rent or sale?
- Is monitoring of target figures and the number of homes built taking place?
- Will target figures be reviewed between 2009 and 2026?
- What consultation will take place in areas where land is to be taken?
- Do target figures include existing ‘available’ housing numbers?
- Social changes in society and south Yorkshire: people are migrating northwards away from the over-heating south-east?

Infrastructure

- All new housing estates will need services/ utilities – flood risk/ drainage issues need to be addressed – how will it all be brought together?
- Infrastructure, transport, schools, sewage disposal is insufficient now, for example at Brookhouse sewage is discharged into the brook; concern regarding flooding issues in Laughton Common from Eel Mires Dyke.
- What consideration will be given to environmental issues and climate change – flooding issues have not gone away despite RMBC emergency planning exercises?
- Money has to be spent on re-housing families of flood damaged homes.
- Catcliffe flooding issues- land resold following demolition of older terraced properties but subsequently the land has again been developed for houses.

Policy Options

- Rural areas – Firbeck not even recognised on plans.
- Core Strategy Revised Options Document (CSRO) Page 31: Option 1, there is an error in Dinnington employment figures, (should include a 32ha site for employment activity at Dinnington West).
- Option 2 – includes land to the east of Dinnington.
- Web site - information on housing sites but it is not easy to access figures and sites.
• Question 1 there are too many imponderables.
• Why pick options that exceed target figures?
• It is unfair to ask us to comment, as it gives you carte blanche to go ahead with the development.
• Concern that the real public (at grass roots) do not have opportunity to comment, many do not have internet access or skills and many do not know/or are even aware of this consultation.
• Infrastructure should be put in place first, for example, Strata have not yet put in appropriate levels of infrastructure at Kiveton Park former White City estate.
• Commuting problems - Community should be consulted on public transport.
• Need for greater parking opportunities at Kiveton Park & Kiveton Bridge Stations to enable commuting by public transport.
• SYPT E has said that even if more housing is to be developed in Woodsetts, there are no plans to increase bus services to Woodsetts. Dinnington has ‘scrag – end’ of bus service.
• Children and young people are not able to get to school by public transport. Adults are not able to get to work in Sheffield from Woodsetts by bus.
• The location should be sustainable, with suitable drains and other services and community facilities etc.
• What “sweeteners” are likely to be proposed? The workshop group discussed S106 Planning Agreements and funding of suitable activities by developers.
• New jobs from any future development should be for local people in the area, workers should not be brought in.
• Is new housing to be private?
• “We have 19 years to find 24500 new houses – It is best to choose the option that gives biggest and most flexible targets, than we could select/identify sites around the region/area which are best suited for development and prioritise these as & when required.”
• Dinnington Guardian journalist “Why consider options 1 & 2, why not just consider option 3?”
• Page 26 CSRO document – Projected figures at Waverly & Bassingthorpe would produce 8000 new houses, this would satisfy targets for now and for a number of years.
• What is the definition of sensitive? Sites are classified as having major reservations, minor reservations and no reservations, sensitive habitats, proximity to the areas of high landscape value and lack of suitable infrastructure, flood zones lead to a further sub-division of the major reservation sites into categories 1 and 2 with 2 being the most sensitive sites.
• Are gardens Greenfield and if so can they be taken?
• In the future it will mean people living in high density areas.
• RMBC development control agency staff had no feel for the locality.
• Nothing’s ever done, we are not listened to – must take up issues with elected members.
• The need for older people’s housing should be considered.

Employment options A, B & C.
• Are different types of employment to be looked at, at the same time?
• Option 3: We cannot even envisage job requirement figures for the next year, never mind jobs targets for 2026. These are unrealistic in the present economic climate!
• Climate change – the development of further green industries that will tackle climate change issues, this will impact on the supply of future jobs.

**Rotherham Town Centre & Villages**

• Need smaller shops in local centres, nothing in Rotherham Town Centre to visit for.
• Meadowhall is a major problem; there is a conflict between shops in Rotherham Town Centre and Meadowhall / Retail World at Parkgate.
• The right environment is needed – high density development will “close people in”.
• The loss of green space is a concern.
• Woodsetts, in the past as not been able to relocate people from Rotherham to take up council housing available

**Group Two**

Earlier consultation on Rotherham’s core strategy was undertaken between 2005 -2007. Tonight’s workshop will focus on Rotherham’s Core Strategy Revised Options Document, which builds on earlier work and presents revised options for consultation.

The Government target for Rotherham is set at 24,500 homes, to be built by 2026. Rotherham’s Core Strategy outlines three options for how this target can be met. The aim of the focus group is to consider each of these three options and to try and determine which option would be the best to pursue.

Further consultation on specific sites will take place at a later date, when we reach this stage.

**Q. Will there be houses pulled down to make way for the new ones?**
A. An actual number has not been calculated as yet but there will be some buildings/houses knocked down to enable new developments.

**Q. What type of housing will be built?**
A. There will be a diverse range of housing built, from flats to family homes. Our current policy seeks to ensure that 25% of all development must be what is termed “affordable housing”.

**Q. Why does Dinnington need 25 hectares of employment land?**
A. To try and bring more jobs into Dinnington. There was concern raised by the group about the current number of recently built employment units around Dinnington which are still vacant.

**Q. What will happen to the size of the sewage farm?**
A. It will have to be looked into to assess its maximum capacity.

**Q. What would be the total % of houses proposed for specific villages as it looks as though some villages are going to be doubled in size?**
A. It would be important not to change communities too much by over sizing them but this again will have to be looked at.
An attendee suggested it would be a good idea for planning to produce a map showing the % increase in homes that was being proposed for each village/town (as a % of the total number of existing homes)– the group supported this proposal.

Option 1: The group looked at option 1 which would require the development of all the proposed sites.

Q. What does the term “sensitive sites” mean?
A. Sensitive sites mean they could be for wildlife, a place of interest, open spaces or greenbelt. They are sites which may require more extensive consultation before a decision is made regarding development.

Option 2: The group then looked at option 2 which looks at building along the public transport corridors.

Q. Would there be a guarantee that not all of the houses will be built in Dinnington?
A. With option 2 there wouldn’t necessarily be a need to build all of the proposed houses in Dinnington.

Q. Who are the new houses being built for?
A. There is a growing demand for housing now and the target has been set to look at the likely demand increase by 2026. The group discussed changing social trends which impacted on the demand for housing including immigration and increased single person occupancy, through changes in life expectancy, divorce rates and lifestyle choices of younger and older generations.

Q. What type of houses will be built?
A. Issues of design and character will be looked at for each individual area, this will be looked into at a later stage when developments are being planned.

Q. When planning look at the infrastructure will the roads come first or the houses?
A. Planning need to look at stronger policies to ensure necessary infrastructure, in terms of sewage and roads are in place first before houses are built.

Q. An industrial building was built outside Kiveton with the view that there would be local jobs for local people. However, this didn’t happen as external people got the jobs. Will this happen again when the new developments are built?
A. Conditions can be put in place to encourage businesses to offer skills training in the local area, however this is very difficult for planning to enforce. We may try to address this through a specific policy in the Local Development Framework.

Q. Why does road safety always come last?
A. Roads will feature in a separate policy. However, if there are any specific concerns about existing roads then they should be addressed to the Council’s Transportation Unit or Development Control section.

Q. Each area will fight for as little development as possible. How will planning be picking the actual sites?
A. Planning will have to make some very difficult decisions and they will rely on the knowledge and expertise of local communities, Elected Members and partners for their thoughts and ideas. The process for choosing specific sites for development will involve consultation with communities and settlements beginning next year.
Option 3: The group then looked at Option 3 this being the most flexible option as it would allow 34,000 homes to be built, 10,000 above the target. This would mean more flexibility and Dinnington wouldn’t necessarily be built on as heavily.

- All relevant infrastructures will be considered such as play facilities and schools.
- Only limited information has gone out so far, so any land that has been put forward by builders since the start of the consultation may not have been considered yet. This will all be done as part of the site specific consultations taking place next year.
- Access for emergency services has got to be looked at as part of planning.
- Most of the group were very keen to stress that the condition of roads are their biggest concern and that they must be looked at first before more houses can be built.

Q. Should the infrastructure be in place first?
A. Policies will be introduced to deal with the infrastructure requirements that new developments will have to address. There will be consultation on draft policies for the Core Strategy later in the year, and other policies will be consulted on later to support the development of new sites.

Q. Will bog land be looked at for building on as there are big issues with flooding?
A. Sites within flood zones 2 and 3 have already been dismissed as sites for housing development.

Q. Can the group get statistics for the percentage increase for each village?
A. Yes this is something that can probably be provided. However, it should be noted that any increase in population may well boost the economy in the area.

Q. If option 2 is looking at the transport routes can it be put into the plan that public transport be made better so that more people use the bus more than their cars?
A. The council don’t own the busses anymore so this would be very hard to arrange but the plan will still look at bus services, rail and parking. Outside of planning, the Council will work with its partners to help improve public transport services.

Q. Would it not be more cost effective to build a new village/town from scratch rather than spending money on correcting previous errors and more dispersed developments in areas which don’t have the infrastructure?
A. It is less sustainable to build from scratch, however this suggestion could be considered. The group were keen that any such development could also be an “eco-village” and agreed this idea as a possible “option 4”. This suggestion will be put forward as part of the feedback from the consultation.

Q. Communities need to have landscape beauty they need to be mixed and sustainable. Could there be a new eco friendly development?
A. Again, it is not cost effective to build a new community as there are new electrics and sewage works etc. to put in place but the idea will be put forward. The Council will look at including policies that encourage new development to include energy saving and eco-friendly technologies within their developments.

Q. What is planned for recreation?
A. This will need to be reviewed for each proposed development.
Employment Land

Would it be better to spread the employment buildings out or have them all together on one large site?

It was agreed that they should be built on suitable sites according to what they are and to spread them out across the Borough.

Summary

Everyone at the table agreed that infrastructure, in terms of roads and sewage lines were the biggest concerns as the group felt that they are already working to capacity and would not be able to take the stress from more houses being built.

Everyone agreed that the development of a complete new town/village, possibly an “eco-village” would be a better option and would like this option, “option 4” to be looked into and feedback given.
Core Strategy Revised Options workshop:  
Wentworth North Area Assembly  
Montgomery Hall, Wath – Wednesday 8 July 2009

Information to attend the workshop didn’t say it was open to the public – just representatives to attend.

Points raised by representatives:

Question was asked about Croda and its potential suitability for housing development. Planner - talked about suitability & safety – need to deal with the pollution effectively to make the area safe for housing.

Knocking houses down & passing the land onto builders, people have to move out and then buildings left empty. Why knock down housing stock & allow developers to build expensive housing? Why not just invest in improving the existing housing stock?

Consultation carried out but then no feedback given to people concerned.

Feedback is provided via the Area Assembly but not everyone attends these meetings.

Meetings don’t always allow people to get opinions over.

Should have a “do nothing” option so people who don’t want it can voice their opinion.

Wentworth Parish Council not had information about consultation. Planner replied the all Parish councils had been sent copies of the documents.

Letter dated 26th June – received last Thursday. Concern that insufficient time given to people to attend the workshop.

Has the consultation into the Core Strategy Revised Options been advertised in press? Planner said there was a statutory notice in the Advertiser and South Yorkshire Times. Should go in Weekender so more people can see it.

70% of time we don’t get to know in Wath until last minute that events like consultations are happening.

Councillors should be involved in meetings like this. It was suggested that councillors should be more pro-active and organise and lead public meetings to inform the community so that they get a better idea of local opinions.

At the Area Assembly on Monday the issue about getting to know things at the last minute & lack of councillor support will be raised.

Not much publicity on Unitary Development Plan (UDP) either when that was in progress.

Options:
Housing increases by 1,800 in this area for option 3. The possibility of hundreds of homes being established around Wath town centre and also, on the land between Doncaster Road and Swinton was discussed, there was a general feeling that the Dearne Valley suffers from a disproportionate amount of development because the residents are not as organised and articulate as other parts of Rotherham.

**Planner** – Pointed out that numbers are at the maximum that could be accommodated, not necessarily the amount that will be built.

Seen demise in coal industry – there will be a demise of steel industry. Bringing people to live in the Borough but they are going to have to go outside of the Borough for work: 30,000 people are going to be looking for employment. Need to build employment opportunities before we build houses.

Planner said we are looking for land for industrial development also. At mercy of private developers as council don’t really build business premises. At the moment there aren’t many industries looking to move.

When Cortonwood got enterprise zone KMP only set on packers, not top managers – not investing in local people for top jobs.

This area was to be boom area 3 years ago but apprenticeships in construction came to a halt due to the slow down of house building.

Spatial strategy management plans proposing to regenerate Dearne Valley and join part of it to Leeds.

**Planner** - The idea of the Dearne Valley being an eco-valley is being pursued.

Barnsley announced today that it is going to rebuild all 13 schools this will provide local construction jobs.

Are you going to encourage industry then house building?

**Planner** - The council needs to look at improving skills & qualifications to encourage industry to invest in the Borough.

The UK has allowed too many companies to be taken over by foreign enterprises.

Are projections for Wath/ Brampton Bierlow inclusive of development currently being constructed at the White Bear Estate? Planner responded that these new dwellings are included.

Highway infrastructure not sufficiently developed to serve Retail World just developed Retail World itself using existing road network.

Brampton Fire Station on Ellis Trust land. The old School is being developed for NHS Trust. Ellis House is listed.

**Swinton** – is anything proposed for Town Centre?
Path should be through to precinct from Temperance Street. Planner was requested to check details of any current proposals.

Rotherham Renaissance – surely this has an impact on housing to be built?

Renaissance Project – needs to be looked at from grass roots and done as one project. One plan – brought together with these housing plans/issues.

*Planner* - Funding is currently not available for Wath/Swinton town centres.

All Saints Square re-development – money thrown away in Rotherham town centre then roll over and spend again 7 years later. Gateways into Rotherham need money spending on them, Harley, Wentworth, Swinton, Wath.

Officers from Rotherham should go to central Government and ask for local communities to decide how town centres should be developed in the future and how money should be spent rather than setting council targets to meet perceived needs.

“There is great danger of going through this consultation process and a new Conservative government coming in at the national elections and everything being altered and having to go through it all again.”

Councils don’t build council houses anymore although the government is looking at whether to change this policy.

**Rotherham Town Centre**

Look at who comes into town centre and cater for their needs. Look at a successful town centre and bring these ideas into Rotherham.

Where is possibility of building Rotherham United football ground? This could determine transport needs.

*Planner* - New stadium will not be going into the town centre, but there may be opportunities on the edge of the town centre.

Turn the town centre into a Leisure Complex – Centertainment Centre at Rotherham. Bring jobs in from shops based around leisure and restaurants.

Get rid of town centre and start again.

Do different owners limit what can be done in town centre?

Retail World – anything happening on building of relief road to relieve congestion? Funding of a new scheme is an issue.

Is it possible Yorkshire Forward could use funding earmarked for Rotherham Renaissance and put it into steel industry?

As it has been small meeting, people have been able to put their points across, rather than if there were lots of people attending.
Introduction

The Local Development Framework (LDF) is a new style development plan which will replace the Unitary Development Plan. It is a folder of documents which will provide the framework for delivering the planning strategy for the Borough. The Core Strategy will outline the vision for the future of Rotherham. It will guide what development is needed, how much is required, where development should go and when it should happen.

Previous consultations were held with the Biodiversity Partnership on 12 February 2007 into the Core Strategy Preferred Options. This led to a hybrid option matching needs with opportunities and managing the environment as a key resource. It also looked at how this may be achieved through a number of draft policy directions.

The LDF takes account of regional and national planning requirements. New housing targets are in place from the Regional Spatial Strategy. This requires 23,880 homes to be built in the Borough between now and 2026. The Borough has also been awarded Growth Point status, requiring an additional 2197 houses to be built up to 2016/17. The LDF has to provide sufficient housing land to meet the housing requirement of 24,482 to 2026 (1361 a year) and around 300ha employment land is also required. Land will be released in phases and previously developed land will be released first.

Three options for the overall pattern of land release for housing and employment land are being proposed in the Core Strategy Revised Option Consultation.

- Option 1 Urban extensions and more Principal Towns
- Option 2 Development in public transport corridors
- Option 3 Dispersed development

Option 1: Urban Extensions and More Principal Towns

- This option focuses new development in the urban extensions at Bassingthorpe Farm (on the edge of Rotherham Urban Area, near to Wingfield and Greasborough), Waverley and an extension to the east of Dinnington, it includes Wath as a principal town. All possible sites, including those with major planning constraints) within these areas above are included. Development at all other settlements is limited to no or minor reservations and focused in existing communities.
- 23,900 homes would be provided: 61% on green field land, 34% on brown field land and 5% on a mix of brown and green field land.
- 221 hectares of employment land could be provided: 18% of employment land would be green field land, 68% would be brown field land and 14% would be a mix of brown and green field land.
- More land for employment uses is required to meet the target.
- It means taking 408 hectares of land from the Green Belt.
Option 2: Urban Extensions, More Principal Towns and Development in Public Transport Corridors

- This option takes Option 1 forward but now includes all development in those communities within main public transport corridors.
- The settlements of Swinton/ Kilnhurst and Wales/ Kiveton Park are served by existing train stations. Aston/ Aughton/ Swallownest could, in the future, be served by rail. Maltby is on a main bus public transport corridor between Rotherham and Doncaster. These communities above could provide 5609 new homes including all no, minor and major reservation sites. Within all other settlements new development is limited to no and minor reservation sites within the built up area.
- 30,175 homes could be provided: 67% on green field land, 29% on brown field land, and 4% on a mix of brown and green field land.
- 283 ha of employment land could be provided: 23% on green field land, 57% on brown field land and 19% on a mix of brown and green field land.
- There is a need to find more land for employment uses to meet the target.
- This Option looks at a number of sites that are within the Green Belt (in total 885 hectares of land) however not all of this land would be needed for development purposes.

Option 3: Dispersed Development

- Option 3 presents all potential development opportunities from sites surveyed to date. It has the greatest choice of sites to meet both employment and housing targets and this means that the more sensitive sites may not be needed.
- It suggests that development could take place in, or on the edge of, any of the Borough's settlements (other than the smaller villages) to meet the housing target. It makes no judgement on the future selection of any of these sites.
- New development can be looked at in, or on the edge of, the following communities:
  - Bramley/ Wickersley
  - Dinnington (two areas for major expansion to the east and to the west).
  - Thurcroft and Catcliffe/ Orgreave/ Treeton could also have more development.
- 34,000 dwellings could be provided: 70% on green field land, 26% on brown field land, and 4% on a mix of brown and green field land.
- 328 hectares of employment land could be provided: 34% on green field land, 50% on brown field land and 16% on a mix of brown and green field land.
- This option looks at a number of sites for development included in the Green Belt (in total 1,090 hectares of land) however not all of this land would be needed for development purposes.
- 1,068 houses would need to be built on the sites with the greatest planning constraints

General questions and statements were taken during the introduction as they arose:

Protection of sites

Where there is a population of protected species shouldn't these be protected? e.g. the muddies; ancient woodland on the eastern edge of Maltby

Housing target

How did the Government decide on these housing figures? The increasing housing requirement is a response the following factors: central government policy to spread
development from the over-heating south east, people living longer, increasing birth rate, changing household occupancy figures, in migration; housing to meet the planned growth in jobs.

**Have empty and vacant housing figures been included in the calculations to meet housing need?** The housing need target is provided to the local authority via the Regional Spatial Strategy

**Housing windfalls: are these sites included in the calculation?** Does the Council know where these are? Could windfalls lead to an over supply of housing land? Windfalls are unpredictable and it is difficult to plan for them. Windfalls are “counted” in the completion figures and do contribute to the housing need target.

**Phasing of site release**
The release of all sites in “one go” could jeopardise the countryside – CPRE very concerned and keen to see tight policies. Suggest phasing of sites/general “areas” for development beyond 15 years? Plan, monitor and manage the release of future sites for development.

**Cross Boundary working**
Regarding the expansion of Maltby which is on the boundary with Doncaster. How are cross border issues managed in planning? There is a need to take an overview of the sites beyond authority boundaries. A holistic view needs to be taken and planning should be undertaken co-operatively with local authority neighbours.

Also noted was Barnsley and Doncaster cross-boundary issues at the Dearne Valley.

**Allocation site working**
Where have the allocation sites come from? How have the most sensitive sites been identified? What is the criteria used to identify the most sensitive housing sites?

During late 2007 and 2008 Forward Planners looked for and assessed potential sites for new development. A number of sites have been suggested for development by prospective developers. These sites have been given an allocation number and entered into the LDF allocation data base. The survey and assessment of potential development sites has led to a portfolio of possible future development sites.

Planners have assessed the level of constraints on the site. Some sites have been automatically excluded from further work (for example all SSSIs). The constraints associated with a site have been assessed as no, minor or major constraints. Constraints are assessed using a wide range of indicators (e.g. access, infrastructure, flood zones, topography, other countryside designations etc). Land has been ranked as having no reservations, minor or major reservations for development. Planners have made a professional assessment of the site and looked at its potential future use for housing, business/employment, retail, greenbelt, or urban greenspace.

**Dinnington/Maltby/Silverwood Colliery sites – where these have been restored for Bio-diversity are they likely to be developed?** These particular sites do not have LDF allocations therefore future development is not likely on these sites.
What is the scope / extent of the proposed policies? How will sites be selected in the future? How will the site selection process be steered? Policies are currently being prepared by the Forward Planning Team.

Development in green belt villages – what consideration has been given to this issue?
A report has been prepared for the larger villages of Green Belt villages and this has been made available on the Council’s web site?

LDF Core Strategy Revised Options and allocation sites discussion

The Ecologist’s assessment work
The Council’s Ecologist presented the work she had done assessing the potential impact of allocating land for future development on identified Local Wildlife Sites (LWS). The Ecologist has looked at LWS adjacent to or within potential allocation sites. The LDF assessment of each site has been reviewed and comments provided on the potential impact of development on LWS. Sites were noted as red, amber or green (traffic light system) as follows:

Green – Where it is considered that the proposed allocation will have no negative impact on the LWS and that there is no immediate objection to the proposed allocation.

Amber – Where there is some query about the boundaries of the allocation and wildlife sites, which may require minor amendment to the allocation boundary and/or require provision of agreed buffer areas between the site boundaries.

Red – Where there is significant concern about the likely impact of the proposed allocation on the LWS and there is a request for significant amendment to the boundary or the proposed allocation.

Biodiversity Forum members were invited to endorse the Ecologist’s comments to give them extra weight, or to use the comments to support / prepare their individual comments.

Impact of the options on landscape and historic heritage: How are landscape and archaeology being considered in the options consultation? Rotherham does not have a Landscape Character Assessment, nor the resources to carry out a full assessment for the whole of the Borough. Currently, RMBC is commissioning a more limited landscape character assessment for the Local Development Framework. This will inform further assessment of possible land use allocations and Core Strategy policy on landscape protection. The Historic Landscape Characterisation already completed should be used to supplement any future landscape character assessments undertaken.

RMBC is reliant on South Yorkshire Archaeology Service’s input in considering the impact of the LDF options on the historic heritage of the borough.

Allocation site discussion - LDF 229 Safety Kleen site
Maps were shown of the various allocation sites associated with the three proposed Options for development in the Borough. Allocation site LDF 229 Safety Kleen site was discussed. There is developer interest in this site, which is a Local Wildlife Site (LWS), home to Pillwort. There is neutral grassland, wet woodland and wet grassland, there
are ponds and water borne interest on this site. There is substantive and high quality, bio-diversity interest on the site.

**Is there any potential development land on this site?** Sites that meet “set criteria” can be identified as worthy of protection; some sites may be able to “give up” some of the site for development without damage to the LWS interest but this is a delicate balance. The Forum were asked whether the site’s status could be maintained as a LWS if development is allowed on site or could this be enhanced through any future development on the site or nearby sites?

**The Biodiversity Forum needs to know the extent of the policies that are required to protect LWS and other sites of known ecological interest.**

**Discussion of LWS in the allocation process**
The Forum were asked if it is possible to rank LWS to guide planners in their future deliberations of potential development sites? The general feeling was that LWS's should not be ranked – as the “bottom” sites would be the most vulnerable and more readily given up for hard development in the future.

**Is there potential of partially developing a LWS - provided that the interest for which it was designated could be retained / enhanced?** This type of decision would be based on site-by-site discussions to establish what was possible (in terms of development and biodiversity) and how the site would be allocated? It was also thought that it is not appropriate to show any LWS as having development potential as this provides mixed messages and could undermine the whole system. There is a need to review the sites where there is (likely) conflict to make decisions about the sites in question rather than trying to generalise. This work will feed into the Biodiversity SPD as well as the LDF Policy work.

**Green Infrastructure Corridors**
The identification of Green Infrastructure Corridors should enable improvements to be achieved across the Borough. Bio-diversity policy shouldn't lose sight of the Green Infrastructure Policy. We shouldn't see LWS’s as islands – remote from each other – but seek opportunities to promote Green Infrastructure Corridors. The biodiversity policy needs to flow from Green Infrastructure policies.

**Discussion on the Muddies (LDF276)**
This site is of SSSI standard and is currently allocated for housing development in the UDP and could potentially be allocated for housing in the LDF. Great Crested Newts are prevalent. In the late 1970’s the land was scraped clear to enable further development but this didn’t happen. The site has regenerated since this time. It is a very wet site, with small pools on site. The water table is close to surface and is non-porous. It has a high bio-diversity value.

Forum members were invited to write in to RMBC regarding this allocation with reasons why it is not suitable for future housing development.

**Re-allocation of sites to Urban Greenspace or Green Belt.**
Sites currently allocated in the Unitary Development Plan for hard development are in a weaker position in terms of preventing future development for hard after-uses as there is a presumption of development of these sites. If sites are to be recommended to change their allocation to greenbelt or urban greenspace then consideration needs to be given
to funding the future management of the interest on the site. A strong case needs to be made to change this allocation as “hope” value is associated with the current (UDP) allocation of this land for housing development (ie assumptions will have already been made that the land is more readily developable and this may have been reflected in land values).

Discussion of Options 1-3 on the distribution of new housing and employment land in the borough
All three Options result in a loss of Green Belt land – particularly around Bassingthorpe Farm and Dinnington and to a lesser extent Rotherham urban area, Wath and Maltby.

Density policies are vitally important to reducing the amount of land taken for new development; low density development will mean that more Green Belt land will be taken to meet the housing and employment targets.

Developers need to continue to be encouraged to build at high density.

Hybrid option? What could this mean for the Borough?

**Why do we carry out surveys and provide data, evidence and comments when a LWS could still be developed?**  RDOS expressed disappointment that they have been asked to collect data to inform and support the selection of LWS sites but that the LWS’s may still be developed.

Assessment of the different options
Natural England favoured option 1 but suggested removing the most sensitive sites.  Option 3 makes large areas vulnerable to development.  Recommend allocation of sites for 10 years only.  Development should be undertaken in a phased way to ensure that the most sensitive sites are protected.  The most sensitive sites should not be allocated for future development.  (Further advice attached).

Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension case study
Bassingthorpe Farm is a parcel of Green Belt land close to Rotherham Town Centre, located between Greasbrough and Rawmarsh.  The urban extension has been proposed for 3632 houses and 22 hectares of employment land.  It is present in all three LDF options for the distribution of new housing and employment land.  It is suggested as a workshop case study to aid discussion of the future policy scope and design aspirations.

The Forum were very anxious generally about major Green Belt land releases and see a need to retain a Green Infrastructure Corridor throughout the development site.  The Bassingthorpe Farm Green Belt area acts as a major green lung.  Any future development should try to ensure that roads and highway infrastructure doesn’t “cut-off” permeability and doesn’t divide LWS and footpath links.  Consideration will also need to be given to hedgerows and streams throughout the area.  Green Corridors need to be a substantial and essential part of the design of any Bassingthorpe Farm development.  Also, ensure linkages are preserved to Green Corridor areas outside the Bassingthorpe area eg Hudson Rough.
The urban extension proposals are contrary to PPG2.
- Green Belts protect the coalescence of major developed areas.
- Provide visual separation between communities

The Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension area provides a green landscape setting for Rotherham Urban Area

Design suggestions included:
High density including public spaces v low density and private gardens
Need for ECO homes to be provided as a matter of course in the future LDF.

Is S106 funding likely to compensate for the loss of agricultural land, Green Belt, open countryside etc.? 

Urban fringe issues will be a major consideration if Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension is developed: off-road bikes, the impact of people and houses on local wildlife.

Workshop Summary

The workshop was part of wider number of workshops on Core Strategy Revised Options and the main points of the workshop will be fed into the consultation.

Information on specific allocation sites should be given to either the Council’s Ecologist or Forward Planning to inform the allocation work.

The maps showing the effect of the different Core Strategy Revised Options on the LWS can be viewed by contacting Forward Planning.

Individual consultation comments can been made using the online consultation system which was accessed from the Forward Planning website at www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning or in writing to be received by the end of August 2009 and sent to Forward Planning, Planning and Regeneration Services, EDS, Bailey House, Rotherham S60 1TD.

Next Steps are the Site Allocation Consultation in 2010 and further consultation on biodiversity policy work. Work has started on policy writing already.

Close

Additional supporting information received from Natural England after the Biodiversity Forum Workshop clarifying some of the discussion points raised

1. Wildlife (and geological conservation) sites fit within a hierarchy: Internationally Important > Nationally Important > Regionally Important > Locally Important. The first two parts of this are quite clear, with European sites (SPA/SAC) and SSSI. The Regional level is represented by Local Wildlife Sites' (which should include Regionally Important Geographic Sites (RIGs)). Refer to the DEFRA guidance for further clarity. The guidance clearly states that criteria for site selection should be set out, and that all sites meeting the criteria should be selected. Sites will vary in quality, however it is clear from this that a site selected has come up to a set standard and is therefore worthy of protection.
2. With regard to development on Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), this has to be assessed on a site-by-site, case-by-case basis. In selecting LWS in the first place all sites of substantive wildlife (or geological) value should be identified. The individual sites should include clear reasons why they meet the selection criteria. If a development can be undertaken in such a way that the wildlife value is not affected then there is no reason to object. Mitigation and compensation may present greater difficulties. The Guidance sets out that the point of the system is to conserve the substantive wildlife value of the area. It follows then that the loss of a site (or its interest) will result in a significant loss of biodiversity to the district. There should therefore be a clear presumption that such losses will not be permitted. However if a developer is able to show that any effects on the wildlife value will be appropriately mitigated, or losses compensated for, this would make it hard to object. A precautionary approach in this sort of situation is advocated, and the onus will be on the developer to show that the scheme will work. However, the Local Authority can always over-ride the protection of sites on the basis of 'over-riding public interest' or for public health and safety. If they do, though, the LA should show how they have given consideration to all the guidance and policy which supports these sites (PPS 9, Section 40 NERC Act, etc.).

3. One critical argument that is under-used in the protection of sites is the provision of alternative sites. If there is going to be damage to a site, and the damaging activity could be carried out elsewhere, then there is an obvious question as to why allow development on that site. In a lot of cases the site has been chosen because the developer has ownership or control of it, but in the case of a lot of development sites there is no over-riding need for the development to be located on that particular site.
Rother Valley West Area Assembly
Aston Parish Hall | 27.07.09

The RMBC planning officer introduced the purpose of the focus group and explained the Core Strategy Revised Options (CSRO) and the three options for possible future growth plus the baseline position.

Questions raised by the participants:
- Does today’s current economic downturn affect the target figures for housing numbers and employment land provision?
- When were targets in the CSRO produced?
- Aston/ Swallownest recent flooding of homes in this area but the extent of the flooded areas are not indicated in the flood plans. A lot of the proposed housing sites could be affected by future flooding. This is a problem as Aston and Swallownest are 300ft. above sea level.
- The ‘Wetherby Road’ estate is situated on clay and this slows down/ prevents drainage of the area.
- Concern that there no consultation with service providers such as the Environment agency has taken place prior to the consultation on the Core Strategy Revised Options.
- There are drainage concerns regarding old pit sites in the area.
- FAQ – ‘What about Flooding’? Concerned that this is not being taken seriously.
- Where are the maps showing levels of flooding across the Borough? Are the maps showing the flood zones publicly accessible via the Council’s map key?
- What will happen about sewage from the new sites? Where will it be dealt with? From 1 April 2011 water companies will be responsible for drainage and sewage.
- Waverley is in the Orgreave Parish – why is it called Waverley?
- Why are we not looking to utilise empty houses, both council and private, there is plenty of them? Why not fill these first even if council have to buy them?
- How is the maximum figure of 802 houses arrived at for the Aston, Aughton, Swallownest settlement grouping?
- Where are the people in the area to fill them?
- The Green Belt review is meaningless – if you want to take it (the Green Belt) you will.
- The CSRO process is a ‘red herring’ in the current economic climate, looks like Option 2 has already been chosen.
- Not inclined to opt for any option as that’s what will be chosen.
- What will the farmer think to the proposed site opposite the Wetherby (public house)?
- Aston, Aughton and Swallownest do not want another supermarket. We will fight any proposals to deliver one in this area.
- In 2007 and 2009, 200 houses were flooded on land taken out of the green belt.
- The Redmires site on Mansfield Road estate has flooding issues; why are the drainage issues not resolved before development is undertaken?
- By building on these sites it will make an already bad situation much worse.
Design guide – drainage problems are not helped by the high number of houses with patios and paved drives and if even more houses are to be built it will only compound the situation.

New housing sites will not be successful until prices are affordable.

**Employment Strategy**

- Laycast site – a scoping opinion has been sought from the council but the applicant is proposing to undertake local consultation on their proposals.
- Are windfall sites to be used to offset current target requirements?
- Is the railway station an option? When the YES project is up and running, the transport situation will be horrendous around here.
- Housing and factories side by side did not work in the ‘old days’ so what makes you think they will work today.
- Rapid Transport System makes sense if rail lines are close to employment sites.
- Public transport gets worse the further out of town you get so unless you have a cheap transport system public transport will not work.

**Other Issues**

- If growth in population continues then more amenities and medical centres will be required – not reduced. This is what is currently happening in Swallownest.
- Renewable energy must be a priority.
- Wind turbines are a result of money by corruption - £20,000 is paid to landowner per turbine.
- We must object to wind turbines – they should be situated out at sea.
- We should be pushing for more solar energy – it’s the way to go.

**Town Centre**

- How will Tesco’s new store impact on the other shops in the town centre?
- Are offices and properties to be opened up to front of the riverside?
- The modern generation move out of town so more cars are required
- Until we get good shops back in the town centre no one will go.
- Leeds, Doncaster and Barnsley have all benefited from good shopping centres
- Even if town centre shops and restaurants are developed, if people are out of work and there is high unemployment they will not be able to afford to use them.
- RMBC’s web site is not user friendly
- Who is responsible for accepting ‘growth point’?
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## Workshop 1

### Question 1 - What do you like / dislike about your area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laughton Common</td>
<td>Residents, Bus Services</td>
<td>Not enough shops, No say in planning future, In future want our own Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The people, Community links, Transport (Accessibility), Green spaces, Environment, Access to shops &amp; doctors</td>
<td>Anti social behaviour, Traffic pollution, Vandalism, Lack of activities for young people (11 – 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawmarsh</td>
<td>Mowbray Gardens Library</td>
<td>Drugs, Untidy, Kids upsetting elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New swimming facilities being built, Council office and health centres, More shopping areas and improvements to those we have</td>
<td>Bad roads and road safety, Council need to listen to people without turning a deaf ear or forcing things onto the people of Rotherham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dene</td>
<td>Good for transport and health centres</td>
<td>Drug, Untidy, Kids upsetting elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltby</td>
<td>Valley Park – good for families, Can’t park all over, double yellow lines.</td>
<td>Too much traffic, Noisy neighbours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group were given a broad overview of the core strategy proposals, housing numbers and the possible positions of new industry and asked for their reactions to the revised options.

1. **Laughton Common Resident**

   “Dinnington has become a town and with more houses Laughton Common will become part of this. If these houses are built Laughton Common will become a town and cease to be a village”

   “Laughton Common is in a state, a right mess. Everybody is aware of this. We now have problems with flooding. Who will pay for flood protection when the problem gets worse?”

   “I don’t like to stop progress but are they saying these figures to try and make Dinnington bigger?”

2. **Rawmarsh Resident**
“This is presented as a wedge of land which will be taken out. We don’t want to be a part of any urban sprawl, we want individual communities”

“We also don’t want people saturation or problems with flooding”

“In one part you talk protecting the environment but all these new houses and people will bring lots more cars”.

Council Officer – Car movements will be taken into account when the option is chosen.

3. East Dene Resident

No comments about the proposals in this area.

4. Rawmarsh Resident

No comments about the proposals in this area.

5. Maltby Resident

“How many of these new houses will be council houses or affordable?”

“Everybody knows that we need housing badly. People need to learn lessons and get these houses built. Forget people saying don’t build in my back yard”

“When we plan these houses we should make sure that a certain number are council houses or affordable”

Council Officer – We don’t decide the affordable figure just yet but it will be decided in the future. The affordable housing is provided through Housing Associations and this is a matter of national policy.

6. Flanderwell / Wickersley Resident

“Bramley is the main focus rather than Wickersley so the option doesn’t concern me”

7. Herringthorpe Resident

“They are closing the laundry down, there are plans to close the pub down next door and there’s lots of space for development at the Burberry factory. Why can’t this be used as a place for housing?”

Council Officer – it will be used for redevelopment but if it is employment land it may well remain this way.

“Is anything going to happen on the playing fields? Surely this is common land which can’t be built on?”

Council Officer – We are not looking at this as a housing site. There is not much available building land in this already built up area!
**Question 2 - Where would you put the 24,482 houses if it was up to you?**

**Maltby Resident** – “Build them in Maltby. There’s a housing list, people need houses, build them in Maltby. I wouldn’t lose sleep if Maltby grew by 25% overnight. But we would need to look at the roads in and out because at the moment there are growing problems”.

**Laughton Common Resident** – “I would feel that if the development grew out of Dinnington and not towards Laughton Common then any option would be fine. I’m not against the future but we must first consider transport and how people are getting to these houses”.

**Rawmarsh Resident** – “People are worried about overloading of the transport systems”.

**Question 3 – Strategic Employment Locations: Should we look to disperse locations or look at five specific sites?**

**Rawmarsh Resident** – “What types of industry will be brought into these locations?”

**Council Officer** – We would look at light industry in Bassingthorpe.

**Maltby Resident** – “Lots of collieries closed down, but would be very useful for light industry”
Workshop 2

Question 1 - What do you like / dislike about your area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masbrough</td>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>Lack of Local Shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Anti Social Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dene</td>
<td>Number of elderly people</td>
<td>Anti Social behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs not done as Streetpride cut own grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aughton</td>
<td>Quiet</td>
<td>Little provision for youths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little crime</td>
<td>No Entertainment – only two pubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>No cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickersley / Flanderwell</td>
<td>Health provision</td>
<td>More flats and houses for single and disabled needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinnington</td>
<td>Is a town</td>
<td>Anti Social behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Close to countryside</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shops, restaurants and take-aways</td>
<td>Variety of shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwood</td>
<td>Modernish</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td>Litter and waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young people</td>
<td>River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group are given a broad overview of the core strategy proposals, housing numbers and the possible positions of new industry and asked for their reactions to the revised options.

1. **Masbrough Resident**

“I’m very unhappy. We have lost a lot of green land between Masbrough and Greasbrough and we don’t want to let the last bit go”.

“I reserve judgement on which housing option [I would choose]. If some houses had to be built, there are certain areas where it would be acceptable. There are two little cottages between Masbrough and Greasbrough which could be developed but the proposals here destroy the whole wedge of green between the two”.

“We need recreation space in Masbrough like that in Eastwood”.

**Council Officer** – You would only need a quarter of the green wedge to develop 3000 houses rather than the whole wedge like a lot of residents think. Something positive, which could come out of development in Masbrough, is money for recreation space.

2. **Aughton Resident**
“The numbers mentioned in the core strategy would not affect Aughton, more Aston, apart from transport. It is already quite hairy getting on the road from Aston right through to Rotherham”

“No real worries about the proposals apart from drainage, we don’t want to make this a flood risk area. In these proposals, how much concern is placed on flood level?”

**Council Officer** – Flood risk is a very important factor in deciding an area’s suitability for housing. We would definitely avoid developing housing in flood risk zones 2 & 3.

3. **Wickersley Resident**

“Why not build the houses in Flanderwell where people want to live?”

“Concerned that option three is a big area of countryside. Even with affordable housing these would not be as cheap as council housing so young people or the unemployed would not benefit.”

“Will the new houses be a mixture of Registered Social Landlords and private?”

**Council Officer** – Obviously schemes from previous governments have led to a position where there is limited council housing, so now Housing Associations are the main way to provide affordable housing and on a development of this sort around 25% of the housing will be affordable but that figure could go up or down.

4. **Dinnington Resident**

“The maps aren’t clear about where the houses will be”.

“It says Dinnington on the document but it involves all these other areas, about four. So people in Laughton Common may not know that development may be in their back garden. It should be clearer”.

“Yes growth in the area could be good but as everyone says, it needs to be affordable”.

“Options two and three would mean quite a lot of new housing; transport would have to be improved”

“There are lots of pathways in the area which link the villages and we’d like to keep this. Are you bound to keep the pathways if houses are built? It always seems to be the person in the car who is given priority”.

**Council Officer** – We would always want to keep public rights of way in the same place. It might not be clear but people on foot are top of the hierarchy on who should be given priority.

5. **Eastwood Resident**

“It’s different here as there is no land to develop”.
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**Question 2 - Where would you put the 24,482 houses if it was up to you?**

Everyone in agreement – “Spread the development across the region and relate the spread to where people need and people want to live”

**Question 3 – Strategic Employment Locations: Should we look to disperse locations or look at five specific sites?**

Eastwood Resident – “The places in Dinnington already have good transport links but would new development be on the other side of town? If they made public transport between industrial and housing, that would be better”.

“Why is Bassingthorpe Farm on all of the options?”

Council Officer – The baseline didn’t have it on but we feel the need to have an urban extension. We know its open countryside but we have avoided all bio-diverse areas and woodland area. This is the place for an urban extension but there are choices in there about the options available.

Masbrough Resident – “On the jobs front we would want manufacturing industry if we could get it. There are so many empty spaces on the enterprise zone. Nothing has ever replaced coal and steel”

“Six weeks is by no means long enough consultation for a borough wide plan, it is not enough”.


Policy Objectives Workshop Comments

Scale of Development
- There should be a policy of filling vacant property first
- Prioritise brown-field sites with a sequential approach to releasing land for development.
- Information isn’t easily available
- Consultation too short. Not enough publicity.

Green Belt Land
- New policies need to be justified in terms of old policies and how they have worked or failed.
- Don’t be hard and fast with green belt policy. Promote building on scraggy green belt land near existing built up areas.
- Villages should be more distinct with distinct boundaries and responsibilities.
- Green belt policies should be very long term policies.

Transport, Infrastructure and Sustainability
- Need very strict policy on sewerage and drainage.
- Planning permission was given to local developments that have been flooded recently.
- Council tax goes towards Supertram but Rotherham doesn’t receive benefit.
- Old trams were good and tracks can be found under existing main roads.
- Can’t have enough public transport.
- Transport infrastructure needs to be put in place before development e.g. bus lanes and routes.

Retail and Service Centres
- Promote existing centres or sites.
- Develop existing town centre and encourage big brand name shops.
- Encourage more public transport to town centre.
- Enough out-of-town shopping already.
- Go back to having the market south of the town centre.
- Affordable rates to encourage local business.
- Regenerate existing centre.

Heritage
- Policy on conservation and sympathetic development needs to be strict.
- Rotherham has a very poor record that needs amending.

Design
- Needs to be in-keeping.
- Promote history and heritage.
- Retain facades at least.

Housing Mix & Affordability
- Affordability quotas are a good idea.
- Unemployment at near 10% so we need more social housing.
- Definitely need a balance and a mix everywhere.
• Future proofing should include 2+ bedrooms houses. 1 bed dwellings won’t sell and will detract from the area.
• Bungalows for ageing population.
• Housing for life a good idea.

**Employment**
• Agree with policy.
• Concentrate on Eastwood Trading Estate, old transport sheds, Rotherham Road at Maltby and the brick yard at Maltby.
• Attract employers and employees with an attractive town.

**Infrastructure Connections**
• GPs local surgeries, not larger clinics.
• Extra schools.
• More choice/competition in public transport.
• Extra provision of buses for the developments. Feeder buses.
• More connectivity with other services e.g. trains.
• We want things back to how they used to run before privatisation.
• Bus conductors, punctuality and cost will make more of a difference than more bus services.
• More facilities for disabled parking.
• Private business should pay for the parking costs it creates.

**Green Space**
• Short of 43 football pitches for local clubs.
• More consultation with local clubs needed.
• Compensation for loss of local green space.
• Localised amenities to encourage defensible space and regular use.

**Well Being**
• Localised green space will reduce obesity.
• Local areas however, perceived to be too dangerous to go out.

**Biodiversity**
• Don’t encroach on local wildlife.
• Vegetation should be cut and looked after in the way the locals want.

**Minerals Disposal**
• Fill old mines to help reduce subsidence.
• Try to sustain limestone quarry as a precious local resource.

**Domestic Waste**
• Council needs to recycle more, especially plastic.
• Waste collection is like a postcode lottery. Some places get paper collection, some don’t. We just want fairness.
• Recycling collection from upper floor flats supposedly held back by health and safety lifting and carrying rules.
• More needs to be done to make businesses recycle to promote recycling in general.
• More convenient bins for recycling.
Town Centre Proposals

- Option C already seems to be happening.
- Don’t allow centre to contract.
- Keep Parkgate separate.
- Concentrate on town centre development to encourage brand name shops, pubs, restaurants, nightlife, and offices, mix of a variety of uses.
- Current transport service is disjointed meaning you have to get an extra bus to civic centre or Parkgate retail.
- Encourage proper bus routes.
- Parkgate discriminates against people on public transport.
- Car parking policy for centre needs totally reworking.
- ALL IN FAVOUR OF OPTION B. Option A also has good points.
- All Saints centre needs developing.
- EXTEND NORTH INTO CIVIC CENTRE.
- 2 way traffic schemes encourage window shopping and more circulation in general.
- Shopping centre has to be concentrated as many people can’t walk that far.
- Rents too expensive in town centre.
- Big business has tax loophole encouraging it to move its business to new pastures regularly.
- Don’t bother with transport between the town centre and Parkgate. Area has to be walk-able.
- WE WANT GONDALAS ON THE RIVERS. Fantastic!
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YORKSHIRE PLANNING AID
Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA) is part of a network of services run by the Royal Town Planning Institute, a registered charity. YPA offers free, independent and professional planning advice to community groups and individuals who cannot afford to pay professional fees.

YPA also helps people to understand and engage with the planning system. This support can be provided through workshops, information sessions, or formal training events, all of which are all tailored to the needs of the group.

The work undertaken by YPA is not part of central or local government but is an independent source of advice and information which complements the assistance given by local councils.

INTRODUCTION
Rotherham Core Strategy Revised Preferred Options is part of the new plan for the Borough, setting out how the Borough could develop up to 2026. Rotherham needs to provide 24,482 new homes by this date and between 250ha to 300ha of employment land, as the population of Rotherham is expected to grow by 30,000 from 253,000 to 283,000 by 2026.

The main issues in the plan are:

1) Spatial Options for housing and employment
2) Options for growth for Rotherham Town Centre &
3) Policy Areas

FORMAT OF SESSION
The consultation event was split into 2 sessions, a morning and lunchtime session and an early evening session. This was to capture both women and men from the local community. The sessions were split into 3 workshops including an introductory discussion finding out where people are from, what experience of planning they have and any issues they wanted to raise.

Workshop 1 covered the spatial options, workshop 2 looked at the town centre options and workshop 3 covered the Council’s policy areas and objectives. A copy of the session plan and the 3 workshops are available in the appendix material. In the first session there were four groups and in the afternoon, attendees worked in 2 larger groups. The morning session involved facilitators moving around the groups.
Notes from the Consultation Workshops  
Unity Centre, Rotherham  
29th July 2009 – Session 1  

Red Group  

Issues:  
No issues or experience of planning stated.  

Workshop 1 – Spatial Options for housing and employment  
Part 1 – Discussion on housing and jobs  

Where are people from and does your area need more houses?  
**East Dene** – needs better houses.  
**Broom / Moorgate** – No more houses needed here. Good quality housing. Not enough for young people to do. Village green might be built on.  
**Masborough** – Need new houses, has older housing at present.  
**Kimberworth Park** – need more houses, large family homes (4+ beds). It is a quiet area and people want to move here.  
**Clifton** – needs new houses, mix of size and type  

Jobs  
There used to be plenty of jobs.  
Lack of employment – across Rotherham.  

Do you want to stay in the area?  
Don’t know what the future will bring  
Clifton – problems with litter, run down appearance, need environment / pollution education.  
Eastwood – has gone downhill, litter problems.  

What jobs are needed?  
Moving area from traditional industry  
Need to keep moving with the times  
Provide opportunities for young people  

Part 2 - Spatial Options  
Baseline –  
Agree it should not be pursued if it does not meet the targets.  

Option 1 –  
Not an option if it involves developing the Green Belt.  
Look at old industrial sites  
Cycle lanes are not safe; council does not consult cycle clubs for where they are needed. Not promoted at Schools.  
Concerns about local infrastructure.  

Option 2 –  
Dearne Valley, convert empty premises (i.e. call centres) to other uses such as housing.  
Wath area could cope with more developments.
Option 3 -
Bramley – Has had development already, new development may reduce property prices.
Dinnington – Would benefit from more development.

Workshop 2 - Town Centre Options

Discussion of Town Centre
Council have ripped the heart out of the town centre.
Car parking costs are high; this is a factor in where people decide to go shopping.
More charity shops than ‘real’ shops in shopping centres.
Support needed for struggling businesses.
Town Centre used for festivals once or twice a year.
Difficult cooperation between partners, attract visitors to town centre through festivals.
Festivals have a knock on effect to other aspects of the town centre, parking problems.
Public transport is not widely used.
Poor provision for cycling, perceived as dangerous, need to consult cycle clubs.
Safer routes needed for cycling – look to Europe!
Centre used for shopping, Tesco for weekly shop.
Used to use market, but not anymore.

No use improving the town centre without attractive parking provision.
Need greater variety of shops.

Discussion of Options
Option A –
Option A is the way forward, all group agreed.

Option B –
Expansion is a good idea, possible space for parking.
Parking should be an incentive to go to the town centre, 2 hours free parking would
Rejuvenate the town centre.
Profit made from parking should be reinvested in the town centre.

Option C –
Lose town centre
Chaotic transport at the Parkgate centre, this option will make it worse.

Additional Information –
- Need to see action from consultation!!!
- Facilities for children as well as general population
- Need for cinema
- Good idea to have people living in the centre – affordable and green.
- Potential for student accommodation (Sheffield)
- Transport links need to be improved, help Rotherham town centre.
- Use green energy and solar energy in town centre.
- Free fitness areas to tackle health problems (Small Park with free machines).

Preferred Option -
A: 0
B: 6
C: 0
Workshop 3 – Policy Areas

Where should new homes & jobs go?
- Revitalise run down, previously industrial land.
- Some areas are a real eye-sore, gateway to town.
- No development of Green Belt – 1 vote.
- Areas near Magna suited for industrial.
- Look at existing buildings for new housing – 3 votes
- Use as little Green Belt as possible. Protect attractive surrounding land, exhaust all other options, town centre should be denser.
- Dislike new houses, no character in a box.
- No distinctiveness, hamster cages.
- High quality design is important.
- Town centre, high possible student accommodation.
- Recruit people from bad areas for jobs. Tackle problems – 3 votes.
- Improve partnership and apprenticeships for future population skills.
- Wardens to patrol neighbourhoods, presence – 1 vote
- More youth facilities - have a say in developing their own town – 2 votes.
- Construction jobs for the short term.
- Long term jobs, relate to IT.

The Environment (Waste & Energy)
- Renewable energy – 2 votes
- Green uses of energy
- Recycling made widely available – 1 vote
- Solar panels / wind energy
- Develop a safe environment
Blue Group

Issues:
Town Centre is boring
Out of town shopping
No play centre for the youth
Should be quick in dealing with issues (development)
Safety at bus stops, racial abuse
The town centre has good health drop in centre.

Workshop 1 – Spatial Options for housing and employment
Part 1 – Discussion on housing and jobs

Housing
Overcrowded housing by 2/3 families.
Long waiting lists, need more housing available locally.
Need larger homes, prefer smaller rooms rather than 1 large room.
Cultural issues – men/women often talk in separate rooms
Like working class houses with front rooms.
Number of toilets in houses is important.
Traditional Asian communities are tight knit
Some Asians prefer to buy, will live in Council houses with the right to buy scheme.

Jobs
Go into professional jobs if possible (IT/ Accountancy, etc)
Also many work in care homes, social services.
People are very keen to work.
Need for more jobs for women not just low grade jobs because of poor English.
Possible social enterprise providing employment (RMBC officers are working on this?)
Women are very busy at home with domestic duties but would love to work if possible.
Ageing population – more care workers some of whom speak different languages.

Part 2 - Spatial Options
A minority of Asians live outside their community areas.
those with aspirations will move, it is changing over time.
Children more ready to move to other areas as they secure professional jobs.
Taxi jobs now less popular, £4000 for licence for taxi driver.
People now going for agricultural jobs in Doncaster, low paid.
Diversity of jobs is increasing especially amongst young Asians.
Previously doctors / accountants were the aspirations, now will consider
apprenticeships.
Schools – standards are ok but there can be issues, making examples of naughty
behaviour can encourage others children to do the same.
Traditional Asian Communities not keen on living on edge of towns.
Would want a mix of communities including those in existing urban areas.
If rural sites are chosen, better public transport is essential and other key facilities like
shops/ schools are required.
Workshop 2 – Town Centre Options

Bad: -
Dirty town centre
Short on shops
Not user friendly
Transport is not frequent
No BME shops in the town centre
Lighting needed in parks / streets.

Good: -
Shops are close together for everybody
Easy movement within town
Some street improvement nice, pavement and trees
Management of spaces generally good.

Option C – link between town centre and Parkgate shopping centre with free bus.

Other comments -
Important that Asian / Pakistani communities engage in this consultation but need to see positive outcomes if they do take part; e.g. park / open spaces, need for them to refer to successful examples in Rotherham, for example BME communities involved in creation of open space at Hollowgate.

Need for small local open spaces with seats and open space, like pocket parks.
Sometimes conflict of cultures, e.g. dogs in parks should not be allowed.
Green Group

Issues/Experiences of Planning:
Involved in earlier consultation process
Worked with Council organising events.
Mainly positive, developing cultural events.
Diverse community events
Experience of Rotherham Renaissance, ok process. Limited feedback from Council.
Positives and negatives. No follow up session.
Consultation was representative and information supplied at consultation was good.

Workshop 1 – Spatial Options for housing and employment
Part 1 – Discussion on housing and jobs

Where are people from?
Ferham Road
Eastwood x2
Clifton

Housing
- Need more homes in the future.
- More need in Eastwood, more homes to rent.
- More houses helps to build communities.
- Very difficult to find houses in Eastwood.
- In Clifton improvements to existing houses are needed. Need to bring empty houses into use.

Jobs
Job situation is worse than housing.
Not enough jobs in South Yorkshire.
Need for jobs for people with different skills/education levels.

Would you want to stop in your area?
Had to move to Barnsley, would want to move back to Rotherham.
Like living in Rotherham, but want more facilities.
More buses, trains are required but they are too expensive.

Part 2 - Spatial Options
Baseline –
Provide plenty of homes for the future.
Rotherham needs to grow and improve.

Option 1 –
Walking, cycling and recreation land are very important.
Option 2 –
Good for using public transport to access jobs
Prefer this to option 1.

Option 3 –
No comments.

Discussion on Town Centre
- Not used as much as should be.
- Does not cater for all ages
- Not enough attraction or appeal to 18 – 24 year olds!
- Activities have to be done in Doncaster and Sheffield.
- Lack of facilities.
- Not enough job opportunities.
- More investment and services to cater for everyone in Rotherham.
- Difficult to go to University, lack of higher education.
- Poor job provision.
- Shops close at 5pm; people do not have enough spending power.
- Facilities do not stay open late enough, compared to out of town centre shopping.
- No cinema
- Not enough jobs for young people coming out of education.
- Need for community facilities.
- Used for shopping.
- Anti – social behaviour and vandalism all through the day.
- Youth have a lack of respect.
- No toilet in the train station.
- Transport costs are too high, compared to Leeds.
- No direct rail connections to major cities.

Option A –
People like to see dramatic change, little attraction.
Good idea to keep the centre condensed, prefer option B.
Keep Rotherham the same = good. Don’t detract away from it.
No-one would want to buy a house in the city centre.
People want to move to the suburbs, away from centre.
Option A is not great.

Option B –
- Favourite option, development is still walkable.
- Good idea, new shopping areas, shorter travel distance from home, less money spent on transport.
- No Sunday Market, markets are good and cheap, option B should include a Sunday market.
- Rotherham is ethnically diverse; facilities such as gym are expensive.
- Easier to create jobs.
- Town should be centralised, not like option C.
Option C –
Like Sheffield City Centre.  
Town centre would suffer due to other development elsewhere.  
Restricting the centre size would force smaller shops out.  
Town centre may disappear.  
There are issues with parking provision.  

Additional comments: -
Good for people to live in the city centre, professionals affluent.  
In city centre sound proofing needs to be good.  
Development (flats) appeal to student population.  
Shops should be designer, street-wise and trendy.  

Preferred Options: -
A: 0  
B: 6  
C: 0  

Workshop 3 – Policy Areas

Protecting and Improving Your Places
• No train connections between Rotherham and Barnsley – All group voted for this.  
• Need for more regular train services, trains which run later, more frequent to Leeds.  
• Public transport is too expensive, difference in weekly prices between south and west Yorkshire – why?  
• Would like 1 ticket you can use on all services, instead of different ones for different bus companies – All group voted for this.  
• Rotherham Train station is dirty and smelly – All group voted for this.  
• Need better toilet facilities at train station, ones that public can use.  
• Bus station has good facilities.  
• Not enough services at the train station.  
• Need more leisure facilities in the town, cinema, and function rooms. Have to go to Sheffield for many things.  
• Need more shops.  
• Other places provide facilities/ activities for asylum seekers but Rotherham doesn’t have any.  
• Need more car parks.  
• More houses needed with driveways.  
• No outdoor areas for recreation (especially at Eastwood) – All group voted for this.  
• Education, daytrips and holidays should be available for over 18’s as well as under 18’s.
Orange Group

Issues:
- Broom Valley Road, if housing site what will happen to the open field?
- Reaction from some neighbours, ‘racist’ in some areas.
- Council house with former tenant’s partner still living there – why? Parks his car opposite our drive.
- Park nearby – no proper fencing, drug problems. People throwing stones and rubbish into residents gardens.
- Mini park in Wellgate – problem with bins being set on fire. Need fencing to park boundary.
- Near Wybourn Grove – little alleyway, needs gating off as before.
- Problems as low response from RMBC and police.
- Council tenants cause problems in areas.
- Problems regarding funerals and the space to show respect.

Workshop 1 – Spatial Options for housing and employment
Part 1 – Discussion on housing and jobs

Jobs
Issue – no jobs locally in Rotherham look towards Leeds, Sheffield and Huddersfield for work.
Some people have found jobs through call centre (Ventura)

Housing
Need larger houses
Waiting lists – need to be on it for 10 years. Long waiting list in Broom Area.
1 person has sold house to RMBC but has found another house and is happy there.
Want to live in community with other members of Asian Community so kids can play together.
1 person has been on housing waiting list for 7 years.

Where do you want to live?
Rotherham – several have lived in Rotherham for many years. 1 Lady moved from Germany 4 years ago.

Shopping – An Asian supermarket (Halal food) opened 3 years ago in Rotherham, but many have to go to Sheffield to shop.
Tesco in Rotherham now selling Asian food.
Clothes are bought out of town, Bradford and Sheffield, etc.
Asian shop in Eastwood closed after short time.
Could an Asian clothes shop be set up in Rotherham? Would need finance to do that.

What jobs do you and your families do?
Retail jobs in Meadowhall.

What community facilities are needed?
Community venue for weddings and funerals, isn’t one locally, have to go to Sheffield, etc.

Workshop 2 – Town Centre Options
Town Centre is boring, dead.
Lack of shops.
Good shops moved out of town centre to Parkgate.
Town centre is not safe.
The Town Centre is close to some homes which is good.
Free car park is good.
Need the following: -
Ladies Gym
Play centre for youth, sports. Maybe a community centre.
City centre needs to be clean (street cleaning).
Poor state of repair of pavements.
Need disabled access around shops.
Market, is used by BME communities.
Free toilets in town.
BME Community Centre.

Option A – Not sure how it will work?
Option B – Closeness to homes, walk to town.
Options C – Good, if free buses.

For all options need CCTV and lighting.

Workshop 3 – Policy Areas

Where should new homes & jobs go?
Jobs in town centre – 4 votes.
Hollowgate for new homes, green space
Improve roads, pavements and buses
Bigger houses in the countryside
Educate the public on issues

Protecting and Improving Your Places
- Transport providers needs to improve customer care – 3 votes
- Safer streets – problems with drugs and noise – 5 votes
- Dirty streets – need cleaning
- Racial abuse – needs addressing – 1 vote

The Environment (Waste & Energy)
- Lights off when not in use
- Recycle
- More regular collections for bins – 9 votes.
Notes from the Consultation Workshops  
Unity Centre, Rotherham  
29th July 2009 – Session 2

Group 1

Issues/Experience of Planning:  
Recognition of Renaissance work.  
Some housing and leisure consultation experience.

Workshop 1 – Spatial Options for housing and employment  
Part 1 – Discussion on housing and jobs

Where are people from?  
Broom x3 – a lot of people are coming into the area, need more housing and community facilities, they are non existent.  
There is area where leisure centre was which could be used to build on. Save play areas.  
Some feel there is no room to build new houses in the area.  
Alma Road – new buildings  
Affordable housing needed in city centre not luxury apartments.  
Broom Valley – No need for new housing. People are moving out of the city centre.  
Clifton x2 – no space to build new houses, where build them? Green spaces should be retained, existing houses improved, support council tenants to get grants to stop houses being cold.  
Young persons view is that need more new houses in Broom.  
Eastwood – No more houses, more local facilities needed.

Housing  
• Housing is needed, different sectors of community say different things, and predominant view is that more houses are needed.

Jobs  
• Not many jobs in Rotherham.  
• People getting trained but no jobs available after training.  
• Money is spent on people getting qualifications but no action.  
• 800 out of work targeted scheme – not single person employed from it.  
• Time spent on projects but no jobs.  
• People are prepared to travel for jobs.  
• Need companies to offer training which lead to jobs.  
• Need sites to encourage bigger businesses to come into Rotherham.  
• Location of jobs depends on type of jobs, providing community facilities will provide jobs near where people live.  
• Factories should not be near houses.

Part 2 – Spatial Options  
Baseline-  
People in Dinnington would benefit from new houses, Council is right to discount baseline.
Younger generation are moving out.

**Option A** –
No comments.

**Option B** -
Public transport needed.
Good idea along transport corridors.
No job so can’t afford a car so reason why public transport needed.
Using Bassingthrope Farm is ok as long as it is sustainable.

**Option 3** –
People live in car ownership world so would suit this.

**Comments**

For all options, can not just provide new houses, need community facilities. Need safe, crime free areas.
70% of Rotherham is rural so some sensitive sites will be needed.

**Workshop 2 – Town Centre Options**

- Quality of shops is going down.
- Big retailers have left as people don’t shop there.
- The market is important to the town centre.
- Town centre needs to be more accessible, variety of shops.
- Idea – reduced rates for independent retailers.
- Nice area – fountain in All Saints Square and Minster.
- Disapproval for town centre housing / living.
- Employment is very important.
- Looking for character?
- Need facilities for children.
- Approval of independent niche shops.

**Option A** –
- Keep as is – no need to spend more.
- Would slowly kill town centre.

**Comments**

- How to access Meadowhall – extending transport services.
- Trams are easier than bus/train.
- Friendlier / more accessible transport
- More all day free parking than just 2 hours free.
- Community Centre for BME community needed, hall, weddings, receptions.
- More cultural places are needed.
- Feeling of lack of action for town centre by council.
- Support for new parking in town centre.
Option B –
Group approved this option.

Preferred Options
Option A = 1
Option B = 7.5
Option C = 1

Idea to include expansion / connection to west in Option B.

Workshop 3 – Policy Areas
• Flood protection – 2 votes
• Improved cycling routes (safer)
• Crime reduction – 2 votes
• Good facilities / amenities – 3 votes
• Manufacturing industry
• Building in renewable energy infrastructure
• Protecting the Environment
• Small loss of Green Belt if needed
• Parking facilities – 1 vote
• Good design – 3 votes
• Affordable housing – 4 votes
• Recycling facilities – 1 vote
Group 2

Issues with Rotherham:
- Buildings popping up, not meeting needs, many empty or to let (town centre / outside)
- Rotherham stadium not yet built.
- Lack of information from Planning Department.
- What benefits could there be to wider community from Rotherham football development?
- RCAT have changed minds on their plans but no money for their plans.
- Parking problems.
- Meeting venue for death / marriages needed.
- Asian community feels left out in Rotherham (no 1 thing to change).
- Need women only leisure facility / sessions, council reluctant to provide.
- Problem with blinds at the swimming pool.
- Closed Oakwood swimming pool, less access to facilities now.
- How many more meetings on this?
- St Ann's facility not flexible.
- Loss of women only session at swimming pool.
- Want 1 community facility to be shared with other communities, Tinsley centre is good.
- Eastwood centre is too small; over 500 people attend weddings and funerals.
- Want a female gym like Body Tech.
- Town centre has lost jobs.
- Buildings for life.
- The one stop shop for Council services is good.
- BME community need to be clean for prayer.

Workshop 1 – Spatial Options for housing and employment
Part 1 – Discussion on housing and jobs

Housing
- Extended families look after older relatives but this varies.
- Need for Asian residential home.
- There are no special care homes for BME in future.
- Taboo to have family in care.
- Homes to respond to the needs of BME communities but not exclusive.
- However different communities have different needs, access to Halal meat, etc.
- Children would ideally come back home but depends on employment.
- Disability needs.
- Would like to live near family in Rotherham.
- 20 minutes ok to commute to parents.
- Community could move if encouraged, by word of mouth.
- Site visits are helpful to areas of new housing, financial incentives too.
- Wickersley, good, sustainable, village feel with shops.
- Supportive of new housing near Rotherham town centre.
- Should have a mosque in new housing development.
- Don’t build a community without a soul.
- Need building for spiritual needs.
Jobs
• Attitude to having university education is ok now.
• Need for professional BME jobs e.g. Medicine in Rotherham.
• Professionals may live in principal towns but work away.

Part 2 – Spatial Options
• No comments

Workshop 2 – Town Centre Options
• All visit town centre.
• But M & S shut down.
• Need to go to Meadowhall for shopping.
• Like shopping undercover and all refreshments there.
• Not a lot going for the town centre.
• Can walk to town.
• Market is very good (contained, better than Sheffield).
• Fresh fish only 1 stall.
• Cannon Mills is very good at Bradford. Sells everything. All inside. Open Saturday, Sunday and Tuesday.
• Need transport to go through but some people won’t go to Bradford for fear of reading timetable wrong so go to Rotherham instead.
• Ackbars too far out.
• Nothing in the town centre.
• Town centre caters for English taste in food.
• No where for youth to go.
• Clifton Park is fantastic and central.

Option A —
• Status Quo. Keeping it as it is.
• Use B & Q site for community facility?
• Clustering of independent shop opportunity.

Option B —
• Is alright as well.
• Positive effect to expand town centre.
• More space for shops.
• Ok if bigger better shops in Rotherham, would use Rotherham instead of Meadowhall.
• Rotherham needs facelift, new shops.
• Public realm needs to be improved, something more colourful not crass.
• Needs more character.
• Internet cafe needed in town centre.
• Specialised courses to use cheap accommodation opportunity but nothing to do here.
• Need something to attract students.
• Ethnic communities need funding to open shops in Rotherham.
• Body Tech was used by many Asian women.

Option C-
• Don’t make the town centre smaller
• Like having everything all under one roof.

Other comments –
• Importance of students for vitality.
• Don’t like idea of Rotherham having less shops and more leisure.
• St Ann’s caters for younger boys.

Preferred Option-
• Most preferred a mixture of options B and C.

Workshop 3 – Policy Areas
• Scale of future growth – 5 votes.
• Green Belt – 4 votes.
• Sustainable locations - 1 vote
• Retail and service centres – 3 votes
• Design – 2 votes.
• Provision for housing – 1 vote.
• Provision for employment – 1 vote
• Greenspaces, sport and recreation – 4 votes.
• Community well being = 1 vote.
• Biodiversity – 1 vote.
• Minerals – 1 vote.
• Waste management = 3 votes.
• Managing water environment – 1 vote.
• Infrastructure delivery – 6 votes
APPENDIX MATERIAL

1. Publicity Material
2. Consultation Workshop
3. Data monitoring
Rotherham in 2026 what are your thoughts?

24,482 NEW HOMES are needed
- Where will they go?
- What facilities are needed for a bigger community?
- How should the Town Centre develop?

Come along and have your say about what is important to you and your family. Help make sure future changes benefit your community and bring what is really needed to Rotherham.

Please Come and Join Us

DATE: Wednesday 29th July 2009
MORNING: 10:30am to 12:30pm
EVENING: 5:00pm to 7:00pm
VENUE: Unity Centre, St Leonards Road, Eastwood

Refreshments & limited childcare places available.

To confirm your attendance please contact Imran 01709 720744
Want to know more?

To find out more about the Rotherham Core Strategy Revised Options, please visit http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning

You can sign up for email updates by clicking on ‘How to get involved’ and following the directions. You can also find the document and comment online.

Or you can contact Rotherham’s forward planning team by emailing

forward.planning@rotherham.gov.uk

or by writing to

Rotherham MBC
Forward Planning (CSRO)
Planning and Regeneration Service
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
ROTHERHAM S60 1TD

This consultation finishes on Friday 7th August 2009

For independent help and advice on the planning system please contact Yorkshire Planning Aid on 0870 850 9808
# 2. CONSULTATION WORKSHOP

**Volunteer Briefing Note: Rotherham Core Strategy Revised Options**

**REMA Workshops 29\textsuperscript{th} July 2009**

**Date:** Wednesday 29\textsuperscript{th} July 2009  
**Workshop times:** 10:30am to 1.00pm and 5.00pm to 7:15pm  
**Venue:** Unity Centre, St Leonards Road, Eastwood

## Workshops Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>YPA Arrive and set up</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>People arrive, refreshments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Introduction / welcome</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taiba, Helen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Introductory discussion in groups to get to know everyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Workshop 1: Spatial Options for Housing &amp; Employment</td>
<td>Ex, Flipcharts, pens</td>
<td>Facilitators, scribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Workshop 2: Options for Rotherham Town Centre</td>
<td>Maps, Flipcharts, pens</td>
<td>Facilitators, scribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Workshop 3: Policy Areas</td>
<td>Flipcharts, pens</td>
<td>Facilitators, scribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Final Comments / Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>YPA Arrive and set up</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>People arrive, refreshments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Introduction / welcome</td>
<td></td>
<td>Taiba, Helen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Introductory discussion in groups to get to know everyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Workshop 1: Spatial Options for Housing &amp; Employment</td>
<td>Maps, Flipcharts, pens</td>
<td>Facilitators, scribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Workshop 2: Options for Rotherham Town Centre</td>
<td>Maps, Flipcharts, pens</td>
<td>Facilitators, scribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Workshop 3: Policy Areas</td>
<td>Flipcharts, pens</td>
<td>Facilitators, scribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Final Comments / Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>YPA Set Down</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introductory Discussions in Groups**

The aim of this is to introduce everyone and give chance to air any issues they may have with planning or consultation experiences.

Ask everyone to introduce themselves and then invite people to share any planning experiences or issues they may have. Explain that some of the issues may be covered in the workshops later.
Notes for Facilitators

Housing need survey shows need 792 homes annually = 15,049 by 2026. 48% of this need is in the main Rotherham urban area.

Original RSS target was 23,880 homes by 2026. This was increased in July 2008 after South Yorkshire awarded New Growth Point Status.

Revised RSS Target: 24,482 homes
250-300 hectares employment land (may be revised following consultation and information regarding future economic climate)

Rotherham population expected to grow by 30,000 from 253,000 to 283,000 by 2026.

Read pp27-39 in the Revised Core Strategy Options document for more detail on following 4 options and sustainability of each one. Each one builds on previous option.

**BASELINE**
Current RSS policy

- Focus on Rotherham Main Urban Area (7694 homes, 64ha of employment land) and Dinnington (506 homes, 28ha of employment land)
- No urban extensions
- No significant expansion of other settlements
- 11,936 homes
- 154 hectares of employment land
- 170 hectares of Green Belt land released (1%)

**OPTION 1**
Urban extensions and more Principal Towns

- Focus on Rotherham Main Urban Area (15,216 homes and 132ha employment land), Dinnington (4,175 homes and 28ha employment land) and Wath/Brampton/West Melton (2,111 homes and 30ha employment land)
- Urban extensions at Bassingthorpe and Waverley
- No significant expansion of other settlements
- 23,886 homes
- 221 hectares of employment land
- 408 hectares of Green Belt land released (2%)

**OPTION 2**
Development in public transport corridors

- Focus on Rotherham Main Urban Area (15,216 homes and 64ha employment land) and settlements in public transport corridors
- Urban extensions at Bassingthorpe and Waverley
- Expansion of Dinnington, Wath/Brampton, Swinton/Kilnhurst, Maltby, Aston, Wales/Kiveton Park
• 30,175 homes
• 283 hectares of employment land
• 885 hectares of Green Belt land released (4%)

**OPTION 3**
Dispersed development

• Focus on Rotherham Main Urban Area (7694 homes and 64 ha employment land) and urban extensions at Bassingthorpe and Waverley
• Unconstrained expansion of all other settlements (apart from smaller villages/Green Belt villages)
• 33,965 homes
• 328 hectares of employment land
• 1,090 hectares of Green Belt land released (5%)

**Summary of Options**

• Only Options 2 & 3 meet the housing target and employment land requirements
• Concentrating growth in limited settlements could meet target – but need sites with “major reservations” (very sensitive sites in planning terms e.g. Green Belt, Area of High Landscape Value, poor access, poor topography etc)
• Allocating more land would give flexibility to use less sites with major reservations – Option 2 best balance
• More allocated capacity does not necessarily mean more houses – managed release approach (i.e. releasing least sensitive sites first)

**Content of workshop**

**Discussion on housing and jobs (15 mins)**
Start by general discussion on housing and jobs in local area. Make notes on flipchart of where everyone lives (ward / postcode). Use following prompter questions:

1. Do you need more homes where you live? How easy is it to find somewhere to live (rent / buy)?
2. Are there enough jobs where you live?
3. Do you want to stay in your area long term? Why / why not?
4. What types of housing are most needed?

**Discussion on 4 options (15 mins)**
Maps showing each option and summaries displayed. Go through each option and summarise main differences. Then discuss each option in turn asking following prompter questions if needed:

1. What do you like / dislike about each one?
2. Which is more important in your view, providing enough homes for everyone or protecting the Green Belt (explain)?
3. Should housing be concentrated, spread out, or along main transport corridors? Why?
4. Which option do you like best? Why?
5. Could any of the options be improved? How?
6. If you don’t support any, why not? Can you suggest an alternative?
**Workshop 2: Rotherham Town Centre Options**

**Notes for facilitators**

Part of the Rotherham Renaissance Programme is a broad 25 year vision for the town centre and adjoining areas. In 2005 a masterplan was produced – the Strategic Development Framework. In 2008 the masterplan was updated and approved by the Council as an Interim Planning Statement. REMA and YPA held a consultation event on this and so some of the people will be aware of it.

This IPS should inform the Core Strategy. For discussion there are 3 options for how the town centre should change:

- **A: Consolidation**
  - current UDP position
- **B: Expansion**
  - extend Town Centre boundary
  - additional retail, housing, leisure, recreation, office
- **C: Contraction/Dual Node**
  - reduce Town Centre boundary
  - greater focus on Parkgate Shopping, better links
  - niche role for Town Centre

Pp 45-50 in the Rotherham Core Strategy Revised Options gives more detail on the options and maps.

**Content of workshop**

**Discussion of town centre (10 mins)**

Start with a short general discussion on how the town centre should change, using the following questions:

1. How often do you use the town centre and for what?
2. What is good about the town centre?
3. What is bad about the town centre?
4. What are the most important things needed to improve the town centre? E.g. attract new shops, new leisure facilities, better public space etc.

**Discussion of options (20 mins)**

Maps of each option on display. Explain each option and main differences. Discuss each one using following prompter questions:

**Option A Consolidation**

1. What are the benefits / problems of keeping the town centre space as it is now and limiting shops and other town centre uses to it?
2. Do you think this will help efforts to revitalise the centre or make it harder?

**Option B Expansion**

1. This option means that new shops / leisure facilities can be in larger buildings than the existing. Do you think larger units are needed?
2. Is a larger area for shopping needed? Do you think this will make a positive difference?
3. Would you come to Rotherham rather than Meadowhall / Sheffield if there were bigger / better / more stores?
4. If the town centre was to grow do you think you would find it easy enough to get around it and from one end to the other? How the space inside should be organised? Should the streets be zoned with similar uses together or mixed? How should it be designed so that it is clear where to go and how to get around?

Option C Contraction / dual node
1. How often do you go to Parkgate Shopping Park?
2. Is it better there than Rotherham town centre?
3. Is it easy to get there by car / bus / walking? How could links to the town centre be improved?
4. Do you like the idea of improving the Parkgate Shopping Park and either keeping the town centre as it is or reducing it and keeping it for mainly non shopping uses? Why / why not? Is it convenient? Would you still use the town centre as much?

Finish by voting on the options and asking if anyone can suggest any improvements to any of the options.
Workshop 3: Policy Areas

Notes for Facilitators

There are 17 objectives which translate into policy areas. The policies themselves will be out for consultation later in the year. At this stage the Council would like comments on the proposed policy areas, are they comprehensive enough or are their other areas that should be covered, and do people agree with the objectives.

PP 7-13 of the document covers this topic. More background can be found in the Objectives and Policy Themes Report (attached and on Rotherham Council website).

Summary of Policy Areas:
Frame Core Strategy around 4 themes:
- Spatial Strategy
- Sustainable Communities
- Climate Change and Managing Natural Resources
- Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMES and Objectives</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPATIAL STRATEGY</strong></td>
<td>Where new homes and jobs should go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Scale of future growth</td>
<td>Provide a balanced choice of housing and employment land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Green Belt</td>
<td>Review Green Belt boundaries to meet housing and employment need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sustainable Locations</td>
<td>Promote development in sustainable urban locations close to public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES</strong></td>
<td>Protecting &amp; Improving your places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Retail and service centres</td>
<td>Improve town centre as main centre for shopping, entertainment etc with local shopping providing for local needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Landscape and settlement identity</td>
<td>Protect and improve special landscapes and local identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Design</td>
<td>Promote well designed and managed public places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provision for housing</td>
<td>Improve existing housing stock and provide for new where needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Provision for employment</td>
<td>Provide land to give choice of jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Local transport connections</td>
<td>Safe and convenient transport with more walking, cycling and public transport opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Greenspaces, sport and recreation</td>
<td>Promote greenspace corridors and accessible local facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Community well being</td>
<td>Promote safe communities protect from crime, terrorism, pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANAGING NATIONAL RESOURCES &amp; CLIMATE CHANGE</strong></td>
<td>The Environment (waste &amp; energy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Biodiversity / Geodiversity</td>
<td>Protect and enhance designated sites for biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Minerals</td>
<td>Manage mineral sites in sustainable manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Waste management</td>
<td>Provide waste management sites and encourage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Managing water environment</td>
<td>Control impact of development on waterways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Carbon reduction and renewable energy</td>
<td>Reduce amount of energy used and increase use of renewable energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY</td>
<td>Ensure adequate provision of infrastructure to meet needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content of workshop

Flipchart showing 3 main policy themes (shown in bold) (pre prepared).

**Discussion (15 mins)**

Explain 3 main policy themes in greater detail by giving examples of issues under each heading. Then ask following prompter question, spending about 5 mins on each.

1. For each theme what are the most important needs / issues that the planners should be addressing?

2. **Activity (5 mins)**

Give everyone 3 sticky dots and ask them to place them against the three most important needs in their view.

NB: The most likely topic to be raised is the need for a new cultural community facility, a place open to all the community that is large enough for weddings etc. Discussions have been ongoing for some time but not progressed to anything definite.
### Rotherham Core Strategy Revised Options

#### Baseline Option
- New dev focused in Rotherham Urban area & in built up area of PT Dinnington.
- Rotherham provides 7694 homes (470 in TC) & 64ha of EL.
- Dinnington provides 506 homes & 28ha of EL.
- 4,242 homes within existing settlements on no or only minor reservations.
- Need greenfield sites, or employment land for housing & increase density of development.
- Would not meet RSS housing target. Limited Rural dev Waverley & Bassingthorpe Farm 'urban extensions' not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total = 11,936 homes.</th>
<th>EL Total = 154ha.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57% on GF</td>
<td>11% on GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34% BF</td>
<td>69% BF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% mix</td>
<td>20% mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short = 12, 546 homes</td>
<td>&lt;250ha &amp; needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170ha of GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Option 1 - Urban Extension & more Principal Towns
- As baseline option PLUS urban extension at Bassingthorpe Farm & Waverley (all sites) & Wath identified as PT.
- Roth & UE = 15,216 homes & 132ha (all land). 68ha EL from Wav/Bass. Din = 4,175 homes.
- Brampton/Wath/West Melton = 2,111 homes (some maj res within GB).
- 2,384 homes within existing settlements on no or only minor reservations.
- By increasing density on some sites RSS targets could be met.
- Less likely to encourage cycling, walking and public transport across the borough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total = 23,886 homes</th>
<th>EL Total = 221ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61% GF</td>
<td>18% GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34% BF</td>
<td>68% BF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% mix</td>
<td>14% mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short = 596 homes</td>
<td>&lt;250ha &amp; needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>408ha of GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Option 2 – Development in public transport corridors
- Option 1 PLUS includes dev in main public transport corridors.
- Roth & UE = 15,216 homes & 132ha (all land). Din expansion to E = 5,363 homes.
- Wath/Brampton/West Melton includes exp to E = 2, 985 homes.
- Swinton/Kilnhurst & Wales/Kiveton Park (served by railways).
- Aston/Aughton/ Swallownest (not served by train station). Matly served by Rotherham-Maltby Bus Corridor. Together (all land) = 5, 609 homes & 92ha.
- 1,002 homes within existing settlements on no or only minor reservations
- Optimum balance, most dev without many maj res site & concentrates dev in sust locs. Dispersed dev help meet rural needs & enable better service provision, but sensitive nature of some sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total = 30,175 homes</th>
<th>EL Total = 283ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67% GF</td>
<td>23% GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29% BF</td>
<td>58% BF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% mix</td>
<td>19% mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over = 5, 693 homes (only 1,202 on red sites potential for 6,895)</td>
<td>885ha of GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Option 3 – Dispersed development
- Option provides greatest choice of sites for homes & EL, so less dev on maj res sites. Meet RSS targets using lowest impact sites.
- Flexibility over choice of sites.
- Option 2 PLUS maj exp @ Bramley/Wickersley (part of Roth UA) = 1,770 homes.
- Din expan to E & W, (5,363 & 1,760/32ha), total 7,123 & 60ha.
- Thurcroft & Catcliffe/Treeton/Orgreave (all sites) = 1,155 homes & 14ha EL.
- 107 homes within existing settlements on no or only minor reservations.
- Implications for recreational pressures around urban fringe, car dependency, Sheffield focus, AH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total = 33, 965 homes</th>
<th>EL Total = 328ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70% GF</td>
<td>34% GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% BF</td>
<td>50% BF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% mix</td>
<td>16% mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over = 9, 483 homes (only 1,068 homes on red sites pot = 10,551)</td>
<td>1,090ha GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 24, 482 more houses needed & 250 hectares - What, how, when & where.
Concerns were expressed that with only 3 members attending this is not a true representation of Older People’s views. Whilst this will be a limited consultation there will be further chances for people to get involved in the future and have their say. Also the deadline for comments had (at that time) been extended to 07/08/09 and subsequently 31/08/09.

It was suggested that sufficient time should be given to the Older People’s Forum to engage in the event. It feels like the Forum is being ‘rushed’.

However notice of this meeting was sent out in a letter dated 24 June 2009.

Officers from the Council detailed the current consultation process – outlined 9-10 weeks process, information is available on line and hard copies of documents has been made available in libraries. Press releases have been prepared and an article appeared in Rotherham News. Statutory press notices were placed in Rotherham Advertiser, Dinnington and Worksop Guardian and the South Yorkshire Times. The consultation into the Core Strategy Revised Options started 29 May 09 for approximately 9 weeks.

There have been rumours surrounding the Bassingthorpe Farm proposals in the Advertiser. Unfortunately it was recognised by the people present that some of the activity surrounding the press was motivated by different political parties. People are attending Member’s surgeries that have been fed mis-formation. The groups was concerned that the wider general public are being force fed by opposition parties and individuals. Information was not being channelled to the right people.

Press release in Advertiser was factually correct – master plan 24,500 new homes needed by 2026, page 29 of the Core Strategy Revised Options document. Forward Planning have surveyed 526 sites in community uses, greenspace, allotment, previous development sites, industrial sites baseline.

4,000 new homes could be met in borough not including Rotherham urban area. The Borough can only meet targets with new development taking place in the green belt surrounding Rotherham urban area. Baseline position is not a valid option to meet Central Government requirements as it cannot meet the target imposed by the Regional Spatial Strategy. Option 1 includes more urban extensions at Waverley 4000 homes 45 ha employment land (112 acres).

Waverley - has considerable green space to the south of the site.

Waverley is white land in the Unitary Development Plan with a minerals notation on it denoting the need for open cast coaling and restoration.

Bassingthorpe Farm – the planner explained extent of area, 3,600 new homes, green belt / green field extensions onto agricultural land.

Option 2 – includes other communities (these are in addition to Rotherham Urban Area and principle towns) and those communities with links to transport corridors. Sustainability Appraisal has been undertaken by consultants WSP on our behalf – Option 2 was favoured in the Sustainability Appraisal.
Concerns were raised over health impacts and on site contamination arising from the former coking activities undertaken on the Orgreave colliery site. The history of Waverley site coking works, subsequent strip mining, creation of a containment cell that is clay lined, capped and grassed and its on-going monitoring of the containment cell by Environmental Health is undertaken. Discussions surrounding likelihood of potential leechates from the containment cell contaminating the surrounding land and the need for stand off zones for new developments was explained. Dealing with the contaminants, dust control, and ongoing monitoring activities has all been at the forefront in reclaiming and restoring this site for potential future uses.

There are potential opportunities from some reclaimed sites, for the methane gas emitted from landfill activities to be siphoned off and burnt to produce energy and heating. These activities and sites are monitored very tightly as our understanding and knowledge advances in the techniques of reclamation and restoration.

Discussion of possible future development on the Household Waste Tip at Carr Hill – land would be left and not developed. Not stable. Stand-off, buffers, landscaping other legislation will all be considered as part of any future proposals.

Concern raised regarding the Greasbrough former canal and associated wetland and the possibility of flooding in this area. Flood maps are available to the council from Environment Agency. The planner explained the purpose and function of low lying flood plains such as meadows and how the water can flow into these meadows and be stored here before the river flow returns to normal, for example Canklow Meadows.

The former Guest & Chrimes site is in Zone 3, this is a business use and there will undercroft (underneath the building) parking developed. This does not endanger people’s lives or cause economic damage, hence the ability to develop certain uses in these areas.

If residential development proposals are to go ahead it has to be demonstrated that the houses and people can be protected. Parts of Catcliffe residential areas flooded in 2007 and now flood gates have been incorporated into the River Rother to pump excess waters elsewhere.

The run off from the new development at Waverley will be kept in the newly created reservoirs for subsequent slow release in times of non-flooding into the River Rother.

Low lying land at Scrooby Drive, there is an outflow to the properties and in times of heavy rainfall the gardens flood. The residential owners are also ‘riparian’ land owners and the outflow must be kept clear.

The planner explained that the future development plan, must account for potential flooding issues and new development should not cause a detrimental impact on other people. Holding water back and keeping people ‘safe’ from flooding is a key principle to be adhered to.

Has a decision been made about number of houses on sites?

RMBC; Option 3 has included every site that could be developed and estimates the possible number of new homes or hectares of employment land that could be achieved on the site.
However **No** decision has been made by the Council other than an agreement from Members of the Council to ‘consult’ with local people.

The site surveys have excluded areas of natural interest such as Sites of special scientific Interest (SSSI), local nature reserves, Flood Zone 3. For example Bassingthorpe Wood is ancient woodland with Tree Preservation Orders attached to it and this should be protected in the future. Species such as skylarks, newts and bats are protected and mitigation or remedial action will be required where this is possible.

Targets are passed down to the Local Authority (LA) from Central Government through the Regional Spatial Strategy. Issues such as population growth, natural increase in people, economic migration and people moving from different parts of the UK are all taken into account in reaching a housing need target for Rotherham.

BNP have capitalised on the in-migration issue and have lobbied hard at each of the “drop-in” sessions held to date.

The Development Plan will plan for a variety of housing types/size/tenure and the local housing needs strategy will be taken into account. A Housing Market Assessment has been undertaken to assess local need. There is a move toward greater numbers of smaller household sizes to meet the needs of the elderly population.

Older people are a key group and we need to plan to the housing needs for that group.

Henley Rise, density is high, it has been built using sustainable construction techniques, carbon footprint has been minimised in the construction of this development. Planners will write policies to guide future development and this will include reference to sustainable construction. The Council’s Development Control Team deal with submitted planning applications. In assessing a planning application the Development Control team will use the Council’s own policies along with planning policy statements and guidance prepared by Central Government and the Regional Spatial Strategy to aid the decision-making process.

The future development of Corus, Aldwarke for residential purposes was discussed. Corus is an existing industrial activity currently employing around 1000 people, any proposals to redevelop it in the future must balance the loss of jobs on the site against its future complex reclamation and restoration. Development of potential sites will be considered “on balance”. The River Don has an associated flood zone and also wetland created in the Ox bow.

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

Proposals for Waverley bus rapid transit were discussed: how is this progressing? Need new roads and transport for Bassingthorpe Farm. Could Bus Rapid Transit be extended to here?

Library has not promoted the CSRO consultation activity. There is a need for exhibitions in the libraries to draw people in. A poster is required to highlight key information and provide accurate and better information. Were any leaflets prepared? This is a good way of getting information and messages across to people.
Use libraries as promotional tool. Raise awareness of the consultation events and activities.

RMBC outlined difficulties of preparing posters and leaflets (lack of resources staff, and funds) this time round but in the future better use will be made of Rotherham News that is delivered free to every household. Consideration will be given to promoting consultation on the Local Development Framework in the future.

Transport issues, work patterns, technology have all impacted on the way we now work and conduct our lives. We could not have predicted 20 years ago the changes that have occurred in that 20 year period.

Need to emphasises that the proposals for 24,500 new homes in the borough to 2026 are based on statistics from Central Government and this figure is handed down to all local authorities in the country.

Page 8 Section 4 – guide future development – review green belt; promote sustainable development particularly sustainable locations and in areas with excellent transport links.

Infrastructure delivery such as health services, schools and other community facilities are all essential to creating sustainable communities.
Employment

Retail World – should we be looking to build more shops here, jobs are up to capacity and the majority of the units are full in this area.

However there is a traffic bottleneck at the roundabout at Taylors Lane/ Great Eastern Way, the road is very narrow. Massive redevelopment has gone ahead without adequate road links.

Where is the employment land to meet future needs?

In the future there may be a move to make greater use of public transport. There is an aspiration to create a bus link from Retail World to Great Eastern Way at Parkgate crossing over railway line, but this has not yet happened.

B&Q new retail warehouse development and proposed industrial developments on employment land that has been reclaimed for hard development.

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

One of the participants is a Greasbrough resident, there are apparently 3000 empty houses why not fill empty properties with people needing the accommodation? What is the Council doing to minimise the numbers of vacant council properties?

Housing commitments (sites with planning permission) and completions and employment land is monitored. There is a 10% vacancy rate in housing stock, but this is not monitored by the Planning Authority.

Reports in the Press have queried the number of families on the waiting list for Council properties (5,000 families on waiting list in urgent need of accommodation).

Properties on Foljambe Drive at Thrybergh are currently being demolished, 2010 colleagues and the Neighbourhood Initiatives Team are leading on these proposals

Are we sure that the 3,000 empty properties are all council owned properties? If this is the case there could be good reasons for this, for example the ALMO is currently refurbishing ‘council’ housing up to (2010) decent homes standard. The 3,000 vacant properties could include privately owned properties and these could be ‘for sale, vacant or not let’. There needs to be a certain level of vacancy in the private sector market to enable general churn in the market as people move house.

At the Greasbrough Councillors Surgery 18th July 2009 there were 100 plus angry people.

At Greasbrough Town Hall Saturday 25th July 2009 masses queued outside to get into the event. This event would have been difficult to handle. The planner explained the purpose of the Greasbrough Town hall consultation event that was undertaken in partnership Yorkshire Planning Aid volunteers.
Not fair to be called a NIMBY by Councillors in the Advertiser. People are genuinely upset and incensed by this.

How is consultation shaping up in terms of options? Is there a clear choice emerging? The Core Strategy consultation is not about individual sites but the Spatial “growth” strategy for the Borough. This is the start of the identification of sites process.

Mrs Bashir commissioned a piece of theatre work – drama. This is a different approach to engagement with Black and Minority Ethnic communities. Tassibee Women’s group directed the drama.

Population movement: “what does this mean?” The participant has read that people are moving in and moving out of the Rotherham area, is the indigenous population itself actually demanding this level of new house building? The involvement of various groups of people varies. The BME population profile is younger.

Office national Statistics (ONS) projections are used at the Regional level to identify the housing need target.

Can information on statistics be provided at consultation stages as people are suspicious of politicians? The information can appear to be very confusing and many people get their information from the local press. Can we challenge the Regional target?

At Greasbrough the Greenside Health Centre full to capacity and there is no dentist in Greasbrough.

NHS Rotherham is a statutory consultee. The information has been sent to the hospital and we rely on the Health Authority to guide the Council in the future on where there is existing capacity within services and facilities and where we may need new services and facilities. These will need to be provided if required.
Consultation Report
Rotherham Core Strategy
Revised Options

Date of Event: 21st July 2009
Venue of Event: Thornhill Young People’s Centre
Event Format: Workshops
No. of Attendees: 11

The Studio, 32 The Calls
Leeds, LS2 7EW
0113 204 2460

Submitted by: Mike Dando
Date: 6th August 2009
Rotherham Youth Cabinet: There were representatives from Rotherham Centre, North, East, West of the Borough but none from the Dinnington/Waverley areas.

1. WHAT DO YOU LIKE AND DISLIKE ABOUT WHERE YOU LIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBOURHOOD</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>BAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bramley (2)</td>
<td>• Close to town centre</td>
<td>• Poor shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leisure centre</td>
<td>• Not nice too look at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Playing areas</td>
<td>• No parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good local shops</td>
<td>• No swimming pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwood</td>
<td>• Small village</td>
<td>• Poor houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not many people</td>
<td>• Untidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good transport links into town</td>
<td>• Crumbling down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberworth</td>
<td>• Small village</td>
<td>• Near Kimberworth Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Not many people</td>
<td>• Litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good transport links into town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltby</td>
<td>• Good transport links</td>
<td>• High unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New service centre</td>
<td>• Bad reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Near countryside</td>
<td>• Poor shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawmarsh</td>
<td>• Pharmacy and GP</td>
<td>• Nothing to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good bus links into town</td>
<td>• Poor shop selection, mainly food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Park day time only</td>
<td>• Park at night, not safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenfield</td>
<td>• Nice area</td>
<td>• Too quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clean</td>
<td>• 2 bus stops, one in and one out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Never see people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No teenagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Centre</td>
<td>• Town centre close</td>
<td>• Drunks in park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Park for children</td>
<td>• Buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Diverse population</td>
<td>• Litter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schools, Hospital etc nearby</td>
<td>• Traffic lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Melton (2)</td>
<td>• Nice</td>
<td>• Boarded up houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Open space</td>
<td>• Nothing to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good chippy</td>
<td>• We have no identity of our own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickersley</td>
<td>• Transport links</td>
<td>• Not much to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Green spaces</td>
<td>• Not much of a community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Good facilities- e.g. shops, library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. PROPOSED HOUSING NUMBERS FROM OPTIONS

Urban town centre: up to 7700 homes
1. Lose Green space
2. Should make use of existing waste land
3. Eastwood is cramped now and there is only playing fields left to build on

Rawmarsh: up to 3632 homes
1. The open space is not used by young people now, but adults may use the land
2. New homes would be good if they brought new facilities for young people

West Melton: 2111 to 3000 homes (includes Wath in this number)
1. Not enough space now
2. No good building new homes unless facilities are provided as there is nothing there now
3. Transport links would have to be improved and the roads
4. Everything for leisure goes to Wath or Brampton and not West Melton – we have no identity of our own

Ravenfield/Wickersley/Bramley: Option 3 up to 1710 homes. (Option 1 and 2 no housing problem)
1. No problem with the housing only if the infrastructure is right e.g. roads, transport, leisure, schools, shops and play areas
2. Do not make the same mistake as Woodlaithes: built nice with a lake but nothing else and the roads are too narrow.

Maltby: up to 1472 homes
1. Where would they go?
2. Definitely not on the Green belt
3. Maltby is regarded as Countryside area and this is it’s pulling power to people and this must not be destroyed
4. Any new homes must have new facilities

There was no real outcry against the homes in these areas as long as the existing open and green spaces were not destroyed and new facilities, especially for the young were included.

3. TOWN CENTRE OPTIONS

At first we only discussed the first 2 options
Option 1 – leave the centre the same size as now
Option 2 – extend the centre.

Option 1 received one vote. The same size should be kept but to remove all the ugly and out dated places and re-build with new modern designs and improved facilities.
Option 2 received 7 votes. The site should be bigger and include more well known shops to attract people, the existing Council buildings should be demolished, more modern architecture needs to be used, more leisure facilities and make a lot more use of the river area.
Then Option 3 was discussed - split into 2 town centres, one at Parkgate and a smaller centre where the existing one is now with bus links between them.

**Option 3 received no votes.** This would kill the existing centre unless something was developed to make people go there. Parkgate would take over as the centre. Why were they not linked in the first place? Do we actually need something called a town centre, just add on banks and market to Parkgate and do something else with the existing town centre space.
Public Meetings
Bramley Parish Council Public Meeting Notes
Venue: Bramley Parish Hall
Date & Time: Tuesday 7 July 7:00pm to 9:00pm
Two representatives of Forward Planning were in attendance
The meeting was well attended by at least 150 residents and many others were excluded on the night, due to the limited capacity of the premises.

Chair of the Parish Council, Neil Fulcher, chaired the meeting with the assistance of the Vice Chair, David Sayner.

Introduction & overview
- Code of conduct distributed by the Parish Council chair.
- A Power point presentation by a representative of Forward Planning provided the context to the planning system and the purposes of the consultation.
- Emphasis was placed on the requirement for difficult decisions to be made regarding the distribution of growth and that it wasn’t intended for discussions to relate solely to specific sites.
- It was agreed at the outset that it was not necessary to discuss the options concerning the future of Rotherham’s town centre.

Questions posed/ Points raised
- Concern was expressed about the use of the term "reservations" in relation to RMBC’S appraisal of parcels of land being extracted from the existing greenbelt within the Parish.
- Concern was expressed in respect of the existing neighbourhoods i.e. Bramley, Wickersley, Ravenfield, Hellaby retaining their identities and not being combined into one large conurbation. The meeting’s consensus was that there should be no net loss of the Parish’s existing greenbelt, and therefore there should be no extension to the existing built-up areas.
- Have the significant number of currently vacant homes being factored in to the Borough’s future housing requirement? This point was extended to more general concerns about the accuracy of the housing requirement.
- Are the housing figures that the Borough needs to meet set by statute or do RMBC have discretion to vary them?
- What will be the repercussions for not hitting the targets?
- Fears were expressed that RMBC were being driven solely by landowners putting forward sites for development rather than ourselves identifying the most appropriate locations.
- Why were only three options presented? Concern was expressed about the apparent flexibility that was inherent within Rotherham MBC’s approach to its 'Options', in that RMBC has presented three options to the public and yet, according the officers in attendance, RMBC may eventually elect to approve a combination of those options.
- The lack of notification for the Area Assembly workshop and the missed opportunity to be involved was felt to be worrying. Attendees wished to ensure that their views are taken on board.
- What opportunities will the people of Bramley have to engage with the Planning Inspectorate?
• At what stage does the MP become informed?
• It was emphasised that the sites that may need to come forward will be very much dependent upon the Option that is ultimately chosen.
• What would be the impact of significant development upon the existing infrastructure and measures have been taken to engage with the highways agency, utility providers and the education & health services to ensure that these issues can be addressed.
• Has the Council taken into account worries that certain areas are susceptible to flooding?
• What will the Council’s position be if the wider community of Rotherham opposes the making available of land for such a large number of houses?
• Why is a Park & Ride (LDF0364) facility being considered given that the proximity of the site to junction 1 of the M18 would make creation of suitable access and routing problematic? Is the Park & Ride scheme being proposed to increase the settlements overall sustainability and thus make significant extra development more appropriate in planning terms?
• To what degree has consideration been given to development of the Lidget Lane site (LDF0452) upon the parish of Ravenfield?
• The Ravenfield Parish Plan identified that no further development should take place – was this document assessed in advance of the Core Strategy consultation?
• Aspirations for the Growth Point were felt to be overly ambitious and unrealistic. Furthermore, employment land requirements did not fit with people’s perceptions regarding the attractiveness of Rotherham as a place to locate and invest. Can jobs explicitly for the people of Rotherham be created as part of these new developments? What would be the employment opportunities for the occupants of these new homes?

Proposal Motioned

• There was a 90% show of hands in support of the motion which called for rejection of Option 3 of the Core Strategy, there was no show of hands against the motion and there were no abstentions.
• Expressions of gratitude were proffered by the attending public to the Parish Council for facilitating the public meeting and to the officers of Rotherham MBC for their contribution.
Notes of Ravenfield Parish Liaison Meeting
Core Strategy Revised Options
Ravenfield Parish Hall
11th August, 2009 at 6:00pm.

Present
Three representatives from Forward Planning, Environment and Development Services, RMBC
Councillor Roger Stone (Leader of the Council), Councillor Ann Russell, RMBC
Chris Ward (Chair), David Rowley, Alan Scholes, Ravenfield Parish Council.

Attendance from Ravenfield and surrounding communities meant the hall was full to capacity and approximately 300 people could not gain access to the building.

Chris Ward opened the meeting with thanks to everyone for attending and apologised that the venue could not accommodate all those who had hoped to attend.

Before the presentation began several questions and criticisms were raised regarding how the 300 people outside would be able to engage in consultations, there was a request for no jargon to be used and a request that there should have been a microphone facility to enable people to hear clearly.

A Forward Planning representative gave a PowerPoint presentation explaining the Local Development Framework and Core Strategy, detailing Growth Point status and the implications for Ravenfield along with a table detailing sites. He then outlined the next steps in the process and explained that formal consultation on the sites would not commence until 2010.

Following a question from the audience, an explanation was provided of the extent of the Parish boundary between Bramley and Ravenfield.

The question was asked why the people of Ravenfield did not receive individual notification letters, Cllr Roger Stone explained briefly that consultation had been carried out beyond statutory requirements and there had been coverage in Rotherham News.

Cllr Roger Stone took on board the point that old Ravenfield residents had not received copies of Rotherham News and that this would be investigated.

The point was raised that the Woodlaithes development had impacted Bramley to saturation point in terms of traffic and the cross roads and link road to the M18 were unbearable. There was also the comment that Silverwood Drive floods every time it rains and there were concerns over securing house insurance to cover this damage to properties. There was grave concern that the drains could not take any more development pressure and that the community of Ravenfield says “no” to the development of 1,500 more houses.

There were questions of the actual housing need being 24,000 houses. A representative of Forward Planning explained that these were based on Government housing projections, with local data being fed into that figure. The question was asked
regarding who would live in these homes. Cllr Roger Stone explained that the only way affordable housing could be provided was by securing private development.

Cllr Thirlwall stated that he understood that the actual active list of people in need of a home was in the region of 5,000 not 19,000. Some people were on the list for “insurance” and did not reflect an actual housing need. He expected that there would be a migrant demand from people from the south east of England to take up the new houses.

Cllr Thirlwall also criticised Growth Point, in that Sheffield could meet their housing target without the use of Green Belt land and suggested that in South Yorkshire Rotherham was the “patsy”. Cllr Thirlwall said that farmers would suggest their sites for development, expecting to cash in and there would be a surplus of land and it would be wise to use up some of the derelict Green Belt land.

The question was asked of the councillors as to where their support would be. Cllr Roger Stone outlined that he would support houses – to provide jobs and strongly believes that the Council house need must be brought down. However, he understood the depth of feeling and would report that back to the other South Yorkshire Leaders and discuss with Regional Assembly if it would be possible to revoke growth point status and reduce Rotherham’s housing target by 2,000 homes.

It was suggested to use land at Corus for housing development. Cllr Roger Stone explained how Rotherham has a shortage of brownfield land and that the other Council priority was to support Corus and look at assisting them with business rate relief to keep the company viable in order to provide jobs within the Borough.

The question was raised that Whinney Hill and Thrybergh should be developed. Cllr Roger Stone explained that the Council could not build properties without losing the stock under the “right to buy” scheme. Several people stated that this Government policy should be reversed and that developers should redevelop derelict properties to make them fit for purpose.

The meeting expressed concern over using Green Belt, especially that land of an agricultural nature, for housing as it was now on the political agenda that domestic food supply was under pressure.

A member of the Parish Council made the point that Hilary Benn MP was seeking to protect green belt and farming land so Lidget Lane development was inappropriate.

The point was made that under the transport budget Ravenfield has a rural classification. Even with the development of Woodlaithes this classification would not change. If more development were to happen the public transport infrastructure would be very inadequate.

The statement was raised that the Ravenfield Community Plan, had as part of its production, surveyed the community of Ravenfield and that the feeling was that the residents had said “no” to any more housing development and that that view should be taken fully into account in the Local Development Framework process. The community urged Planners to review the Ravenfield Parish Plan.
A local resident asked for a review of Cllr Roger Stone’s statement. It was clarified that for the people of Ravenfield “Option 3 is not an option” and that would be reported back to Council.

A resident outlined that since 1976 there had been no improvements to roads, infrastructure and schools and since then there has been more housing built with no improvements to that infrastructure. The question was asked ‘how many houses had been built since 1976?’

Donald Buxton of Wickersley asked for the Councillors assurance that consultation and views would not be ignored as they had been in Bramley previously.

There was concern that a petition raised would not hold weight with the Council, as a recent press report had quoted a councillor dismissing petitions as “signatures were easy to get”. Cllr Stone assured the meeting that such representations would be taken seriously. Cllr Thirlwall went on to ask for clarification as to who ultimately makes the decisions on the proposals.

A Greasbrough resident whose parents live in old Ravenfield made a short statement. She was concerned over the short time period of the consultation process that information on the website was inadequate and discriminated against those without computer access or computer literacy. She was also concerned that proposals had not been clear enough to motivate the community to respond as people were unaware that it affected them directly. There were genuine concerns regarding the provision of social housing and the degeneration into “sink” estates. If communities that pay the highest band of Council tax for their residential amenities and this quality is reduced will that be reflected in a revision of council tax bandings? There are many concerns over traffic and national concerns over the loss of farmland. The poor financial situation of RMBC should not be reflected in this development to local people’s detriment.

Cllr Parker, Conservative member for Wickersley, stated that due to the rat run it could sometimes take 20 minutes to get off his own drive. He stated that he thought the Core Strategy was divisive and communities would vote for what was best for them. These projections were made before the current recession and as industrial land is largely vacant due to high rents there is no further need for more industrial land. He also requested that the housing figure be reviewed to account for out migration of foreign workers.

A Forward Planning representative addressed the meeting explaining that that the planning process was about achieving a balance of development for the whole Borough of Rotherham and that the LDF is a long term plan to 2026.

A resident quoted some minutes of a meeting in 2007 where representatives of Forward Planning were present. “Hellaby industrial estate should not be extended and the request to release green belt land denied. There should be no major developments … but Government guidance must be adhered to…. “ It was explained that since these minutes were produced circumstances had altered and it was again emphasised that projections for housing need had been linked to Growth Point status.

Cllr Roger Stone reiterated that he would report back that for the community of Ravenfield “Option 3 is not an option”.
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The point was raised that at present due to the recession there are no jobs so demand is lower for housing.

Cllr Parker spoke that brownfield land should always be used first and then scraps if less valuable green belt land. Cllr Roger Stone stressed that Green Belt would not be used until available brownfield sites were taken up and developers would be instructed to use brownfield first. It was explained that this was the principle of managed release of land. Cllr Roger Stone went onto say that if Corus closed or the national government changed the requirements of the Plan may alter.

There was a concern regarding Option 3 that if the Council identified land for 36,000 homes that then there would be pressure to indeed build 36,000 homes. Many people enjoy village life and don’t care if they are classed as “NIMBYs”.

Cllr Roger Stone reiterated that the Option 3 level of 36,000 homes would give the Planners a higher capacity and more discretion in sites to pick and choose from. He also explained that currently housing numbers were not being met. Cllr Roger Stone said that developers would not be allowed to “cherry pick” the most attractive sites.

The point was raised that the inclusion of the Lidget Lane site was like a “Sword of Damocles”. Woodlaithes development had added a burden on traffic to Bramley and Morrisons area and approximately another 1,600 cars makes Option 3 completely untenable.

Cllr Peter Thirwell addressed the meeting and summarised that Ravenfield do not accept Option 3 and that the petition be put to the Leader of the Council to revoke Growth Point. Cllr Roger Stone said he will report back and talk with other Council Leaders. This motion was proposed by Cllr Peter Thirlwall, seconded and sanctioned by the meeting. He continued by expressing his thanks to Derek Stocks and the Parish Council for arranging this meeting. Cllr Roger Stone reiterated that he would report back that for the community of Ravenfield “Option 3 is not an option”.

The point was made that the plan was not sustainable, not just in our patch but for the whole of the Borough.

Queries were raised over how sites had been named and that this could confuse people as to the proximity of the site to their personal location, examples being Moor Lane South and Bassingthorpe. The Planners explained that this was for survey purposes. These concerns were noted by the Forward Planning Team who would look into renaming the sites where appropriate.

A question was raised as to the grading of the agricultural land at Lidget Lane - Planners to investigate this further.

Questions were raised over LDF0375 the Cattery and LDF458 Braithwell Road, with much concern over flooding in this area.

Questions were raised over the former Sheffield Road baths site, where high rise flats had been built but were as yet vacant. Cllr Roger Stone accepted that Rotherham does not have a tradition of high rise developments. It was a suggestion that better provision of multiple occupancy dwellings of a high standard could help meet the housing targets.
At this point Councillors Roger Stone and Ann Russell left the meeting.

There was a short break in the proceedings and some people vacated the hall and other people entered.

Chris Ward resumed the meeting asking for comments and concerns on individual sites in Ravenfield.

LDF0391 – Land off Allott Close - Questions were asked about the status of live allotments and that they were protected and should not be built on. There were questions asked of the Parish Council as to why residents were having difficulty renting vacant allotments and they suspected “dirty tricks”. Allot Close, with the access down Hollings Lane was also considered an unsatisfactory access.

A member of the Parish Council said that a former Chair had wanted to allocate the land for composting and there had been difficulties with access, fences and water to the site. However, the Parish Council were seeking a meeting with the Borough Council to secure an affordable lease of the allotments and the playing fields for the benefit of Ravenfield residents.

A lady made a statement that she was against all the sites in Ravenfield and she had major traffic concerns. Especially near the school as this despite protests to the Council remained a 40 mile per hour speed limit. Too many houses have already been built and yet no one listens to us.

A member of the audience stated that Forward Planning did not take into account the “knock on effect” on schools. Children within walking distance of an over subscribed school now have to be bussed out of the area.

There was criticism that all the sites were referred to under Bramley / Wickersley not Ravenfield and that this was misleading consultation and that some households have received letters from the Parish Council and others have not. Chris Ward explained that letters were sent out to those whose properties lie within the Ravenfield Parish boundary.

Concerns were raised that Rotherham could not accommodate any more residents. A Forward Planning representative explained that consultation on the Core Strategy was an internal Council process as well.

A parish councillor stated that sites should be discussed and scrapped now but it was explained that government guidance was to consider the options first and then the allocation of sites later.

A question was raised that if Option 3 were to go ahead would council tax bandings be reduced accordingly?

Questions were asked as to the ownership of the proposed sites. It was explained that land owners had proposed their sites for consideration.

A lady was very concerned that her house had been shown on a map as available for development from formerly being green belt. A representative of Forward Planning
explained that residential areas were washed over with designations but that no one could re-develop her home.

Some attendees were concerned that historically Site LDF0452 had once been subject to a planning application for housing that had been refused on reasons on the land being green belt. Why had Planners thought about a “u turn”? Explanation was given that it was being considered to meet the Government’s housing targets.

The meeting felt that constraints should be fully considered in rejecting sites before they were brought forward. Some people expressed that they had a lack of trust in Forward Planning. In response it was stated that sites would be subject to due process and discounted as appropriate.

One resident expressed concern over the 3 storey development near her home that it “looks like a prison” but she believed that this would be the last development to take place and was concerned over proposals for yet more development.

There were many concerns expressed over Hollings Lane, regarding flooding, water courses and education provision as the Woodlaithes development had impacted a water course and now results in localised flooding.

Questions were raised as to legal requirements and to assessing biodiversity. It was explained that all sites would be subject to the rigours of the planning process.

Questions were asked as to when and how the results would be known regarding the consultation and the options. Hard decisions would be made by the politicians, Cabinet, full Council and then be subject to examination by a Government appointed Inspector who would impose a binding report on the Council.

Chris Ward gave his thanks to all who had attended the meeting and for the many enthusiastic responses received. Thanks were also expressed to representatives of Forward Planning for attending.
Bassingthorpe Farm Development Drop-In Sessions
Consultation Report
Bassingthorpe Farm Development Consultations

Date of Event: 9th July, 2009
Venue of Event: Thornhill Youth Centre,
Event Format: Drop-in Sessions
Total No. of Attendees: 13

The Studio, 32 The Calls
Leeds, LS2 7EW
0113 204 2460

Submitted by: Mike Dando
Date: 21st August 2009
YORKSHIRE PLANNING AID

Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA) is part of a network of services run by the Royal Town Planning Institute, a registered charity. YPA offers free, independent and professional planning advice to community groups and individuals who cannot afford to pay professional fees.

YPA also helps people to understand and engage with the planning system through its community planning work. This support can be provided through workshops, information and interactive drop-in sessions, or formal training events, all of which are tailored to the local planning issues and/or local communities involved.

The activities undertaken by YPA are not part of central or local government but are an independent source of advice and information which complement the work of local councils.

YPA’S COMMUNITY PLANNING WORK

YPA aims to work in the Local Authorities which are in the top ten most deprived Local Authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber according to the ODPM Indices of Deprivation 2007\(^1\), and within the Super Output Areas in the Region which fall in the most deprived 20% in England (i.e. those that rank between 1 and 6,496 on the IMD ranking).

YPA will also prioritise opportunities to work in areas which are covered by regeneration programmes, or in areas where we have identified key planning issues which provide a timely opportunity for community planning activity.

In recognition of the fact that some areas of need are missed by the IMD process, we will also take guidance from partner agencies as to recommended priority areas and groups.

YPA also aims to work with disadvantaged groups, in line with the definition in the National Planning Aid Delivery Plan, as outlined below.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) Hull, Bradford, Doncaster, Barnsley North East Lincolnshire, Sheffield, Wakefield, Rotherham, Kirklees, Leeds

\(^2\) People on low incomes; unemployed people; minority ethnic communities; women’s groups; disabled people and disability groups; older people; children and young people; tenants groups; community groups and voluntary organisations.
YPA’S INVOLVEMENT WITHIN ROTHERHAM AND WITH THE ROTHERHAM CORE STRATEGY

Within the context of Rotherham’s position amongst the top ten most deprived authorities in the Region, YPA approached Rotherham MBC Planning and Regeneration Service at an early stage of the Council’s Local Development Framework programme and offered assistance, in relation to the engagement of those priority areas, communities and groups detailed above.

YPA’s work in relation to the current consultation stage of the Rotherham Core Strategy falls within the context of this general approach. In line with this and available resources/capacity, YPA’s work has focussed on eligible communities around the proposed Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension, Rotherham Youth Forum, Rotherfed and Rotherham’s black and minority ethnic communities.

YPA’s undertaking at the outset of this Core Strategy consultation stage was to faithfully report, verbatim, the comments made by the individuals and groups attending the events which YPA facilitated. While this report honours that undertaking, in a few cases the comments recorded may have caused offence and therefore these have either been re-worded, whilst still acknowledging the fact that they were made and the numbers of such comments, or where they were clearly not related to planning issues they have been edited out. This in no way affects the substance of this report in planning terms or the weight that it will carry within the context of the planning consultation.
Event 1 – Thornhill Youth Centre
9th July 2009

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where Do You Live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Postcodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henley Rise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S61 1TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masbrough</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>S61 1RF x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 1TB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 1RG x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 1SB x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S601HZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No postcodes provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

What do you think about today’s event?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultation Questions

1. What do you think about the idea of new housing on Bassingthorpe Farm?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Bothered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. If you don’t like the idea of housing at Bassingthorpe Farm, WHY don’t you like it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of greenbelt / countryside</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More traffic problems</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of overcrowded health, school and other facilities</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. If housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what would you like to see happen to lessen the impact of development?

New green space with facilities that would be shared with surrounding communities (e.g. trim trails,
rangers, café, play areas/pitches)
New wildlife habitats 1
Protection/improvement of local wildlife sites 1
Hedgerows retained 1
New planting to enhance local landscape features 2
Green corridors linking communities with open countryside

4. If housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, on which part of the green belt should they go?

Next to Masbrough/Thorne Hill/ Henley Rise 4
Next to Munsbrough / Greasbrough 2
Next to Parkgate / Rawmarsh 2
Next to Upper Haugh

Comments:
- The housing plans shouldn’t go through
- I think there should be other methods of building new homes. Build up not outwards x 2

5. If housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what’s the biggest number of new homes you’d want to see built?

3,600
2,500 – 3,600 1
1,500 – 2,500 1
Below 1,500 8

Comments:
- Next to 1,500 – 2,500 – As long as the housing plans have enough facilities for schools and community areas
- None should get built. Fill the existing empty properties in the area

6. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what sort of tenure should the new homes be?

Private for sale 4
Affordable for sale 5
Private rented
Council (2010) rented 5
Housing Assoc rented 1
Shared ownership

7. How would you like any new homes to be designed?

Like existing homes around Bassingthorpe Farm
Modern ‘eco – homes’ which fit with the environment 8

8. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, would you or any of your family like to live in one of the new homes?

Yes 1
No 9
9. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what new community facilities would you like to see to make it a good place to live?

- Primary school: 5
- Health centre: 5
- Community centre: 5
- Shops: 6
- Small park/play areas: 6
- Natural green space: 6

10. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what transport improvements would you like to see to make it a good place to live?

- New access road to the town centre to the north of the borough: 2
- Better bus links: 1
- New cycle links, footpaths & bridleways: 1

11. Would you like to see new local businesses and jobs along with any new homes?

- Yes: 10
- No

Comments:
- The jobs you are going to provide are going to be temporary anyway.

12. How should any new community facilities be provided?

- As an extension/improvement to existing: 6
- As a new centre in a new settlement: 4
Notes on the Frequently Asked Questions Sheets

Q. Why do we need more housing?
   Note: Show us the research that has / or hasn’t been done!
   Note: Why has the number here [24,500] gone up to 34,000 on the council website?

Q. Isn’t a lot of this land Green Belt?
   A. To meet the housing target set by the Government we will need to change the Green Belt boundary to build new houses and employment opportunities.
   Note: Rubbish, there are plenty of brown field sites x 3
   Note: Tell the Government to stick its mysterious targets somewhere dark!

Q. Why are we looking on Green Belt land?
   Note: Sheffield refuses to build on Green Belt. Why are we even thinking of it!!
   Note: Try again looking on brown belt.
   Note: If you keep building on our farm land how will we feed all these people newly housed here!!
   Note: If you build on the green belt there will be less drainage for the current rainfall and increase flood risk.
   Note: The sewage systems fail now!!
   Note: I’m 75 years old. Don’t try and kid me. It will flood.

Q. Why aren’t you building on old industrial sites?
   Note: Ha ha ha. So they want to build on Greasbrough flood plain instead.
   Note: Houses are being built next to business & industry sites already, you say to help security. Tide turns when it suits eh!!
   Note: There are lots of empty un-let industry and business units already??
   Note: Greasbrough, Ings & Cinder Bridge are flood areas.
   Note: Flood risk around Cinder Bridge. Why is this in your proposals?
   Note: Use Corus site.
   Note: Greenfield sites are liable to flood as well e.g. Stubbin.
   Note: Because what you are doing is XXXX. [NB Potentially offensive language edited out]

Q. What about flooding?
   Note: Unacceptable risk – exactly – fields around Cinder Bridge!!
   Note: Why suggest (canal?) site at THE WHINS and Parkgate if you have read maps??

Q. Who will build the houses?
   Note: Fat pockets.
   Note: Who can afford to buy them?
   Note: What about all the empty council houses? What about empty flats and recently built property?
   Note: 3,000 properties empty in Rotherham at any one time.
   Note: Use the empty Munsbrough flats.

Q. Has this already been decided?
   A. No
   Note: That is a lie, and if you are honest you would admit it.
   Note: I bet.
   Note: Liars.
   Note: Of course, corrupt politicians and the like, disgusting.
   Note: Will the consultations later this year / early next be publicised earlier and more than these meetings??
   Note: Be specific what sites you mean, not just general.
Q. Why weren’t we told about this before?
A. The consultation has been running since 29th May and has been publicised in the local press.

Note: In small print!!!
Note: No one knew about this until the end of June.
Note: It was not publicised.
Note: It has never been publicised in any papers.
Note: Does what we say really matter? Because you’ll do it anyway, same as that slum Munsbrough. Greasbrough will then be the same. Houses full of drug takers and dealers. We don’t want it. [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]

General Points
- We don’t want your XXXXXX buildings [NB potentially offensive language edited out]
- No, no, no building on the green belt.
- Have you looked at sites around Thurcroft, Dinnington & Thrybergh / Hooton Roberts?
- Let Sheffield and other areas take care of themselves, we don’t want this housing project!
- Rotherham is already failing in Government clean air commitment how would increase in housing & carbon, & traffic etc help?! x 3
- You do not need this land.
- What about effect on already overburdened healthcare?
- What about the increase in numbers in the classrooms this will create?
- No to bigger schools. Small is beautiful.
- Rubbish, don’t want it. Leave Greasbrough alone.
- Greasbrough is named in the Domesday book. All you will do is destroy it.
- They already have destroyed it 40 years ago when they started Wingfield. NO MORE.
- Keep Britain farming.
Consultation Report
Bassingthorpe Farm Development Consultations

Date of Event: 13th July
Venue of Event: Wingfield School
Event Format: Drop-in Sessions
Total No. of Attendees: 31

The Studio, 32 The Calls
Leeds, LS2 7EW
0113 204 2460

Submitted by: Mike Dando
Date: 21st August 2009
Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA) is part of a network of services run by the Royal Town Planning Institute, a registered charity. YPA offers free, independent and professional planning advice to community groups and individuals who cannot afford to pay professional fees.

YPA also helps people to understand and engage with the planning system through its community planning work. This support can be provided through workshops, information and interactive drop-in sessions, or formal training events, all of which are tailored to the local planning issues and/or local communities involved.

The activities undertaken by YPA are not part of central or local government but are an independent source of advice and information which complement the work of local councils.

**YPA’S COMMUNITY PLANNING WORK**

YPA aims to work in the Local Authorities which are in the top ten most deprived Local Authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber according to the ODPM Indices of Deprivation 2007, and within the Super Output Areas in the Region which fall in the most deprived 20% in England (i.e. those that rank between 1 and 6,496 on the IMD ranking).

YPA will also prioritise opportunities to work in areas which are covered by regeneration programmes, or in areas where we have identified key planning issues which provide a timely opportunity for community planning activity.

In recognition of the fact that some areas of need are missed by the IMD process, we will also take guidance from partner agencies as to recommended priority areas and groups.

YPA also aims to work with disadvantaged groups, in line with the definition in the National Planning Aid Delivery Plan, as outlined below.

---

3 Hull, Bradford, Doncaster, Barnsley North East Lincolnshire, Sheffield, Wakefield, Rotherham, Kirklees, Leeds
4 People on low incomes; unemployed people; minority ethnic communities; women’s groups; disabled people and disability groups; older people; children and young people; tenants groups; community groups and voluntary organisations.
YPA’S INVOLVEMENT WITHIN ROTHERHAM AND WITH THE ROTHERHAM CORE STRATEGY

Within the context of Rotherham’s position amongst the top ten most deprived authorities in the Region, YPA approached Rotherham MBC Planning and Regeneration Service at an early stage of the Council’s Local Development Framework programme and offered assistance, in relation to the engagement of those priority areas, communities and groups detailed above.

YPA’s work in relation to the current consultation stage of the Rotherham Core Strategy falls within the context of this general approach. In line with this and available resources/capacity, YPA’s work has focussed on eligible communities around the proposed Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension, Rotherham Youth Forum, Rotherfed and Rotherham’s black and minority ethnic communities.

YPA’s undertaking at the outset of this Core Strategy consultation stage was to faithfully report, verbatim, the comments made by the individuals and groups attending the events which YPA facilitated. While this report honours that undertaking, in a few cases the comments recorded may have caused offence and therefore these have either been re-worded, whilst still acknowledging the fact that they were made and the numbers of such comments, or where they were clearly not related to planning issues they have been edited out. This in no way affects the substance of this report in planning terms or the weight that it will carry within the context of the planning consultation.
Event 2 – Wingfield School, Greasbrough
13th July 2009

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where are you from?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Postcodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greasbrough</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>S61 4NT x 4, S61 4NR x 3, S61 4QW x 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munsbrough</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S61 4NL, S61 4RH, S61 4NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkgate / Rawmarsh</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S62 6LR x 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masbrough</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S61 1RG x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>S65 4RF x 2, S61 4AD, S61 3PP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

What do you think about today’s event?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Too little, too late.
- Found out about this today 13/07/09.

Consultation Questions

1. What do you think about the idea of new housing on Bassingthorpe Farm?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Bothered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. If you don’t like the idea of housing at Bassingthorpe Farm, WHY don’t you like it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loss of green belt / countryside</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More traffic problems</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of overcrowded health, school and other facilities</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Houses would be too near town. What is green belt for?
- Health impacts of losing areas used for walking, cycling, riding etc would be huge.
- I don’t like it because there are too many houses. We will get confused.
- When you put a house in front of Munsbrough the price of the houses will go down.
- Fill the houses we have first.
- Concern re the affect of extra housing on farm animals.
- Leave the green belt & rural areas close to town alone. It’s one of the few reasons left to make Rotherham a nice place!
- Other than the first two question & answer boards, all assume the scheme is going ahead. The downsides to the development are not explored.
- Explore how many empty houses could be renovated before new ones are built.
- I thought ‘green belt’ meant ‘protected’, or does that not apply to our area?!
- Current house / flat builds have already stopped e.g. on Parkgate Hill because those already completed are still empty and not selling.
- Road infrastructure not good enough. Congestion at Christmas is unbelievable. State of roads already unusable due to lack of maintenance. Flooding? Too crowded as it is in area. Schools too full. Who’s paying?

3. If housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what would you like to see happen to lessen the impact of development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New green space with facilities that would be shared with surrounding communities (e.g. trim trails, rangers, café, play areas/pitches)</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New wildlife habitats</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection/improvement of local wildlife sites</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedgerows retained</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New planting to enhance local landscape features</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green corridors linking communities with open countryside</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Nothing would lessen the impact of loosing our green spaces and open fields. Health impacts would be huge.
- Nothing would lessen the impact of a huge housing development.

4. If housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, on which part of the green belt should they go?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next to Masbrough/Thorne Hill/ Henley Rise</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next to Munsbrough/Greasbrough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next to Parkgate/Rawmarsh</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next to Upper Haugh</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- None x 5
- None on green belt land x 2
- Widest part.

145
• Green belt means what it says.

5. If housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what’s the biggest number of new homes you’d want to see built?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Homes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>None x 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 – 3,600</td>
<td>None – The green belt is small enough anyway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 – 2,500</td>
<td>This ill thought-out scheme is not required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1,500</td>
<td>More because no-one wants to buy current houses as they are scruffy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More because nobody has homes. Also need to make them affordable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what sort of tenure should the new homes be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private for sale</td>
<td>There should be no new houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable for sale</td>
<td>Build somewhere else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented</td>
<td>None, build somewhere else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council (2010) rented</td>
<td>No need for houses on green belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Assoc rented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How would you like any new homes to be designed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like existing homes around Bassingthorpe Farm</td>
<td>There is no need for this urban sprawl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern ‘eco-homes’ which fit with the environment</td>
<td>Eco-homes designed at some other place in Borough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for huge estates to be built.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, would you or any of your family like to live in one of the new homes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>New houses would destroy residents in existing community’s, quality of life i.e. no green area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is no need for any new housing in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You have got to be joking. Get a life. Better still get a real job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No, and my existing home would no longer be a nice place to live!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what new community facilities would you like to see to make it a good place to live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health centre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small park/play areas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural green space</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- The whole scheme is unacceptable. Use the money on roads, woods, and parks. Not on this useless idea.
- No new facilities will make it acceptable to build on green belt land.
- All these would be needed – so don’t do it!
- Did any new schools or other facilities get built in Maltby?

10. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what transport improvements would you like to see to make it a good place to live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New access road to the town centre to the north of the borough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better bus links</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New cycle links, footpaths &amp; bridleways</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- None, because it would no longer be a nice place to live.
- Roads, buses & cycle links are already useless. This stupid idea should be binned ASAP!!
- No new housing plans in this area are acceptable.
- Not needed. People are comfortable as they are.

11. Would you like to see new local businesses and jobs along with any new homes?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Would destroy existing agricultural jobs.
- No new homes – use existing private & social housing which is currently unoccupied.
- No, because don’t want to see new homes so close to town!
- None needed.

12. How should any new community facilities be provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As an extension/improvement to existing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a new centre in a new settlement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- None needed. Keep off the green belt.
- No new community facilities will compensate for the loss of green belt land.
Notes on the Frequently Asked Questions Sheets

Q. Why do we need more housing?
Note: Show us the research that has / or hasn’t been done!
Note: Why has the number here [24,500] gone up to 34,000 on the council website?

Q. Isn’t a lot of this land Green Belt?
A. To meet the housing target set by the Government we will need to change the Green Belt boundary to build new houses and employment opportunities.
Note: Rubbish, there are plenty of brown field sites x 3
Note: Tell the Government to stick its mysterious targets somewhere dark!

Q. Why are we looking on Green Belt land?
Note: Sheffield refuses to build on Green Belt. Why are we even thinking of it!!
Note: Try again looking on brown belt.
Note: If you keep building on our farm land how will we feed all these people newly housed here!!
Note: If you build on the green belt there will be less drainage for the current rainfall and increase flood risk.
Note: The sewage systems fail now!!
Note: I’m 75 years old. Don’t try and kid me. It will flood.

Q. Why aren’t you building on old industrial sites?
Note: Ha ha ha. So they want to build on Greasbrough flood plain instead.
Note: Houses are being built next to business & industry sites already, you say to help security. Tide turns when it suits eh!!
Note: There are lots of empty un-let industry and business units already??
Note: Greasbrough, Ings & Cinder Bridge are flood areas.
Note: Flood risk around Cinder Bridge. Why is this in your proposals?
Note: What about floods?
Note: Use Corus site.
Note: Greenfield sites are liable to flood as well e.g. Stubbin.
Note: Because what you are doing is XXXX. [NB Potentially offensive language edited out]

Q. What about flooding?
Note: Unacceptable risk – exactly – fields around Cinder Bridge!!
Note: Why suggest (canal?) site at THE WHINS and Parkgate if you have read maps??

Q. Who will build the houses?
Note: Fat pockets.
Note: Who can afford to buy them?
Note: What about all the empty council houses? What about empty flats and recently built property?
Note: 3,000 properties empty in Rotherham at any one time.
Note: Use the empty Munsbrough flats.

Q. Has this already been decided?
A. No
Note: That is a lie, and if you are honest you would admit it.
Note: I bet.
Note: Liars.
Note: Of course, corrupt politicians and the like, disgusting.
Note: Will the consultations later this year / early next be publicised earlier and more than these meetings??
Note: Be specific what sites you mean, not just general.
Q. Why weren’t we told about this before?
A. The consultation has been running since 29th May and has been publicised in the local press.

Note: In small print!!!
Note: No one knew about this until the end of June.
Note: It was not publicised.
Note: It has never been publicised in any papers.
Note: Does what we say really matter? Because you’ll do it anyway, same as that slum Munsbrough. Greasbrough will then be the same. Houses full of drug takers and dealers. We don’t want it. [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]

General Points
• We don’t want your XXXXXX buildings [NB potentially offensive language edited out]
• No, no, no building on the green belt.
• Have you looked at sites around Thurcroft, Dinnington & Thrybergh / Hooton Roberts?
• Let Sheffield and other areas take care of themselves, we don’t want this housing project!
• Rotherham is already failing in Government clean air commitment how would increase in housing & carbon, & traffic etc help?! x 3
• You do not need this land.
• What about effect on already overburdened healthcare?
• What about the increase in numbers in the classrooms this will create?
• No to bigger schools. Small is beautiful.
• Rubbish, don’t want it. Leave Greasbrough alone.
• Greasbrough is named in the Domesday book. All you will do is destroy it.
• They already have destroyed it 40 years ago when they started Wingfield. NO MORE.
• Keep Britain farming.
Consultation Report
Bassingthorpe Farm Development Consultations

Date of Event: 23rd July
Venue of Event: Rawmarsh
Event Format: Drop-in Sessions
Total No. of Attendees: 156
YORKSHIRE PLANNING AID

Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA) is part of a network of services run by the Royal Town Planning Institute, a registered charity. YPA offers free, independent and professional planning advice to community groups and individuals who cannot afford to pay professional fees.

YPA also helps people to understand and engage with the planning system through its community planning work. This support can be provided through workshops, information and interactive drop-in sessions, or formal training events, all of which are tailored to the local planning issues and/or local communities involved.

The activities undertaken by YPA are not part of central or local government but are an independent source of advice and information which complement the work of local councils.

YPA’S COMMUNITY PLANNING WORK

YPA aims to work in the Local Authorities which are in the top ten most deprived Local Authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber according to the ODPM Indices of Deprivation 2007, and within the Super Output Areas in the Region which fall in the most deprived 20% in England (i.e. those that rank between 1 and 6,496 on the IMD ranking).

YPA will also prioritise opportunities to work in areas which are covered by regeneration programmes, or in areas where we have identified key planning issues which provide a timely opportunity for community planning activity.

In recognition of the fact that some areas of need are missed by the IMD process, we will also take guidance from partner agencies as to recommended priority areas and groups.

YPA also aims to work with disadvantaged groups, in line with the definition in the National Planning Aid Delivery Plan, as outlined below.

5 Hull, Bradford, Doncaster, Barnsley North East Lincolnshire, Sheffield, Wakefield, Rotherham, Kirklees, Leeds
6 People on low incomes; unemployed people; minority ethnic communities; women’s groups; disabled people and disability groups; older people; children and young people; tenants groups; community groups and voluntary organisations.
YPA’S INVOLVEMENT WITHIN ROTHERHAM AND WITH THE ROTHERHAM CORE STRATEGY

Within the context of Rotherham’s position amongst the top ten most deprived authorities in the Region, YPA approached Rotherham MBC Planning and Regeneration Service at an early stage of the Council’s Local Development Framework programme and offered assistance, in relation to the engagement of those priority areas, communities and groups detailed above.

YPA’s work in relation to the current consultation stage of the Rotherham Core Strategy falls within the context of this general approach. In line with this and available resources/capacity, YPA’s work has focussed on eligible communities around the proposed Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension, Rotherham Youth Forum, Rotherfed and Rotherham’s black and minority ethnic communities.

YPA’s undertaking at the outset of this Core Strategy consultation stage was to faithfully report, verbatim, the comments made by the individuals and groups attending the events which YPA facilitated. While this report honours that undertaking, in a few cases the comments recorded may have caused offence and therefore these have either been re-worded, whilst still acknowledging the fact that they were made and the numbers of such comments, or where they were clearly not related to planning issues they have been edited out. This in no way affects the substance of this report in planning terms or the weight that it will carry within the context of the planning consultation.
Event 3 – Rawmarsh
23rd July 2009

Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where are you from?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Postcodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkgate/ Rawmarsh</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>S62 5HD, S62 5HG, S62 5QU x 2, S62 5QJ x 2, S62 5PF, S62 5ND, S62 6LR x 22, S62 6LN x 3, S62 6LP, S62 6AP x 7, S62 6HA x 5, S62 6JA x 2, S62 6HT x 4, 1 with no postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Haugh</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>S62 7DT x 4, S62 7LN x 4, S62 7AP x 5, S62 7NL x 2, S62 7AQ, S62 7AJ x 3, S62 7DJ x 4, S62 7LD x 4, 4 with no postcodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greasbrough</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>S61 4NR x 2, S61 4NT x 4, S61 4PL x 2, S61 4PH x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munsbrough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S61 4NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>S61 3QZ, S66 9EH, S64 5RN, S62 7RZ, 2 with no postcodes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

What do you think about today’s event?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- What about those a) at work, b) on holiday c) who don’t know?
Consultation Questions

1. What do you think about the idea of new housing on Bassingthorpe Farm?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Bothered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- XXXX x 2 [NB Potentially offensive language edited out]

2. If you don’t like the idea of housing at Bassingthorpe Farm, WHY don’t you like it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loss of green belt / countryside</th>
<th>83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More traffic problems</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of overcrowded health, school and other facilities</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Crime would go up in all local areas. Fact: More estates, more crime.
- I have grown up looking out of my window at the nature and when I have kids I want them to have the same privilege.
- We are a village; we do not want to be a town.
- NO!!!
- Who will be living in them?
- The value of my home would drop, and the wildlife would no longer be in the area. You have a duty to protect the wildlife.
- Wildlife, pollution.
- It’s mad how money allows you to break rules – no to building on this area.
- Loss of community.
- Loss of green countryside, this leaves Greasbrough with none.
- Loss of countryside – so many houses empty already. Recession to last 20 years. What is the point?
- Lack of privacy, overcrowding, devaluing the PARISH of WENWORTH, the Haughs and individual houses.
- Devalue our homes. Loss of countryside.
- Overcrowded, loss of green belt. Increased affect on global warming due to loss of trees / vegetation, loss of activity area.
- What happens to my property at Munsbrough Lane?
- Opposed to any use of green belt land.
- If we wanted to live in an overcrowded area we’d live in the city!
- Rotherham would be totally dead if it wasn’t for its scenery and GREEN BELT LAND. If you take that, you take the only thing left.
- The area will become unsustainable. It is bad enough as it is at this time.
- What impact will there be on the community and environment?
- Where are people going to go for recreation? What happens to the wildlife?
- Loss of countryside and wildlife.
- Who is the housing for? Local population falling – unemployment rate up.
- This must not happen.
- There are 7 golf courses in Rotherham to facilitate 1 section of society. This proposal facilitates at least 9 sections of society. Why not build on Park Golf Course?
- Loss of green belt.
- Loss of food production from viable farmland.
- Loss of open space near to town centre and lack of green area and views from town.
- Creates urban sprawl.
- Why build more houses. Plenty of boarded up ones in Borough.
- Loss of countryside and it would disrupt wildlife. I would like to live in an area that is calm and be proud to bring up my children in this area.
3. If housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what would you like to see happen to lessen the impact of development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New green space with facilities that would be shared with surrounding communities (e.g. trim trails, rangers, café, play areas/pitches)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New wildlife habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection/improvement of local wildlife sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedgerows retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New planting to enhance local landscape features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green corridors linking communities with open countryside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- Only use brown land x 3
- Please leave this space for future generations.
- We are OK as we are.
- Leave it alone x 6
- Please just leave everything as it is.
- New wildlife habitat? You plan to destroy existing ones!
- How are hedgerows going to be saved? x 2
- How? x 2
- No action about plans. Leave the land alone.
- The countryside IS the local wildlife site. Building houses will destroy it not protect it!
- Leave the green belt alone x 3
- Don’t want it at any price – but if forced on us, sack all Rotherham Council leaders and charge them with treason.
- We who live here? Like the area untouched.
- Wildlife already in decline and you want to destroy the current habitat x 2
- I have lived in Greasbrough 23 years and wildlife is on decline.
- If you don’t destroy the current habitats you won’t have to create new ones x 2
- Nothing – I would like my children to grow up in a natural environment.
- What about the wildlife at Parkgate? We have swallows every year and all the other species. This is out of the question!
- All previous green belt land has been used already. Kimberworth, part of Wingfield, Munsbrough and Rockingham. It's wrong to take it all.
- Just don’t build. We already have enough shoddy housing estates.
- It’s not required.
- We don’t want the plans to go through.
- Wildlife in decline. Survey through RSPB.
- We don’t want or need any houses. Leave our green belt alone.
- Where will you find green space facilities x 2
- Do not take the green space we have now, then there will be no need to find new green space.
- Why ask for our opinion? We are only pawns on a chess board. In the end you will do what you like.
- Make all councillors live there.
- Please leave green belt alone x 2
- Leave it as it is. The wildlife flourishes quite well on its own.
- Only build on brown land. Rotherham has a lot.
- Wildlife under threat. Enough is enough. No more houses leave some countryside.
- What countryside will be left? x 3
- Not now, not ever. We don’t want it x 2
- The only way to lessen the impact is not to build these unnecessary buildings.
- There is nothing in this for us, only the ‘developers’.
- We would loose so much. What about brownfield sites?
- We won’t have any countryside left if you keep building on it.
- Don’t destroy! Then there won’t be any need for new planting!
4. If housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, on which part of the green belt should they go?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next to Masbrough/Thorne Hill/ Henley Rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next to Munsbrough/Greasbrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next to Parkgate/Rawmarsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next to Upper Haugh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- Nowhere – keep the green belt.
- None of it – this is not housing for Rotherham people. Population is static.
- Save our countryside – no more homes wanted or needed.
- Farming land is not to be used.
- Leave the green belt alone. Not enough space as it is x 2
- We want green belt land.
- Nowhere.
- We don’t want it anywhere x 5
- No new homes in this area.
- None at all, we have enough already.
- None x 7
- It should not go through.
- Loss of value of homes x 2
- Loss of views of countryside.
- There is enough brown land in Rotherham. Say no to building on green belt.
- There should not be any more housing built as we have many empty properties in the Borough.
- No to all 4 – try Canklow.
- None – don’t want the plans at all.
- None – use brownfield sites x 4
- Parkgate has already had its fair share of development.
- None – we want more green belt not less!!
- Loss of green belt, affect on wildlife. [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
- No to any development. Try other brownfield sites.
- Green belt should not be released for development.
- Nowhere to the west of Parkgate and Rawmarsh and east of Greasbrough.
- Let our kid’s life be free NOT in housing estate.
- None – green belt only.
- None – leave it as it is.
- No to green belt sell off – save the planet for future generations.
- Identify all empty properties in the borough and put them to use.

5. If housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what’s the biggest number of new homes you’d want to see built?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 – 3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 – 2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**
- None x 19
- No to new houses x 8
- None – no need for them.
- None – it is green belt.
- None – we are in a population decline.
- None anywhere.
- Save our green belt. [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
• None anywhere on Bassingthorpe Farm area.
• None – who are they for? [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
• None – use the brown sites.
• None at all x 2
• None – there is a huge surplus of empty homes in Rotherham.
• Finish all part built houses first – Dearne Valley.
• None at all, ever x 4

6. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what sort of tenure should the new homes be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private for sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable for sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council (2010) rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Assoc rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• Use the empty houses in Rotherham first.
• We don’t want them.
• None – we have a full quota.
• None x 7
• We don’t want any new homes.
• Do not build.
• Refurbish existing empty housing. It will be cheaper.
• The day you build is the day we move on to the fields in tents.
• No tenure required or necessary.
• What is affordable housing?
• Refurbish housing stock already empty.

7. How would you like any new homes to be designed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Like existing homes around Bassingthorpe Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern ‘eco–homes’ which fit with the environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• None x 3
• They are not wanted at all.
• Not wanted.
• Far away from here.
• With the same consideration as towards its rate payers.
• Don’t need new homes. Can’t fill the flats now.
• Any development should be in existing industry.
• Available funds should be used to improve existing housing stock.
• Take a hike to the ‘Eco’ homes by the quarry and draw your own conclusions.
• Do not want any.
• Don’t bother. Leave well alone.
• Do not do x 2
• Housing Association. Private developers do NOT build to the required council standard.
• Invisibly!!
• They are not necessary or required.
• Do not build.
• Do not want any new homes.
8. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, would you or any of your family like to live in one of the new homes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- You must be joking.
- No, quite happy at Greasbrough. If it goes through we move.
- Leave well alone.
- I live in a nice home that we bought 3 years ago, next to these proposed plans. We bought the house because it was near the fields not in the middle of an estate.
- No, we are happy in Rawmarsh surrounded by green belt.
- No, fix the ones that already exist.
- You have to be joking. Get a life. Get a real job. Think about it.
- No we’re happy as we are.

9. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what new community facilities would you like to see to make it a good place to live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small park/play areas</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural green space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Do not build on the green belt.
- Leave it alone x 2
- I like where I live, as it is now – and chose to live here because of the countryside.
- Green spaces i.e. green belt.
- No x 2
- If it has to go ahead we need ROADS. It is too congested already in Parkgate area. SCHOOLS – over-subscribed already. Decent playground for children.
- Leave green belt alone x 3
- No – the High Street now is a ghost town.
- No not required.
- What will happen to the water supply?
- Think of global warming.
- It’s already a good place to live. Please don’t change it!!
- If these unnecessary proposals go through, the area will no longer be worth living in.
- We think this is disgusting. Keep our green belt land.
- We have schools now for our needs. We want our green belt land.
- A mess has been made of Rotherham town centre. Now it’s the turn of outlying areas!

10. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what transport improvements would you like to see to make it a good place to live?

| New access road to the town centre to the north of the borough | 2 |
| Better bus links |   |
| New cycle links, footpaths & bridleways | 3 |

Comments:
- Too built up to be a good place to live if you get your way.
• No chance.
• The roads are a joke now, so if this goes ahead it would be 10 times worse. Improve what we have now.
• It already has good footpaths and bridleways through beautiful countryside. Leave it alone.
• No. Who would use these facilities without green belt?
• Traffic is bad enough as it is – never mind all the pollution more cars will cause
• Where is the money coming from for the infrastructure?
• Are you having a laugh? Have you seen the state of the existing roads?
• Motorway to Sheffield so we can move there quicker. If we have to live in urban sprawl might as well live there.
• No (to better bus links).
• Helicopter pad for us, because we wouldn’t be able to move for the gridlocked traffic.
• We’ve been waiting for an upgrade to Rawmarsh Hill / Broad Street for the last 30 years.
• We can’t get out now without more traffic to block us in.
• Parkgate already gridlocked due to shopping centre. We do not need more traffic.
• Road links are inadequate at present without more traffic.
• Too much traffic. We in Rawmarsh need a Helicopter to get out as it is.
• Too much traffic in Greasbrough leading to Rawmarsh and Nether Haugh. Go away.
• No more buses or access required.
• No matter what transport improvements are mooted, the infrastructure, particularly roads, cannot support them …. Unless of course you want to knock down HOUSES to do it!!!

11. Would you like to see new local businesses and jobs along with any new homes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• Not on green belt x 2
• This is a loaded question.
• What new business & jobs?
• Jobs for whom?
• What jobs?  [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
• No new homes. Jobs for the current unemployed.
• Parkgate and the surrounding areas have been over developed already.
• Not enough jobs for the current population.
• Cannot attract new businesses into the area.
• We already have empty buildings on Rawmarsh Hill.
• Yes, plenty of empty shops in Rotherham Town Centre.
• No x 2
• No more development.
• No, not on green belt land!!
• We don’t want new businesses if we lose green belt.
• Where are the jobs going to be found? The whole area is overcrowded.
• Who will provide the jobs for all these proposed people? Stop it all.

12. How should any new community facilities be provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As an extension/improvement to existing</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a new centre in a new settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• Not required. Do up the ones we have.
• Can’t afford? We’ve got enough.
• None needed. Improve those we have.
• Don’t need and don’t want.
• Not needed x 2
• Leave well alone.
• We have all we require.
• Not required x 5
• Facilities are below standard for existing residents.
• Do not need it.
• None of this is needed.
• Not required at all.
• None of this is required.

Further Comments

• No to the whole idea x 2
• Should local people have been consulted before applying for special status to build these houses? There has been no consultation for this process.
• Is Labour doing as much damage as it can before it’s kicked out of power?
• Meeting organised when most people are at work (that’s if you’ve got a job) and others are on holiday. How convenient. Build houses on your own doorsteps!!!
• Are we Rotherham urban area? 7,237 homes over my dead corpse!
• What about Rawmarsh?
• I would agree to a deep lake and fully encase all the councillors and planners responsible for these atrocious plans. Please note well – I mean it!
• If we are a declining population why do we need 24,500 new homes? Leave us alone
• What a complete waste of time. Where are all the councillors? Spending their expenses money!!!
• Exactly. This will start a civil war.
• Fed up with Rotherham Councillors repeated dictatorship – (From a former staunch Labour voter – now ex-Labour).
• Why have Rotherham Council ever considered using all this green belt and agricultural land?
• It is impossible to communicate at this event. The plan seems like empire building for our masters.
• [NB 1 comment that could be perceived as political electioneering was also made].
• Representatives of the local Council were unable to answer questions asked of them by members of the local community. Avoidance strategies and shoulder shrugging were a regular occurrence. How are the local community supposed to know what is going to happen if Council representatives present meetings without preparation! As for building houses on our local countryside, I think this would cause many more problems than it would solve! LEAVE WELL ALONE!!!
• Why are you putting concrete all over this green land?
• Fields are more likely to flood specifically CINDER BRIDGE!
• Two years ago when floods were rife the fields flooded at the bottom of Cinder Bridge and my son was unable to get back to Rawmarsh.
Notes on the Frequently Asked Questions Sheets

Q. Why do we need more housing?
   
   Note: Show us the research that has / or hasn’t been done!
   Note: Why has the number here [24,500] gone up to 34,000 on the council website?

Q. Isn’t a lot of this land Green Belt?
   A. To meet the housing target set by the Government we will need to change the
      Green Belt boundary to build new houses and employment opportunities.
      
      Note: Rubbish, there are plenty of brown field sites x 3
      Note: Tell the Government to stick its mysterious targets somewhere dark!

Q. Why are we looking on Green Belt land?
   
   Note: Sheffield refuses to build on Green Belt. Why are we even thinking of it!!
   Note: Try again looking on brown belt.
   Note: If you keep building on our farm land how will we feed all these people newly housed here!!
   Note: If you build on the green belt there will be less drainage for the current rainfall and increase flood
      risk.
   Note: The sewage systems fail now!!
   Note: I’m 75 years old. Don’t try and kid me. It will flood.

Q. Why aren’t you building on old industrial sites?
   
   Note: Ha ha ha. So they want to build on Greasbrough flood plain instead.
   Note: Houses are being built next to business & industry sites already, you say to help security. Tide
      turns when it suits eh!!
   Note: There are lots of empty un-let industry and business units already??
   Note: Greasbrough, Ings & Cinder Bridge are flood areas.
   Note: Flood risk around Cinder Bridge. Why is this in your proposals?
   Note: What about floods?
   Note: Use Corus site.
   Note: Greenfield sites are liable to flood as well e.g. Stubbin.
   Note: Because what you are doing is XXXX. [NB Potentially offensive language edited out]

Q. What about flooding?
   
   Note: Unacceptable risk – exactly – fields around Cinder Bridge!!
   Note: Why suggest (canal?) site at THE WHINS and Parkgate if you have read maps??

Q. Who will build the houses?
   
   Note: Fat pockets.
   Note: Who can afford to buy them?
   Note: What about all the empty council houses? What about empty flats and recently built property?
   Note: 3,000 properties empty in Rotherham at any one time.
   Note: Use the empty Munsbrough flats.

Q. Has this already been decided?
   
   A. No
   
   Note: That is a lie, and if you are honest you would admit it.
   Note: I bet.
   Note: Liars.
   Note: Of course, corrupt politicians and the like, disgusting.
   Note: Will the consultations later this year / early next be publicised earlier and more than these
      meetings??
   Note: Be specific what sites you mean, not just general.
Q. Why weren’t we told about this before?
A. The consultation has been running since 29th May and has been publicised in the local press.

Note: In small print!!!
Note: No one knew about this until the end of June.
Note: It was not publicised.
Note: It has never been publicised in any papers.
Note: Does what we say really matter? Because you'll do it anyway, same as that slum Munsbrough. Greasbrough will then be the same. Houses full of drug takers and dealers. We don’t want it. /NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made/

General Points
- We don’t want your XXXXXX buildings /[NB potentially offensive language edited out] /
- No, no, no building on the green belt.
- Have you looked at sites around Thurcroft, Dinnington & Thrybergh / Hooton Roberts?
- Let Sheffield and other areas take care of themselves, we don’t want this housing project!
- Rotherham is already failing in Government clean air commitment how would increase in housing & carbon, & traffic etc help?! x 3
- You do not need this land.
- What about effect on already overburdened healthcare?
- What about the increase in numbers in the classrooms this will create?
- No to bigger schools. Small is beautiful.
- Rubbish, don’t want it. Leave Greasbrough alone.
- Greasbrough is named in the Domesday book. All you will do is destroy it.
- They already have destroyed it 40 years ago when they started Wingfield. NO MORE.
- Keep Britain farming.
Consultation Report
Bassingthorpe Farm Development Consultations

Date of Event: 25\textsuperscript{th} July 2009
Venue of Event: Greasbrough
Event Format: Drop-in Sessions
Total No. of Attendees: 490
Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA) is part of a network of services run by the Royal Town Planning Institute, a registered charity. YPA offers free, independent and professional planning advice to community groups and individuals who cannot afford to pay professional fees.

YPA also helps people to understand and engage with the planning system through its community planning work. This support can be provided through workshops, information and interactive drop-in sessions, or formal training events, all of which are tailored to the local planning issues and/or local communities involved.

The activities undertaken by YPA are not part of central or local government but are an independent source of advice and information which complement the work of local councils.

YPA’S COMMUNITY PLANNING WORK

YPA aims to work in the Local Authorities which are in the top ten most deprived Local Authorities in Yorkshire and the Humber according to the ODPM Indices of Deprivation 2007, and within the Super Output Areas in the Region which fall in the most deprived 20% in England (i.e. those that rank between 1 and 6,496 on the IMD ranking).

YPA will also prioritise opportunities to work in areas which are covered by regeneration programmes, or in areas where we have identified key planning issues which provide a timely opportunity for community planning activity.

In recognition of the fact that some areas of need are missed by the IMD process, we will also take guidance from partner agencies as to recommended priority areas and groups.

YPA also aims to work with disadvantaged groups, in line with the definition in the National Planning Aid Delivery Plan, as outlined below.

---

7 Hull, Bradford, Doncaster, Barnsley North East Lincolnshire, Sheffield, Wakefield, Rotherham, Kirklees, Leeds
8 People on low incomes; unemployed people; minority ethnic communities; women’s groups; disabled people and disability groups; older people; children and young people; tenants groups; community groups and voluntary organisations.
YPA’S INVOLVEMENT WITHIN ROTHERHAM AND WITH THE ROTHERHAM CORE STRATEGY

Within the context of Rotherham’s position amongst the top ten most deprived authorities in the Region, YPA approached Rotherham MBC Planning and Regeneration Service at an early stage of the Council’s Local Development Framework programme and offered assistance, in relation to the engagement of those priority areas, communities and groups detailed above.

YPA’s work in relation to the current consultation stage of the Rotherham Core Strategy falls within the context of this general approach. In line with this and available resources/capacity, YPA’s work has focussed on eligible communities around the proposed Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension, Rotherham Youth Forum, Rotherfed and Rotherham’s black and minority ethnic communities.

YPA’s undertaking at the outset of this Core Strategy consultation stage was to faithfully report, verbatim, the comments made by the individuals and groups attending the events which YPA facilitated. While this report honours that undertaking, in a few cases the comments recorded may have caused offence and therefore these have either been re-worded, whilst still acknowledging the fact that they were made and the numbers of such comments, or where they were clearly not related to planning issues they have been edited out. This in no way affects the substance of this report in planning terms or the weight that it will carry within the context of the planning consultation.
### Event 4 – Greasbrough
#### 25th July 2009

## Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>248</strong></td>
<td><strong>242</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Where are you from?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Postcodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Munsbrough</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>S61 4HP x 1 S61 4NT x 4 S61 4QT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4HT x 2 S61 4NW x 1 S61 4QY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4NJ x 2 S61 4OB x 3 S61 4RG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4NL x 2 S61 4OE x 2 S61 4RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4NR x 2 S61 4OF x 4 2 with no postcodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greasbrough</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>S61 3DB x 2 S61 4ES x 6 S61 4PJ x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4AS x 2 S61 4ET x 2 S61 4PL x 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4BA x 2 S61 4EU x 1 S61 4PN x 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4BX x 2 S61 4EX x 3 S61 4PR x 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4DG x 2 S61 4JF x 2 S61 4PT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4DL x 2 S61 4JG x 5 S61 4PU x 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4DQ x 2 S61 4JQ x 4 S61 4PW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4DS x 2 S61 4ND x 2 S61 4PX x 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4DX x 18 S61 4NG x 10 S61 4PY x 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4EA x 4 S61 4NR x 41 S61 4PZ x 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4EB x 2 S61 4NS x 10 S61 4QA x 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4ED x 7 S61 4NT x 32 S61 4QF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4EE x 2 S61 4NX x 32 S61 4QJR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4EF x 6 S61 4PA x 3 S61 4QR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4EG x 4 S61 4PB x 10 S61 4QW x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4EH x 3 S61 4PD x 1 S61 4RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4EJ x 2 S61 4PE x 7 S61 4RH x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4EL x 2 S61 4PF x 16 S61 4RR x 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4EN x 2 S61 4PG x 4 S61 4RS x 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 4ER x 2 S61 4PH x 17 8 with no postcodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Haugh</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>S62 7AN x 1 S62 7FF x 1 S62 7RY x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S62 7AR x 1 S62 7NP x 1 S62 7SJ x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkgate / Rawmarsh</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>S62 5HH x 1 S62 6HR x 1 S62 6LR x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S62 5LP x 2 S62 6HY x 2 S62 7AJ x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S62 5NL x 2 S62 6HZ x 2 S62 7BD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S62 6HA x 2 S62 6LJ x 1 1 with no postcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nether Haugh</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>S62 7RS x 9 S62 8ER x 9 S62 9JS x 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masbrough</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>S61 1JD x 1 S61 1SG x 2 2 with no postcodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 1RY x 1 S61 1TP x 1 S61 1SU x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>S60 4GB x 2 S61 2RR x 1 S61 3SU x 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S60 4LQ x 2 S61 3EN x 1 S61 3SY x 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 1JH x 1 S61 3EP x 1 S61 4AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 1JY x 1 S61 3ET x 5 S61 4AS x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 1LD x 2 S61 3HE x 2 S61 4BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S61 1LQ x 2 S61 3HT x 3 S61 4BQ x 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation

What do you think about today’s event?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Good 23</th>
<th>OK 28</th>
<th>Bad 149</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face painting was brill!</td>
<td>In theory – good event, in fact – questions made assumptions – not good.</td>
<td>Consult &amp; listen – don’t ignore us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If they take notice of all the stickers.</td>
<td>The man is annoying.</td>
<td>Not enough information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it works.</td>
<td>Not given enough notice.</td>
<td>Where are the council people?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope the planners read the notes.</td>
<td>This was just an exercise in letting the community think they have a say. The council will do what it wants as usual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A map would have been useful.</td>
<td>Very poor consultation event – Venue too small, no parking for non – Greasbrough residents, not enough officers to explain things, too many yes &amp; no answers. Core Strategy response form worse than useless without supporting information. Needed an opportunity to speak and be heard. Needed presentation of the options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Just what I expected – rubbish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where was a representative from council?? Too scared!!! Does the meeting make any difference??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not what I thought.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rubbish – need a speaker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will the council listen to all the views written down?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Badly publicised x 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council is rubbish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No spokesperson to talk properly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not been able to talk to anyone x 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A token exercise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Load of tripe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not organised well enough for number of people wanting to give their opinion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not telling us anything.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Just spin exercise x 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No answers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We need a public meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not well organised – at least thanks to Mike Dando – having the bottle to turn up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why did you pick the main holiday weeks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waste of time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should have been done sooner and properly promoted. Bigger venue needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where were the official councillors? x 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not enough information – no spokesperson.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We need to be told officially what’s happening, not from the newspaper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  |  | Rubbish x 3 – very little consultation. No-one can answer my
Consultation Questions

1. What do you think about the idea of new housing on Bassingthorpe Farm?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Not Bothered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>487</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. If you don’t like the idea of housing at Bassingthorpe Farm, WHY don’t you like it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of green belt / countryside</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More traffic problems</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of overcrowded health, school and other facilities</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of flooding and risk to environment</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- Risk of flooding on Cinder Bridge Scheme.
- Loss of identity of local communities e.g. Greasbrough, Wingfield, Rawmarsh all becoming one.
- What about floods?
- What about crime rates. They will rise!
- What are we leaving our children and grandchildren? Shameful!
- No public consultation & totally unnecessary.
- Don’t want to walk in a concrete jungle!
- We will lose our local farm & wildlife.
- Loss of wildlife and walks, most of land at Bassingthorpe, open cast mining.
- Development prevents rainwater into land – no soil left. Already marsh land.
- Will destroy village life and wildlife habitat.
- Misuse of housing already in situ.
- Loss of village feel, countryside walks and recreation.
- What about infrastructure – rail links, links to all services? x 3
- Where will the beautiful wildlife go to live?
- Loss of habitat for wildlife.
- Lots of other land in other areas could be used instead.
- Loss of beauty for artists and photographers.
- If we wanted to live in an overcrowded concrete jungle we’d have moved to a new estate, not a beautiful village on the edge of countryside!!

3. If housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what would you like to see happen to lessen the impact of development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New green space with facilities that would be shared with surrounding communities (e.g. trim trails, rangers, café, play areas/pitches)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New wildlife habitats</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection/improvement of local wildlife sites</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedgerows retained</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New planting to enhance local landscape features</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green corridors linking communities with open countryside</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- By not building. The loss of countryside will be a disaster.
• Do not build and save our wildlife / countryside.
• If we don’t build more houses. We don’t need to build all these things – unless you say that the existing communities need them anyway – in which case, build these facilities now.
• We already have the green spaces – protect what we have.
• It’s the green corridors you are planning to build on.
• How do you create new habitats inside 3,600 houses?
• Exactly. Protect what we have.
• Yes! Hedgerows and fields in between.
• We already have all these, so why spoil it?
• Keep our green belt. Use windfall option.
• No development x 29
• It must not happen.
• What are we going to leave our children? If you get your way NOTHING.
• [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
• All leading questions!
• Don’t build x 3
• Leave us alone x 2
• How does it benefit the area?
• Leave the area as it is.
• Not on green belt.
• No development on green belt. These measures will be just window dressing. Damage would be done.
• No x 2
• Lack of drainage. Will flood as well.
• Happy with what we have x 2
• Don’t want this outrage imposed on us.
• We don’t want development. Think of the environment and carbon footprint.
• We wouldn’t have had this problem if you hadn’t sold all the council houses.
• Nothing would save the beautiful countryside. We don’t want it.
• Protect what we have. Once it’s gone it’s gone.
• Leave the existing wildlife alone x 4
• No to development. No private builds.
• No housing would lessen the impact – all councillors resign x 2
• Don’t build – preserve what we’ve got x 6
• Leave Greasbrough alone – we’ve got Munsborough, Rockingham and Wingfield – is that not enough?
• None – we are happy with what we have x 3
• To see that the houses AREN’T BUILT. This is the only meaningful way to lessen any impact x 2
• Earthquake x 3
• Flood.
• Happy with present countryside.
• None it will end up as a slum area x 3
• Please don’t build.
• Wildlife exists better without houses and people – leave it alone, build on brownfield sites
• There will be no countryside left x 4
• Nothing would lessen the impact x 6
• Rubbish – Cannot replace countryside.
• No development – leave our countryside alone x 5
• Leave everything as it is – No need for change x 2
• We already have green space, green corridors, wildlife habitats and hedgerows.
• Nothing can lessen the impact – how can you preserve anything with new housing development? x 5
• Leave everything as it is now. Put Bassingthorpe to bed. Permanently x 6
• Just don’t build x 3
• No need. Just save as much green belt as possible. Build elsewhere.
• Nothing can be done – the impact is turning Greasbrough into a housing estate.
• What sort of housing? Who will pay for it?
• All 3 councillors get the sack.
• The development should not go through. None of this is needed. It is already there!
• Look after green belt and wildlife and [NB I potentially racist comment removed] look after the old. Need more youth clubs.
• Just leave the countryside alone x 3
• Would not need to invest anything if green belt is retained!
• New green belt put in place.
• None – don’t build it!
• No development, no buildings, leave it alone.
• Schools, GPs, dentists, roads ….. Where will it end?
• None of these are required if you don’t build.
• It should not happen. Question should be irrelevant.
• Leave everything untouched.
• Do you think we are daft? One big con.
• Nothing would lessen the impact, some would cause more problems, trouble spots with teenagers x 2

4. If housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, on which part of the green belt should they go?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next to Masbrough/Thorne Hill/ Henley Rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next to Munsbrough / Greasbrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next to Parkgate / Rawmarsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next to Upper Haugh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• No green belt land! No.
• Save the green belt.
• There should not be any building on green belt. Therefore the question is irrelevant.
• Strong objection to massive developments on green belt land.
• Keep it green for our children to enjoy as we had it. Greasbrough is a village!!
• Please, please, please do not destroy our green belt. There’s not enough of it as it is – Please don’t take away what little we have.
• Green belt stays. What else are you going to take?
• They shouldn’t go on any green belt land.
• None on green belt x 13
• None at all – use brown belt not green belt!!
• None at all – Green belt is sacred.
• None – Don’t spoil the countryside.
• None – not needed! The beauty of the area will be gone for good!
• Leave the green belt alone or we will have none left.
• None – why is it called green belt!! Use brown belt land.
• Do we need new builds? Renovate the empty properties.
• What a question! Talk about divide and weaken!
• Divide & conquer – Green means green – find another way!
• Not on any green belt x 6
• None – Leave it alone. The wildlife need somewhere to live too x 4
• None – Stop destroying the environment and this country x 2
• Do not destroy wildlife.
• Keep green belt green. Use brown belt.
• None on green belt near Greasbrough – brown field first – sites more balanced.
• Build anywhere but not near S61 4NF.
• No need for any x 2
• Just try it.
• Strongly no x 2
• We don’t want any.
• None – This project is NOT wanted and no need for this. Fill up other houses first.
• None – Leave it green x 2
• None – I like fields & space
• None at all. Keep the green belt green x 7
• None at all x 75
• None at all. Plenty of empty houses in Rotherham x 14
• None at all. Fill the empty houses x 13
• None – use brownfield sites Corus etc. Think of carbon footprint of 35,000 new homes.
• None – use brownfield sites. Fill the empty council houses first.
• None – we do not want to live in a concrete jungle.
• None – Use brown belt and empty production units.
• None – where’s the concern for existing home owners?
• None you idiots – we want our picnic area. Don’t take our play grounds for kids.
• No to green belt development – There are plenty of brown field sites!
• Leave Greasbrough alone x 2
• Stop prioritising council tenants over home owners.
• None in Greasbrough. Use existing council houses.
• Use brown belt – re-generate housing already there.
• Brown belt land in Sheffield!!
• What about the brownfield land – Corus, Jenkins, Guest & Crimes.
• No where x 2
• No where. Redevelop the empty houses x 6
• No where. Why spoil anywhere?
• No way x 3
• No more building.
• None – Housing already in situ not used to full. Why build more?
• Do not build on any land in area. Not on green belt.
• None at all – Already over populated x 2
• None. Give us a 4th option x 2
• None at all. House prices will drop. More traffic through village that can’t cope.
• Where is the 4th option?
• Why no baseline option?
• Why build on countryside – Greasbrough is a village!
• Not on any of these designated areas x 2
• Build elsewhere not Rotherham, not enough jobs.
• Build on brown belt x 16
• Use brown belt windfall NO way should green belt be used!!
• No to building on green belt. We will lose our identity as a separate village, plus increased traffic congestion.
• Build at Worry Goose to Thurcroft and Thurcroft to Dinnington and Dinnington to Hooton Roberts. Greasbrough has had its share of building with Rockingham, Wingfield & Munsbrough. Enough is enough.
• No need to build on green belt land. More than enough derelict / boarded up houses in need of repair.
• No where here. Build on posh people’s [land]. We’ve had enough. Try Ripon area.
• Calling the proposals Bassingthorpe Farm is misleading
• Somewhere else nearer the concrete jungle not on our beautiful countryside!!!
• [NB 1 comment that could be perceived as political electioneering was also made].
• One of Councillor Stones houses – either one.
• In your back yard RMBC.
• Let’s build them in Roger Stone’s back yard. See if he likes it.
• None – There are plenty of empty houses left. When the green fields, plants, birds, insects & animals are gone, THEY ARE GONE FOR GOOD x 3
• All ex-council houses for sale (current & future) should be bought back by the council – then no new green belt development required.
• No! Clean air act. Increase traffic, loss of green belt, loss of wildlife.
• No – It is an assassination on the farmer, his family, his previous & future generations. I together with the mass attendance of this meeting wholly disapprove of removing agricultural land for development.
• No housing on Bassingthorpe Farm. It is a working farm providing food & cutting carbon footprint. The same family have farmed there for 70 years. Wildlife habitat including many bats – protected species.
• Vast cost to ALL Rotherham rate payers. Cost of paying Fitzwilliam Estates at redevelopment prices not recouped by selling to developers at social housing prices.
• None – get rid of Labour Council who do not represent the people’s wishes.
• Once a green and pleasant land – do not destroy it.
• Build somewhere else, what about nice Tickhill x 2
• I think the idea stinks. We don’t need these houses. [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
• Where are the proposed residents coming from?
• [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
• Flooding so they drown while building.
• Disgrace – Where do you get 70,000 people? This Council needs to be out of office.

5. If housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what’s the biggest number of new homes you’d want to see built?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Homes</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 – 3,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 – 2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1,500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• 3,000 empty houses in Rotherham.
• What ever you can fit on the brown belt.
• None – the area can’t take any more people.
• None - use the brown belt and make improvements x 5
• None on green belt – yes to brown field x 4
• If there is a democratic vote by local people it won’t go ahead x 2
• None – enough is enough.
• None – the wildlife live here too.
• Think of the children – None!

6. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what sort of tenure should the new homes be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Type</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private for sale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable for sale</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private rented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council (2010) rented</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Assoc rented</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• None x 129
• If they must be built then the ‘affordable houses’ should be run by ‘not for profit’ organisations.
• This smells like a done deal to me x 2
• While ever people like Councillor Stone buy their council houses – removing them from Council stock then buy other homes abroad – it’s actions like that, that create the need for all these new houses.
• [NB 1 comment that could be perceived as political electioneering was also made].
• Not in my back yard! x 2
• [next to private rented] – Definitely not! This is selling our green belt for someone else’s profit.
• How can this be sustainable? Bring in industry / employment, raise skills, empower people, give them jobs to buy existing stock – FAR MORE SUSTAINABLE FOR ALL.
• No houses!
• None – We want to keep our green belt!!!
• Tenure should be left as green belt land.
• None – We don’t want to live on an estate.
• No development here.
• No to homes on the green belt x 5
• You are not listening!!
• Ask the wildlife.
• How many more times, no more houses x 2
• None at all. [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
• You’re building on my future children’s heritage! x 2
• None – Labour will never again get my vote.
• Definitely not Council tenants have ruined many communities already.
• [NB 2 comments that could be perceived as political electioneering were also made].
• No choice.
• Absolutely no tenure! You’re having a laugh.
• Our houses will be worthless.
• These ludicrous & unnecessary plans should not go through.
• Don’t spoil it any more x 5
• [NB 1 comment that could be perceived as political electioneering was also made].
• [NB 1 comment that could be perceived as political electioneering was also made].
• It will create a slum x 3
• ‘Council (2010) will not be allowed to build council homes’ says Government rules years ago.

A press release from Balanced Migration 7 July 2009 entitled Migration and Social Housing was attached to the chart. Across was written “RMBC – Please note this!”

7. How would you like any new homes to be designed?

| Like existing homes around Bassingthorpe Farm | Modern ‘eco–homes’ which fit with the environment |

Comments:
• Eco-homes – entirely self sufficient – solar, wind, ground source etc. Anything less is a detriment to what is already there – fields.
• No development here at all.
• Houses are already nice.
• Happy with our homes and open views for children to explore.
• Invisible would be nice i.e. none.
• Brownfield land only x 47
• Brownfield only – You will cause so much ecological damage with this scheme. “Eco” is a misnomer. This would also make them less affordable.
• Design them for brownfield sites.
• To look exactly like untouched green belt land.
• Modernise the ones we’ve got x 2
• Away from the country!
• No new homes x 34
• Have to fit in with existing property.
• No building to go ahead x 6
• Don’t want any new homes – however nice they might look – green belt looks better.
• We would not like any new homes to be designed.
• Do up the thousands of boarded up properties before even thinking about new builds.
• Don’t you think Greasbrough has had enough in the last 40 years? x 2
• More houses increase carbon footprint and loss of clean air.
• There are enough brownfield sites that should be considered. Leave the green belt alone.
• [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
• No need to ask. “Eco” is far too expensive. Council resources.
• Leave Greasbrough alone – We already have Wingsfield, Rockingham & Munsbrough all built over last 30-40 years on green belt land x 6
• Underground x 4
• Never.
• Fields only – get lost we’ve been kidded enough.
• Leave it as it is x 3
• Forget it x 2
• How “eco” is building 24,000 houses? You hypocrite.
• Stop deflecting.
• No green belt development x 3
• Did anyone ask the wildlife x 3
• As long as they’re built on brown land – you can decide – but no high blocks of flats to increase
drug problems.

8. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, would you or any of your
family like to live in one of the new homes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• Not a chance – You will have already destroyed why I wanted to live here!
• Absolutely not
• Don’t be daft x 2
• No thank you x 6
• Never x 20
• I’ve recently been working in Beeston in Leeds. Go and look for yourselves – It’s terrifying.
• No leave things alone.
• Who wants to live on what will become yet another sink estate?
• What about the 3,000 empty properties now?
• No another Munsbrough!
• I have worked hard to buy my house – others shouldn’t get freebies!
• Yes, if it has all the fantastic facilities you are suggesting – If not, I’ve already got them – so who
would down grade?
• Would like to stay in current home but you will spoil it if you build here!
• Think of fall out area at pylons and damage to wildlife.
• No thank you. Would we be given the opportunity anyway?
• Never ever – concrete jungle full of scruffs!
• Where are our children supposed to play! (Who wants to live in an urban sprawl?)
• No – that’s why I bought my house.
• [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
• I have a nice house to live in – in a village – Greasbrough x 3
• It will not go through. All the public are against the plans.
• You have to be having a laugh. Would you live in there? I don’t think so.
• Why build new houses on green belt? Rotherham Council should to listen to their voters.
• No. Leave us to our green fields.
• Never! If we wanted to live on an estate we would go and live in the cities! IDIOTS! x 2
• Leave this village alone.
• No – this is not for local people. [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also
made]
• [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made] There is no net economic
benefit to the area.
• No way x 2 – [NB 2 comments relating to issue of economic migration were also made]
• Leave alone x 2
• I have a nice place to live on Munsbrough Lane, so don’t spoil it for us x 2
• We like our OLD houses!
• [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
• Forget it leave it as it is x 6
• I would not like to live on top of a tip, chemical works or major gas pipes.
• If the trees die, we could die.
• No – we’ve got our homes so leave it.
• After we’ve been sold down the river – DEFINITELY NOT.
• No – we would rather move.
• They may flood.
• Could anyone afford them?
• Yes – next to one of our lovely councillors x 3
• Stop deflecting.
• It’s not for Greasbrough people – its for the homeless [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
• The houses are not for LOCAL people. The council will not tell the truth.

9. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what new community facilities would you like to see to make it a good place to live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community centre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small park/play areas</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural green space</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
• Greasbrough School doesn’t need more. It’s great as it is.
• Lived here since I was a lass, no need to change! Save Council resources!
• We don’t need a health centre.
• Try providing these to existing communities because we have NOTHING other than the green belt land which you want to take.
• We are a village.
• No building.
• Wouldn’t need the XXXXXX facilities if you didn’t build on here [NB potentially offensive language edited out]
• Please reject plans to build on the green belt.
• The development will kill our existing small businesses – shops, hairdressers, pubs etc.
• Got it already [Green space] x 2
• A proper swimming pool – the one at St Anne’s is PATHETIC.
• We already have this so leave it as it is [Green space].
• We’ve got green spaces. We enjoy it, leave alone please.
• Don’t develop this area full stop.
• How do you get green space if you want to destroy it by building on it!!!!
• None – no more housing!
• This is what we have now – leave it alone [Green space] x 3
• Another earthquake to flatten it all.
• Think of fall out area from VICKTREX (Laportes).
• Vast improvement needed of existing facilities. Not enough for existing residents.
• Don’t fill a nice village. You have an opportunity to develop a new model village outside the town. Make this your goal! Don’t try to squeeze it in.
• Development of existing facilities. There is no need for a population expansion creating more socio / economic pressures. End this project x 2
• Leave our green space alone.
• None – Greasbrough is already a good place to live. Any further development will detract from this x 6
• It is already a good place to live! x 5
• Leave existing countryside. We’ll lose habitat for bats / owls / swallows etc.
• Greasbrough is great as it is. Please leave it as it is x 2
• I can’t answer this question as it encourages a positive reply!
• No houses – it will be like a concrete jungle with no countryside x 2
• Greasbrough has all these already.
• None – against development.
• Village – The clue is in the name! x 2
• UNITE & FIGHT – Don’t let them get away with this!
• None - do not want any housing plans x 3
• Have we not already got that? [green space] x 2
• How do you create natural green space when you plan to build on it?
• Why bother destroying all the natural landscape, if you plan to rebuild?! STUPID x 2
• Use money to improve what's already in place x 4
• Go away x 2
• Greasbrough is already a great place to live, don't destroy it, don't develop.
• No, no, no to a future ghetto x 2
• How would that be???? There is no money for any facilities now!!!
• No more houses x 4
• Make existing area better for people who already live here. More development will only bring more social problems – we have enough already!
• Will these be private homes? Any bungalows for aging population? I don't think so.
• Judging by the council's previous miserable record – none.
• None – it will ruin it as a place to live.
• None – you are turning us into an urban sprawl x 2
• More facilities for existing community x 2
• This area was a good place to live until RMBC messed it up with their policies.
• We don't need anything – the countryside is enough for our children.
• [1 comment with racist overtones edited out]

10. If the housing plans for Bassingthorpe Farm go through, what transport improvements would you like to see to make it a good place to live?

| New access road to the town centre to the north of the borough |
| Better bus links |
| New cycle links, footpaths & bridleways |

**Comments:**
• Please reject these plans x 3
• We don't want it going through x 2
• Don't do it this end of town. Already developed to the hilt with Munsbrough, Wingfield and Rockingham.
• Spaceship to the moon for the council.
• Just forget it x 2
• None of these links required – Leave the green belt land alone.
• Leave our area alone x 3
• No to all and any building on green belt.
• My daughters live in Australia and New Zealand. Is there any wonder?
• The roads are busy enough without more! x 2
• Less drainage = more flooding.
• Bridleways through what? Industrial estates?
• Bridleways through what? This would not be a nice place for recreation. No one uses the cycle path we have already.
• Leave the green belt as it is then there is no need for new bridleways.
• No to all!
• Save our / the environment and consider reducing pollution. The roads are already busy, more roads is not the solution.
• Global warming anyone?
• What about improving access to Retail World?
• What about re-opening Aldwarke Station with large park & ride?
• What about re-developing brown field sites?
• Super Tram from Meadowhall through Greasbrough corridor onto Swinton.
• If the plans go through [the roads] will be even worse and nothing will prevent that. Leave the place alone.
• Leave our green belt alone x 6
• Have you seen the congestion in Greasbrough in rush hour, during school runs etc?
• Greasbrough is already gridlocked with traffic. Come and look for yourselves! x 3
• Roads are busy already x 28
• Extra transport and traffic would make current conditions intolerable.
• We already have a bus every 15 minutes.
- We have already got a good bus service x 2
- Too many buses already.
- That’s a laugh. No buses now x 3
- Too much traffic now. Don’t build.
- Leave it alone. Transport is OK. x 2
- Transport is adequate, stop obscuring the argument.
- Traffic flow through Parkgate, Greasbrough, Rawmarsh, Nether Haugh already at full capacity. Even a link road would do no good. Leave well alone.
- No, no, no, do not want any of these.
- There won’t be any improvement. Can only get worse.
- How big will our carbon footprint be then?
- This isn’t the correct place for the housing. Why bother with transport – the roads are already rubbish.
- Bassingthorpe would just create more problems x 2
- Why have improved access to the town when Rotherham Council have killed the town centre stone dead?? x 2
- It won’t be a good place to live if this goes ahead. Clean up the Munsbrough estate.
- No new roads – can’t repair the ones in use x 2
- We don’t want the development, so we don’t need a new road.
- No roads. Would rather walk.
- Fine as it is. Loads of paths on unspoilt land – leave it as it is, you will ruin it!
- An increasing population will only create more congestion / oil dependency & carbon emissions!
- The roads are already too busy, even with new access roads all the traffic will still bottleneck in Greasbrough x 3
- Big car parks.
- We love it as it is!
- We’ve already got what we need.
- Check roads at peak times – too much traffic now x 2
- It will not be a good place to live – do not build, just look at the mess on the Munsbrough estate x 2
- No wonder my beautiful 23 year old son is off to Australia!!
- Have you seen the traffic? It’s killing our village already!
- 75% of all new homes will be on benefit.
- New houses not required. Council buy up empty houses and rent them out.
- We need improvements now, not more people x 2
- Find other sites in areas around Rotherham towards Thurcroft & Dinnington NOT Greasbrough
- We like it how it is. Why take the green belt?
- We want our parks to stay! x 3
- Green spaces should be left all around Greasbrough so it remains a village and wildlife is preserved
- No – Roads are too crowded now. Parkgate, Greasbrough & Masbrough.
- Why not regenerate and tidy up the many brownfield sites that are in Rotherham, instead of destroying what little green belt that is left for us and our children.
- The infrastructure as it is can’t cope. Get real. And use some common sense for once.
- No development means no more roads needed.
- Don’t be stupid. There are enough cars and buses already.
- More speed cameras.
- Better roads.
- By pass away from built up areas.
- Rotherham Council needs to listen. We do not want it!! x 5
- They are not currently needed. No need for bus routes. It’s cheaper by car or bike.
- How can more roads make it a good place to live?
- No new roads.
- Total rejection – too much congestion already.
11. Would you like to see new local businesses and jobs along with any new homes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

- Use existing empty shops and factory units first!
- Get real – haven’t you heard of Corus etc? x 3
- Rotherham can’t attract new business or retain existing ones as it is.
- No, waste of time.
- No – Leave well alone x 2
- None – enough is enough.
- What would be the point of new development without businesses or jobs?
- There are already empty units.
- No – Closed businesses in town. Use your brains x 2
- No – Use brownfield sites – Rotherham full of empty shops x 2
- Rotherham businesses closing. Use those premises for new ones.
- How about helping the existing businesses? x 4
- Nothing at all on green belt land x 8
- Forget it – We want nothing on green belt.
- Leave our green belt alone x 3
- No businesses on green belt x 8
- Yes in town centre, not green belt x 2
- I live in the real world. This won’t happen – stop dreaming x 3
- Businesses are needed but should be on brownfield sites. In view of the recession there is no shortage of these.
- Who would open a business here?
- The people that will be re-housed here will probably not want a job!
- Brown land to be used x 2
- There is no employment for all these new people!
- There still won’t be enough jobs, no one is employing anybody x 2
- We’d like to see new jobs for people in existing homes.
- This is a load of spin!!
- No – this is not helpful – the planning needs to be more balanced.
- Forget houses & shops – leave us alone.
- We have enough local shops and businesses. We don’t need more.
- Obscuring the argument!
- Stop deflecting.
- No – more homes will create pollution x 2
- [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
- Why not just businesses for the current unemployed first?
- Think about existing businesses – Why don’t you help them? We have enough unemployed people already.
- No new homes wanted full stop x 2
- We don’t need this development to create jobs!
- What jobs? What about Corus, Toyoda Gosei, Burberry? x 2
- Who would invest in the area? Rotherham has already been killed. Please save what is left! x 2
- What new firms, what new jobs? Numerous old firms in decline x 2
- Don’t want more Council tenants in Greasbrough.
- Keep the multi-culture as it is. We have had enough x 2
- [NB 1 comment that could be perceived as political electioneering was also made].
- Leave Greasbrough as it is.
- The residents of those new homes will need jobs also. Won’t help us already here!
- Not another B & Q warehouse.
- We are surrounded by supermarkets. We’ve got enough kebab shops and takeaways. [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
12. How should any new community facilities be provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As an extension/improvement to existing</th>
<th>As a new centre in a new settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Comments:**

- Community facilities should be provided by making best use of existing ones i.e. upgrading and bringing into use empty brownfield sites.
- Don’t need any – we in Greasbrough are a community because we are a small village.
- Use existing only x 3
- No building at all x 8
- No development x 34
- No development – there will be no money for new community facilities! x 3
- We do not want any more facilities.
- Don’t want it.
- Not necessary x 2
- Not interested in new facilities – need money balanced planning.
- Leave our Greasbrough alone.
- Fine as it is – leave it alone x 3
- No housing – where is the money for a centre coming from?
- Leave countryside and farmland alone.
- The farm is a business – leave it alone.
- Need to develop on brownfield sites first and spread any development over a wide range of sites. New facilities are not helpful.
- Use brownfield sites x 9
- Build on old factory sites x 3
- Better use of existing housing stock.
- Ours is adequate – we all have a sense of community we don’t need anything else.
- If it’s not broke don’t fix it x 2
- Improve what we have already. Clean up Munsbrough and make that a better place to live for families – stop putting drug addicts in the flats.
- Why the hell are you trying to ruin our lives and health? Derrrrrr....
- None needed – use brown belt.
- Leave the area as it is.
- Use the brown belt – there’s still plenty!!!
- None – You say people want to live in Greasbrough – It won’t be Greasbrough any more [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
- Can’t trust corner shop keepers.
- You are going to kill us by taking away the trees.
- Bring in the business and employment. People will then buy the existing houses or create a demand then.
- Provide for the people that already live here, not any more.
- More community facilities, but no housing development.
- If I wanted to live in a Sheffield tower block I would have moved there!
- No need for them. Keep them in Sheffield x 2
- Too many already.
- No housing. Use vacant properties that are empty. Fill Barbot Hall for business x 3
- Stop deflecting!
- You should be regenerating existing developments and not building on green belt! x 3
- Why not just sort out the existing community facilities rather than destroying them too x 4
- Why not improve existing facilities first!
- Improve the run down area which already exists!
- No further facilities needed!
- No facilities need to be provided, no new community needed or wanted. No to development.
- Provide them in existing communities that need them now but aren’t getting them. NOT HERE!
- By not building the proposed new development.
Notes on the Frequently Asked Questions Sheets

Q. Why do we need more housing?
Note: Show us the research that has / or hasn’t been done!
Note: Why has the number here [24,500] gone up to 34,000 on the council website?

Q. Isn’t a lot of this land Green Belt?
A. To meet the housing target set by the Government we will need to change the Green Belt boundary to build new houses and employment opportunities.
Note: Rubbish, there are plenty of brown field sites x 3
Note: Tell the Government to stick its mysterious targets somewhere dark!

Q. Why are we looking on Green Belt land?
Note: Sheffield refuses to build on Green Belt. Why are we even thinking of it!!
Note: Try again looking on brown belt.
Note: If you keep building on our farm land how will we feed all these people newly housed here!!
Note: If you build on the green belt there will be less drainage for the current rainfall and increase flood risk.
Note: The sewage systems fail now!!
Note: I’m 75 years old. Don’t try and kid me. It will flood.

Q. Why aren’t you building on old industrial sites?
Note: Ha ha ha. So they want to build on Greasbrough flood plain instead.
Note: Houses are being built next to business & industry sites already, you say to help security. Tide turns when it suits eh!!
Note: There are lots of empty un-let industry and business units already??
Note: Greasbrough, Ings & Cinder Bridge are flood areas.
Note: Flood risk around Cinder Bridge. Why is this in your proposals?
Note: What about floods?
Note: Use Corus site.
Note: Greenfield sites are liable to flood as well e.g. Stubbin.
Note: Because what you are doing is XXXX. [NB Potentially offensive language edited out]

Q. What about flooding?
Note: Unacceptable risk – exactly – fields around Cinder Bridge!!
Note: Why suggest (canal?) site at THE WHINS and Parkgate if you have read maps??

Q. Who will build the houses?
Note: Fat pockets.
Note: Who can afford to buy them?
Note: What about all the empty council houses? What about empty flats and recently built property?
Note: 3,000 properties empty in Rotherham at any one time.
Note: Use the empty Munsbrough flats.

Q. Has this already been decided?
A. No
Note: That is a lie, and if you are honest you would admit it.
Note: I bet.
Note: Liars.
Note: Of course, corrupt politicians and the like, disgusting.
Note: Will the consultations later this year / early next be publicised earlier and more than these meetings??
Note: Be specific what sites you mean, not just general.
Q. Why weren’t we told about this before?
A. The consultation has been running since 29th May and has been publicised in the local press.

Note: In small print!!!
Note: No one knew about this until the end of June.
Note: It was not publicised.
Note: It has never been publicised in any papers.
Note: Does what we say really matter? Because you’ll do it anyway, same as that slum Munsbrough. Greasbrough will then be the same. Houses full of drug takers and dealers. We don’t want it. [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]

General Points
- We don’t want your XXXXXX buildings [NB potentially offensive language edited out]
- No, no, no building on the green belt.
- Have you looked at sites around Thurcroft, Dinnington & Thrybergh / Hooton Roberts?
- Let Sheffield and other areas take care of themselves, we don’t want this housing project!
- Rotherham is already failing in Government clean air commitment how would increase in housing & carbon, & traffic etc help?! x 3
- You do not need this land.
- What about effect on already overburdened healthcare?
- What about the increase in numbers in the classrooms this will create?
- No to bigger schools. Small is beautiful.
- Rubbish, don’t want it. Leave Greasbrough alone.
- Greasbrough is named in the Domesday book. All you will do is destroy it.
- They already have destroyed it 40 years ago when they started Wingfield. NO MORE.
- Keep Britain farming.
Consultation Report
Bassingthorpe Farm Development Consultations

Accompanying Report
Feedback from Mapping Exercise
The comments are from all 4 consultations

The Studio, 32 The Calls
Leeds, LS2 7EW
0113 204 2460

Submitted by: Mike Dando
Date: 21st August 2009
Feedback from Mapping Exercise
(The comments are from all 4 consultations)

1 Green Belt

- Don’t spoil the green belt – go to brownfield sites.
- Stop this madness – we don’t want anything building on green belt.
- Sheffield won’t even consider it – Why are we?
- Stop this madness, leave the green belt – GREEN.
- Building on green belt is robbing future generations. When it’s gone it’s gone!
- Stop using our green belt land. [NB 1 comment that could be perceived as political electioneering was also made]. [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
- Green belt should be green belt.
- Why destroy the little green belt we have left. Please leave Greasbrough alone.
- Keep off our green belt.
- Do not build on green belt - The Labour council is on its way out!!!
- Leave the green belt green.
- We do not want this on our door step. We need our green belt land.
- Don’t build on this green belt land. Build on brown land.
- Concerns over complete loss of green belt land.
- I thought you had a duty to protect our wildlife & green belt. How is this protecting?
- Green belts are what attracted people to live in all these areas in the first place so leave well alone. Let’s look after people already in area.
- This is green belt.
- Leave the fields and green belt.
- RMBC – You should be ashamed. You make me sick! Leave our green belt alone.
- Leave it green belt – Already enough facilities.
- No building on green belts. We enjoy the wild life and walks.
- Once the green belt’s gone it’s gone for good!!
- You change your policies to suit your own agendas….Local people cannot get planning to extend, improve their own property – you say it’s green belt…Now the lies are changed to suit your aims.
- No to building on any green belt.
- Don’t build on green belt leave well alone.
- Don’t build on green belt x 3
- Why green belt? There are enough brownfield sites available – developers could use these and clean areas up, improve areas.
- I think the consultation process is diabolical. Please keep the green belt.
- Save our green belt for our kids.
- No building on our green belt. Build some where else.
- Leave our green belt and village (Greasbrough) alone – we do not need all these houses.
- Leave green belt alone x 2
- Do not agree with any building on green belt land.
- No to green field sites.
- Bassingthorpe Farm is the only bit of green belt left - no to all of it.
- Private house holders are not allowed to do what they want on green belt land. So why can the Council? At the end of the day you are the custodians of the land not the owners – WE ARE.
- No building on green belt land – people come to Greasbrough because they like living in the country side, you want to take all that away.
- Leave our green belt land for animals to survive and humans to enjoy. Build on brown land No, No, No to green belt development.
- No to any building on green belt land.
- Leave the green belt alone x 3
- RMBC asked the question of building on green belt land in 2007. 67% of them answered NO.
- The clue is in its name – Green belt should be kept GREEN. NO HOUSES!!
Children of the future need open space.
The Government has targets to reduce childhood obesity. How is this encouraged when we are getting rid of green space? x 2
This area is our main breathing space. This must not go ahead.
Wingfield, Rockingham & Kimberworth Park are known for their green areas. That’s the only thing that keeps it attractive. Let’s hang on to it – if they take that away it will just look like an ordinary estate.
I live in this area because it feels / is semi rural - why do I want to live in a concrete jungle?
Britain is one of the worst countries in Europe for children to grow up in (recent news headlines). How does urban sprawl improve the environment for our children?
How do we reduce childhood obesity with no green space?
Not enough greenery as it is. Know when to stop.
This is destruction of beautiful countryside. Please leave this for future generations.
I take my sister to the park. How can I do that if there is a XXXXXXXX house on top of it? Ahhhh.....
People who live in this area have chosen to do so, on the basis of green space, green belt and easy access to the countryside. A development of this scale ignores quality of life on this basis. Evidence shows that smaller developments within existing communities create better, more cohesive living spaces and better integration for people new to the area.
When will it stop!! How long will it be before all the countryside is gone?
Environmental issues. Think about it.
Why spoil Britain’s natural beauty! Build somewhere else!
At the moment leave the green fields until we really have no where else to build e.g. use the brown land – old Corus land.
We need our countryside. Please don’t build.
Save our environment.
Keep the countryside.
Consider the loss to environment. Is it worth it for a massive concrete jungle?
Leave the countryside alone! x 2
I walk here each day with my dogs!!
We want our grandchildren and great grandchildren to enjoy the countryside and wildlife that has been here since I was a child.
Leave England’s green and pleasant land alone x 2
No to loss of green field sites – plenty of brown field sites x 2
Think about our younger generation.
Land is criss-crossed with public footpaths. Do not build on green field land.
Build houses where you live!
How will schools learn about nature when there’s none left because you’ve built on it?
Pleasant rural area – leave alone as makes Rotherham a pleasant place.
PPG2 green belt rules state ‘green corridors to countryside’ - that will go.
Recent survey’s said that green spaces were far and few. Why are houses going to be built on them?
Rotherham residents need green space to enjoy – improving health and well being, not urbanized areas with high levels of pollution and deprivation!
The farm provides recreation for many groups. Horse riders, families, not to mention the residents of the local mental health care home.
Keep green fields. No building.
No to green field sites.
Ideal educational site for school visits to learn about Eco-systems.
Think of fallout area from Vicktrex (Laportes).
Please leave this countryside alone.
We need our countryside leave it alone
This green belt area is very important to the local community. We need fields and pathways – (public I might add) for the enjoyment of the people.
Green space for kids / future generations? Keep em!
Please leave our countryside alone, for our children and our children’s children.
Need recreational space.
• Born and bred in Greasbrough. Don’t you think we have had enough building? Our countryside has been murdered.
• What a waste of land, wildlife & enjoyment for all!
• We work hard and pay into the system. We at least deserve countryside for our pleasure.
• There will be no areas for leisure.
• This is not just about residents – The land is used by many Rotherham families for pleasure.

3 Loss of Farmland
• Farming land taken! How are we going to feed the people?
• Keep Britain farming!
• Loss of food production locally. (air miles)
• What about the tenanted farmers that are going to loose their livelihoods? They won’t get any compensation.
• Currently arable land.
• Don’t ruin our farmland.
• Loss of bio-fuel production.
• Gordon Brown started growing his own veg. We won’t have any allotments to grow own vegetables.
• What about the farmland?
• What if we need farming land? We may house people – will we be able to feed them without increasing food miles.
• Carbon footprint – growing local crops.

4 Wildlife
• Don’t want to lose wooded areas.
• Protect the wildlife and the environment.
• We need to protect British wildlife. We need the countryside for recreation and exercise.
• Don’t tamper with the balance of nature, use the brown belt!
• Endangering rare species is criminal. Use the brown belt.
• Environmental wild life issues.
• What about all the wildlife, plants and trees.
• Say goodbye to hedgerows. Munsbrough Farm was demolished overnight.
• What about vermin that live in these fields, will they come into our houses?
• Under DEFRA scheme we have planted half this field with wild grasses and flowers to promote wildlife and butterflies, many of which are rare. Why undo all our good work? Keep green belt green.
• Keep off our land - Wildlife needs somewhere to live just like everybody else. Please don’t build and lose our wildlife.
• Natural border between two areas with wildlife to be enjoyed by Rawmarsh and Greasbrough people.
• Huge loss of wildlife.
• How sustainable / ecologically friendly will development be? – How does this fit with other Government targets? Who is really profiting from the development? Building on green belt is a crime!
• Loss of wildlife like hedgerows and ditches. 1997 Act.
• What about our wildlife and nature x 2
• Save our animals and trees.
• Don’t destroy homes of all these wild and endangered species.
• Think of the skylarks, little owls, tawny owls i.e. endangered species.
• Think of the endangered species, already well established.
• Protection of natural green space, hedgerows, wildlife and the open aspect for all Greasbrough community. We should be promoting green sites for our children and their future.
• All wildlife will suffer.
• Visit www.rawmarshnature.co.uk.
• Save our wildlife, trees and plants. Green spaces for our children’s future x 2
• Why our green belt and wildlife?
• Shouldn’t woodland be protected?
• No more building. It’s killing our wildlife
• Killing wildlife?
• Don’t build in green land areas – Protect our wildlife.
• Massive loss of wildlife!!! It’s disgusting.
• Loss of green belt & wildlife. What about the skylarks?
• I see owls, bats, rabbits, all birds, pheasants & foxes etc. keep our green belt fields for all animals and humans.
• We need the habitat for all the animals and wild flowers - I say NO!
• Don’t disrupt the natural habitat of many established creatures.
• Preserve the wildlife.

5 Flooding

• Concrete = flooding
• What about drainage? A lot of places flood already.
• Harold Croft – You can’t build on – it’s flood land i.e. pastures and natural springs.
• Has anyone considered flooding?
• Let’s not cause any more flooding.
• What about the flooding at Cinder Bridge?
• This area has flooded heavily in the last few years. Cinder Bridge floods every time it rains.
• Why get rid of flood plains to cause even more damage than RMBC want to already - no to building.
• Massive flooding and environmental risk.
• Building housing on Bassingthorpe WILL flood Parkgate.
• Cinder Bridge Road floods regularly. Where will the water go?
• The area around Cinder Bridge Road is a flood area. I cannot believe the Council would build houses on a flood plain.
• Where will the floodwater go? Dump it on someone else?
• Rotherham already has flooding problems. So why do you want to make the problem worse by taking away land?
• Will you build on Rawmarsh / Parkgate “Tops”? I live on Holmflatt Street. My concern is flooding and no proper access roads for new homes.
• There’s flooding on the land and where is all the water going to go?
• What about flooding, Greasbrough doesn’t have good drains.

6 Effect on Facilities / Services

• How will this new housing effect the already poor service received from the local council?
• There aren’t enough schools, doctors or infrastructure to cope with such a huge development.
• Ashwood School is full to capacity. Where will the children in the new houses go?
• This will put a strain on the NHS with all these people moving to this area.
• What about overcrowding in our local schools and hospitals?
• What about police, fire, ambulance services for this proposed development?
• What about crime increase?
• Impact on levels of crime.
• What happens to St Joseph’s Football Ground? Spent £45,000 on electricity and built new facilities.
• Will Rawmarsh School lose its sports college status, because that field is how they got it?
• What about schools? Rawmarsh comp is already crowded. Are we going to have to fight for places?
• [1 comment with racist overtones edited out]
• Think about the increased pressure that will be placed on our doctors and schools.
• All these houses that are proposed. There’s nothing about schools, doctors, hospitals, police – where is the money coming from? We can hardly run these services now.
• What additional community services will be put in place?
• Public transport in the area is already dire – nothing at all in the Rawmarsh comp area of Haugh Road. Complaints fell on deaf ears then, and I suspect this ‘consultation’ will be more of the same.
• How will this area be policed and how do you predict an increase in population will affect the crime rate?
• Roads no good. Schools and doctors won’t be able to cope.
• Crime rates will go up, but police officer numbers will not.
• The bigger the school, the worse the education. We like ours as it is, don’t spoil it.
• Public transport at Haugh Road - there’s none now.
• How will this vast increase in housing effect the local health service?
• Schools? – The local schools are already over subscribed.
• Increase in crime, over use of existing facilities.

7 Protect Village Identity

• Let’s keep Greasbrough as a village. It has already had a lot of its character taken, leave the rest of it.
• Stop knitting all the villages together.
• No to green belt building. Save our village.
• Please allow Rawmarsh to retain its identity and not be ‘Rotherham urban area’ and appreciate the level of opposition there is to this scheme.
• Don’t spoil our village anymore.
• Greasbrough is big enough.
• Keep our countryside as countryside. Save our village.
• Keep Greasbrough a village. No to Council houses. We don’t want to be an estate.
• Totally against losing the identity of our village. The whole scheme is totally out of proportion with the area.
• Keep Greasbrough a village, that’s why we have lived here for years.
• You started with Kimberworth Park, Wingfield, Rockingham, Munsbrough, and now Bassingthorpe. You are engulfing us from all sides. Save our village x 2
• Enough is enough. Keep it Rotherham and we (Greasbrough) won’t exist as a village.
• We do not need all the land round Greasbrough built on. It is supposed to be a village.
• Leave Greasbrough alone. You have already built too many houses. We love the place. No building.
• Greasbrough is a village. Leave it that way.
• Greasbrough has already been killed – Now you want to bury it!!
• Leave Greasbrough alone.

8 Traffic

• Too much traffic in Greasbrough now.
• Traffic is chaotic now.
• Would a by-pass be necessary for Nether Haugh? YES! Full capacity road at the moment.
• How on earth do you think you are going to construct a new road system when you can’t even keep the existing ones from being grid locked?
• Traffic chaos & over crowding. Any more development and it will devastate the area. Traffic is already at full capacity.
• Already prisoners in our home at the weekend due to extreme traffic. How will it be with all the new build??!
• Traffic pollution – Cinder Bridge Road, Greasbrough.
• What about traffic? I live in Parkgate and we can’t use our car on Saturdays already.
• Greasbrough is already grid locked with traffic at busy periods - come and look for yourselves!!
9a Brown Belt / Field & Other Building Options / Non-option

- Lack of imagination! Use the brown belt.
- Build on Brownfield sites.
- Use Brownfield sites. Clean up areas with empty houses so people will want to live there. Get the town centre sorted first – how many properties are there??!!
- Take responsibility in dealing with the brown belt. Don’t make excuses, use all the brown belt.
- Take responsibility in dealing with the brown belt even though this costs you more money! (which is the excuse).
- Why not look to develop brown belt field sites. The countryside is an important feature – once it’s gone its gone!
- Invest in brown belts.
- Use the brown belt. You have to deal with this problem.
- Use brown belt first. Don’t spoil green belt.
- Use the brown belt – you have to deal with it eventually.
- Use brown land sites. There are loads.
- Get a grip and develop the brown field sites. You numpties!
- There is plenty of land without taking good farm land and flood land i.e. Cinder Bridge.
- Why Bassingthorpe. Why destroy green fields when brown fields abound!
- Invest in brown belts.
- Use brown belt land & windfall.
- Use brown field! Regenerate run down areas.
- Use ‘windfall’ brown site - PPG2 green belt rules refer.
- Leave alone, build on brown field sites.
- Get a grip and develop the brown field sites. You numpties!
- There is plenty of land without taking good farm land and flood land i.e. Cinder Bridge.
- Why Bassingthorpe. Why destroy green fields when brown fields abound!
- Use up the many brownfield sites that litter Rotherham. There’s so little green land left in England, we can’t afford to loose any more, where are we going to produce our food??
- Why should 48% of the new houses be here? Share the number across the whole of Rotherham.
- Demolish Rotherham town centre and put your houses there. The town is a waste of space.
- Green belt gone forever. No! Spread the development over the whole Rotherham borough x 2
- Use the existing council houses in Maltby.
- There are seven golf courses around Rotherham exclusively for 1 section of the borough to enjoy. Why not use 1 of these instead of green belt sites?
- Build council flats in town centre – It worked for Sheffield.
- Joining up urban conurbation will lead to social disturbance. This area cannot take such a huge influx of people; no one wants this, DON’T BUILD!
- Develop Parkgate.
- Why has Rotherham area no options to choose from?
- We do not want to be an urban sprawl stretching from Nether Haugh to Rotherham until we eventually become part of Sheffield.
- Build along main roads making small estates with schooling and community facilities.
- Anywhere would be nice. As long as the homes are realistic and long-lasting. Some where that was once used, so it won’t cause too much of a fuss.
- We need to be sharing out the build through at the whole of the borough. Why do you want to destroy the green belt that is our children’s heritage? Urban sprawl helps flooding / congestion and over–crowding of public services in one area, causing problem areas - share out the build with no loss of green belt.

9b Other Building Options

- No to proposed urban sprawl.
- You are going to destroy a happy community – why is this area ear-marked for the full impact?? i.e. 48% development.
- Use up the many brownfield sites that litter Rotherham. There’s so little green land left in England, we can’t afford to loose any more, where are we going to produce our food??
- Why should 48% of the new houses be here? Share the number across the whole of Rotherham.
- Demolish Rotherham town centre and put your houses there. The town is a waste of space.
- Green belt gone forever. No! Spread the development over the whole Rotherham borough x 2
- Use the existing council houses in Maltby.
- There are seven golf courses around Rotherham exclusively for 1 section of the borough to enjoy. Why not use 1 of these instead of green belt sites?
- Build council flats in town centre – It worked for Sheffield.
- Joining up urban conurbation will lead to social disturbance. This area cannot take such a huge influx of people; no one wants this, DON’T BUILD!
- Develop Parkgate.
- Why has Rotherham area no options to choose from?
- We do not want to be an urban sprawl stretching from Nether Haugh to Rotherham until we eventually become part of Sheffield.
- Build along main roads making small estates with schooling and community facilities.
- Anywhere would be nice. As long as the homes are realistic and long-lasting. Some where that was once used, so it won’t cause too much of a fuss.
- We need to be sharing out the build through at the whole of the borough. Why do you want to destroy the green belt that is our children’s heritage? Urban sprawl helps flooding / congestion and over–crowding of public services in one area, causing problem areas - share out the build with no loss of green belt.
10 Need for more houses / Homes

- Redo the homes that are boarded up, not make more.
- Why do we need all these homes any way? Would someone explain who the occupants will be. Will they be British?
- We need more houses in Rotherham.
- YES for Rotherham people.
- Thousands of family’s are forced to privately rent due to lack of social housing! And can’t get on the property ladder! We need more houses.
- Homes already built are not selling.
- Stop - no more houses needed.
- We don’t want houses. If we have them who will you put in them?
- Growth status. Why has Rotherham alone got approx 33k houses against Doncaster 49,230 or Leeds region 32,233?
- Did we elect you to just find houses (or should I say destroy green belt) or do you want to get your teeth into something worth while, right and just.
- We don’t need more homes in this area; [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made].
- [NB 1 comment that could be perceived as political electioneering was also made].
- Several private developments i.e. ‘oasis’ and Fenton roundabout have come to a halt – why plan more?
- At last weeks surgery one councillor said they had 4 or 5 enquires every Saturday for housing. Why do we need to build 1,000?
- Where are all these extra people coming from, that increases the population to the extent that warrants this amount of houses?
- Who forecasts the population explosion to fill all these extra houses?
- There are already empty houses. We don’t need any more.
- Fill empty houses first.
- Where are 3,600 families coming from?
- More housing who for?
- I challenge the house waiting list figures. Independent audit!
- Need to fill empty houses first, and would have to be more community officers.
- We don’t want or need more housing. Keep our countryside.
- What about the 3,000 houses already empty in Rotherham?
- Why build houses for people who don’t work so we can pay for them?
- We don’t need any more houses.
- You can not fill houses now, so why build more?
- Who’s going to live in these so called ‘needed’ houses?
- Why do we want more houses? Still a lot of empty properties in the borough – use them!
- Have we got a 4th option that shares out any building needed? Do we know how many new homes are needed?
- Large housing estates cause social problems. We don’t want to live in an inner city.
- We don’t need or want new developments. 1000’s of houses boarded up in need of repair – No to development.

11 Views / Property Values

- This land is seen from town. Large tracts of housing would be visually unattractive.
- You would destroy beautiful views over the town.
- I moved here for the beautiful view of fields and countryside and wildlife – not to look at a housing estate!
- Cost of houses when views are lost.
- 50 years I’ve lived here viewing over Greasbrough, not houses.
- Are we going to be compensated for the fall in value of our homes?
- Is the council going to compensate people for the view they are going to get?
- Houses will lose value – losing view.
- Greasbrough valued for view / landscape. Who will buy the new houses if this goes??
- Would this land be available if I wanted to build on it - Think not! I pay my own way. I think it’s disgusting that my house will be devalued and insurance increased.
• Moved from town to green belt. What a waste of time and money.
• Greasbrough is a beautiful village - please don’t destroy our land.
• No - our house looks onto green belt fields.
• What will happen to house values? Will we be compensated?
• When we bought our house we were told they would not build on the Green belt at the bottom of the garden.
• We have been buying our house for the last 7 years. We had a search done and they said we were told nothing could be done for 10 years.
• Will we be compensated for losing the view we paid for?
• Will local residents be compensated for loss of value for their current homes?
• Who will pay the difference on our house value? We live on Newbiggin Close and if this goes ahead the value of our house will drop substantially. We only bought it 3 years ago. We will lose money, are the council going to give us this money. We would seriously consider moving.
• Equity in houses – due to new houses.
• Impact on views and quality of life of existing residents & impact on property prices.

12 Jobs

• What about jobs! Not houses.
• Will it be locals doing the work?
• Which jobs? Not enough now for us.
• Help all businesses that are closing down to redevelop and create more jobs.

13 Multiple Grounds for Opposition

• You will be left with a concrete jungle where no birds sing and all the wildlife has perished – together with unclaimed brown belt full of industrial waste! This depresses everybody including your Labour supporters. [NB 1 comment that could be perceived as political electioneering was also made]. You are destroying what is left of England while simultaneously hanging onto the remnants of all our industrial waste. The Romanians fought very hard to get rid of Ceausescu for these reasons! Don’t create the same depression in England. Use the brown belt. Beautify the country, look after all its species.
• More crime, poverty, less jobs, less countryside, and fewer police. Well done Rotherham council. DID I VOTE for you?
• Over crowding, crime rates increase, loss of wildlife – No more homes. STOP – A WASTE OF OUR MONEY!! No one wants to live there. [NB 1 comment relating to issue of economic migration was also made]
• Concerns: a) Reduction of green belt land, b) Traffic congestion, c) Who will the housing, be for? d) Loss of value to people’s homes, e) School places, f) Why build houses when many houses are empty or unfinished due to the recession? g) Are these the only areas the council wants to build on?
• Real concerns: a) Loss of green belt land, b) Loss of wild life – the Council have a duty to protect wildlife, c) Loss of valuable recreational space for all ages to enjoy, d) Pressure on healthcare – doctors, hospitals, dentists, e) effect on school classroom – over crowding, f) Heavy traffic, g) Carbon footprint.
• Don’t build on green belt – use empty houses. Too much pressure on schools/doctors and other services. Don’t destroy wildlife / arable land.
• I care about wildlife conservation, pollution, the way people live. We need green spaces for a pleasant environment. Green spaces relieve stress. Why take it all away? Villages should remain so – Rotherham should look at their own website!
14 General Opposition

- You will have to run over us with the bulldozers!!!!
- This is criminal. You should all be ashamed of yourselves.
- Rotherham was a nice small town. The council is hard pressed to look after it efficiently now, how is it going to cope with the planned expansion?
- Why complain about carbon footprint if you’re the one’s that have the biggest XXXXXXX footprint. [NB potentially offensive language edited out]
- Forget it.
- The people don’t want to increase the current population – leave the fields green.
- No building at all.
- Think about our land and younger generation.
- Who’s going to tell my 16 month old grandson that they took his green inheritance away?
- Give our children some green and pleasant land where they are safe from traffic.
- Should not be done.
- We don’t want this. Listen to us!
- This is mad and we won’t count!!
- No to more houses. No way.
- We don’t need any more. We love our area as it is. Leave us alone.
- This is far too many houses for people to live with. We’ll have no where to go to get away from the maddening crowds.
- Poor show – no imagination RBC.
- This land is one of the few things that is actually good about Rotherham.
- Living in Greasbrough for nearly 40 years – when doing any alterations to my 200 year old house the planning we have to go through to keep the old character is unbelievable and yet they want to just put up any building anywhere. Not very good.
- A big no to a big development.
- Be prepared for a long hard fight.
- No to housing anywhere in Greasbrough and Munsbrough.
- Why? Leave it alone!
- [1 comment with racist overtones edited out]
- You will have to build over my dead body.
- We don’t want them at all.
- We are already surrounded by estates and have to try to live decent lives with all the social problems created. Please build somewhere else!
- Leave things alone.
- Where are you shameful councillors? You’re rubbish.
- Stop this over-crowding, we don’t want this concrete jungle.
- Don’t do it!!
- Wish I’d bought my narrow boat now. This should have been my nirvana!! Thanks RMBC!! Waste of time/done deal!
- Bad idea councillor.
- Rotherham is only a small town; it won’t cope with all these new people.
- No. Must not happen.
- It is not necessary to build in this area at all!!
- Wingfield / Munsbrough - Have you looked at number of residents already?
- Put the houses in your front garden, not ours.
- Thorpe Hesley said no!!! We say NO!!!
- Try using the bigger part of your brain. Stupid.
- No
- Go somewhere else and just leave Greasbrough alone.
- We have no baths, no leisure centre and shortly no fields.
- Civil war is imminent.
- No housing x 4
- Don’t bite off more than you can chew.
- No new homes keep existing green belt. Council tax payers do not want this eyesore.
- I live here! Gerr’off moy laaand!
- Why?? RMBC have no shame!
- The underhand council at it again. No to the development.
• Leave this area alone!
• What about our children’s land and future!
• Why are you doing this to us? You’re adding to our problems.
• You are stupid!
• Very unwise proposal.
• What are our children going to have left!!
• You’d have to kill me first!!
• We pay extra to live in Greasbrough – Now you are taking the pleasure of living in Greasbrough away. You idiots!
• Our national heritage is almost gone. With you lot we’ve enough houses for our own.
• Improve Rotherham’s roads and environment because building new houses that will blight the nicer areas.
• Put them on your own XXXXXXX door step. [NB potentially offensive language edited out]
• Our lad’s fought for this land. Don’t you take it from our children. You’re all for yourselves.
• This will happen over my dead body.
• Land belongs to the people not the Council.
• We will fight you to the bitter end. You have been warned.
• Rotherham council act like Saddam Hussein and look what happened to him.
• Build somewhere else.
• This map is covered in post it notes – imagine what it would look like covered in houses.
• We need oxygen. Don’t build on the 7 hills it’s too dangerous to bring up children there.
• This is one mad crazy scheme.
• You build in the day and we will knock it down at night.
• Private house-holders are not allowed to do what they want on green belt land. So why can the Council? At the end of the day you are the custodians of the land not the owners – we are!

15 Specifics of Development

• Why can we not have a copy of plans?
• What will happen to the pit shafts dotted all over?
• Couldn’t the council be more specific where they intend to build?
• How discrete is the housing going to be around the cemetery?

16 Immigration

[NB 41 comments relating to issue of economic migration were made]

17 Scepticism of Council & Consultation

• Who are these houses for? Strangers. IDIOTS are planning this and the Council is getting a good pay off. TRAITORS.
• They’ll probably just rip this up and toss it.
• Please don’t throw any of these post-it notes away.
• I hope all these [comments] are going to be read and not binned.
• I hope you are going to read these comments and listen to public view x 2
• Will our voices really be heard and read?
• What is the point of asking us? You won’t listen.
• Will the planning board listen to the people?
• Please listen to the people, Council.
• Listen to the people. No no no.
• I suppose you (the Council) will roll all this up and throw it away. As usual people’s views don’t matter, and then carry on as you want.
• Are the Council ‘consulting’ residents or is it as usual a decision that has already been made.
• Why isn’t Kimberworth Park on here? It will affect us too!
• I agree – we lost our Wingfield Club. Guess what’s there now – houses. Grrr.
• Did anyone go into schools and tell them about their future?
• Suggest hand delivered flyers to the door.
• Our local councillor has gone on holiday this week. That says it all.
• Nice to see so many councillors. Cowards.
• Surprised there weren’t more councillors here – Saturday, expenses and all that!
• There should have been a proper meeting with councillors. (If they dare attend)
• Where have all the Councillors gone? Long time passing!!
• If this plan goes ahead the council will definitely go!
• We will have nothing left in this country if we don’t get rid of you Labour Councillors
• Why have we (affected residents) only found out about this today? 13/07/09 by leaflet?
• Why have you only given 3 weeks deadline??
• Need for another event at Thornhill before the end of the month.
• You are supposed to represent Greasbrough and Rotherham. DO IT or give us our voice.
• What research has been done for this project and how valid is it? I notice that it has not been shared with local residents. We should be doing everything we can to save green belt in this country, and that includes Greasbrough.
• I shall be writing to David Cameron (Conservatives) to tell him about this underhand dealing by an inept and unprofessional Labour Council and will also be sending evidence of the shady dealings. Once again politicians are showing their weaknesses.
• Goodbye Councillor Lindsay Johnson.
• Labour Out!!
• [NB 1 comment that could be perceived as political electioneering was also made].
• Take heed of your wage payers. If Sheffield won’t do it, why should we? Show some balls.
• Shameful and underhanded way of stealing our countryside. Who has had their pockets lined to let this go ahead?
• Councillors are put in office by residents for residents’ interests and good. Not for their own gain.
• This Council has already been responsible for the rape of Greasbrough. Let’s have an election!
• Why not listen? A lot of these residents actually voted you in.
• Stop dictating to us Rotherham Council
• This will be remembered at the ballot box!!
• Vote none of them. All as bad. Money obsessed liars!!
• Rotherham Council selling Rotherham out. They need voting out.
• We elect you the Council. If this goes through, we can sack you as well.
• The Councillors of this area are our elected representatives. You have failed in your duty of care to your electorate.
• Listen to Rotherham people who pay the council tax and your wages. We voted you in to look after us and you are selling us down the river.
• Give us proper information. Why has a map not been put in the paper you send out?

18 Other

• John Healy left here - why??
• You have no money to repair existing housing, so who’s paying for this?
• Has any land already been sold off to private developers?
• Will any properties be compulsory purchased?
• The project is misnamed – Bassingthorpe Farm is only part of the area.
• In the middle of no where – Greasbrough Lane.
• Spin the Rawmarsh area.
• Local schools, doctors, post offices.
Specific Areas from Mapping Exercise

Thornhill

- No don’t you think we have enough problems in this area already?
- Keep allotments.
- Concern about loss of local allotments which grow for school.
- We lost the play area on Henley Rise due to houses. We lost the playing fields due to the school. The little bit of green space we have left are the allotments and you want to take them as well. We are not having it!
- Clough Road is used as a rat run between islands and is very busy with fast cars despite speed ramps. Police are aware but unwilling to change anything as there have been no accidents and it keeps traffic flowing.
- Want no more houses. Road outside school too / very busy.
- Footpath to field which is part of Trans Pennine Trail.

Thornhill Nursery

- This is a family run business. Land bought from council. Taken years to build up to what it is now. XXXX council has no right to do this. [NB Potentially offensive language edited out]
- Family run business – Concerns over being pushed out to make room for development.
- Popular local business. A rare local, sustainable, successful, family business.

Henley Rise

- Will prospective house buyers be told this was a canal and is constantly flooded?
- Popular for walkers etc.
- Improve Clough footpaths. Well used but gets over grown at bottom.
- You are building within the blast zone of the chemical plant.
- Worst scenario - develop top part of field only. That adjoins South Yorkshire Housing.
- Use Henley public footpath and expand to single carriageway road.
- New eco homes already built – South Yorkshire Housing.
- Improve public footpaths
- Clough is lovely walk - needs more management – retain all.

Barbot Landfill

- This is the most toxic land in South Yorkshire.
- What’s happening here? There were machines on site over last few days? Please ring 07733 260404.

Barbot Industrial Estate

- Acid plant.

Bassingthorpe – Farm / Springs / Fields

- Popular place for walkers, children, cyclists, riders, etc.
- Many hares here (protected species?)
- Natural under water spring here i.e. Bassingthorpe springs!!
Greasbrough

- Woodside walk.
- Recently spotted endangered species.

West Carr Hill

- Unsafe ground – landfill.
- Methane gases and subsidence.
- Land next to landfill. Hardly healthy.
- Over 30 pairs of lapwings nest in these fields.

Barbot Hall Road

- Dump site. Is this healthy living? And what about Laporte?

Gin House Lane

- Possible road access to new housing.

West Carr Lane

- This can only be a sports centre.

South of Barbot Old Hall Farm

- Mine shaft.

Land South of Munsbrough Lane

- Geological fault-line to roundabout.

Coach Road

- I flood now. Spent thousands of my own money & Water Board says any more houses will ruin me.

Cinder Bridge

- We would lose so much wildlife, fresh air, peace and quiet. We do not want this. I live here.
- Where is the wisdom in building on a flood plain and an old canal???
- No building on flood plain or anywhere else.
- Our field floods, so bad idea. What would be the point?
- Bottom fields are a flood plain.
- All this floods.
- Some of this land floods and natural springs are here.
- Flood lands.
- All the land behind Harold Croft floods really badly.
- This land is all flood plain. Building here would be a disaster, even more concrete, even more severe flooding.
- This is the low lands and will flood. Another Catcliffe!!
- This area floods here. It would be immoral to house people in this field. Important site for wildlife e.g. barn owl, bats etc.
- Flooding, ‘Cinder Bridge’ Road - excess traffic – pollution.
- W. Cinder Bridge land prone to flooding.
- Bringing more traffic to area. The houses will ruin the landscape and wildlife around the dam.
- All this land floods. Do not drive wildlife away.
- No houses on field. Green belt.
Bassingthorpe Farm

- Are the cows still tested, that feed on this grass, because of Laporte’s?

East of Bassingthorpe Farm

- Viking heritage site.

Fenton Road / Opposite Rough Wood Road - Kimberworth Park

- This area floods.

Fenton Woods

- What about the protected silver birch trees that grow in these woods?
- There are several endangered species of birds around these fields! The RSPB will want to know.
- These woods are a haven for British wildlife and many birds.
- What about British wildlife and protected trees that grow in Fenton Woods – Also over-crowding in these areas. Where are the people going to find work?!

Munsbrough / Wingfield

- This area is enjoyed by lots of residents and would ruin this particular area.
- Recently spotted endangered species: grasshopper warbler, buzzard, northern marsh orchid, hares (in these fields).

Kimberworth Park

- This area floods

Rawmarsh

- Do not pull down these trees near The Granges

Allotments at Back of School Lane

- I object to these housing plans – allotments are a vital community past time.

Cinder Bridge Field

- Long time residents have noticed that this land is sinking

Old Pit Site

- Mine shafts dotted all over

Fields West of Greasbrough Road & School Lane

- Top field still dropping in height.
South Church Street

- Monument of crashed aircraft in field

Land Opposite Rawmarsh Comprehensive School

- Will prospective house buyers be told their houses are built on a slag heap?

West Avenue

- We get severe subsidence here because of mine works...imagine what it’ll be like on Bassingthorpe.

SW of Haugh Road

- Old Pit Site - Bee orchids, lapwing, grey partridge, skylarks, kestrel, 20 species of butterfly, 80 species of bird!!

Old Pit Site & Fields SW Haugh Road

- A barn owl lives here!!
- When did you last see a wren or chiff-chaff? They live here you know – so keep off
- Methane rises up from pits, like what’s happened at Treeton Pit
- Many wild flowers grow here
- Very many rare localised insect and plant species
- Colonies of skipper butterflies
- Rare pyramidal orchids
- Butterfly habitat, plants to sustain butterflies, birds, wrens, herons, finches, trees
- I’ve seen rare butterflies and frogs here
- “Rare and declining” great burnet plants
- Colonies of burnett moths
- Grasshopper warblers moved in here – RSPB red list
- Site of nesting birds, on the RED list. Lapwings, grey partridge, skylark.
- Site of rare flowers – Bee orchid, southern marsh orchid, pyramidal orchid, common spotted orchid.

Upper Haugh

- Underground reservoir here!
- Upper Haugh is full of old mine shafts, you can’t seriously think of building here!!

Adjacent to Reservoir

- Ground core sample taken from here 10 years ago for building. It failed!

Chapel Walk / Way

- What will happen to the allotments and holders?

Nether Haugh

- The 5pm traffic can’t cope here as it is
Parkgate

- Ease congestion into Retail World and re-open Aldwarke Station to better serve existing community.

Outside Boundary

**Ex Works – Fenton Road**

- You have already knocked this down and built houses.

**Fenton Road**

- Quarry Area – Homes built – Private owners.

**Cinder Bridge Woodland**

- Mature woodland. Very important local wildlife habitat and recreation facilities.

**Mill Dam**

- [The plans would] bring more traffic into the area, the houses will ruin the landscape and wildlife around the dam.

**West of Cinder Bridge / The Whins**

- Land is prone to flooding

**Wortley Road towards Town Centre**

- No overland walkway into town. You have to go in underground subway.