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This document can be made available in your language and in alternative formats such as Braille, large print, electronic and audio-tape versions. Contact Forward Planning:

Tel  01709 823869
Fax  01709 823865
Email  forward.planning@rotherham.gov.uk
Minicom 01709 823536

Translations say: ‘Contact us if you want a summary of this document in another language and/or in an alternative format’

Urdu

اگر آپ کو اس دستاویز کا خلاصہ کسی دوسری زبان اور/یا یکسی متبادل صورت میں دیکھنے میں درکار ہو تو ہم سے رابطہ کریں۔

Chinese

如需索取這份摘要的其他語文譯本和/或各種形式版本，請聯絡我們。

Farsi

در صورتی که خلاصه ای از این مطلب را به زبان و یا شکل دیگری میں خواهید لطفا با ما تماس بگیرید

Arabic

أتصل بنا إذا تريد خلاصة من هذه الوثيقة بلغة أخرى أو بصيغة بديلة

French

Veuillez nous contacter si vous désirez un résumé de ce document dans votre langue et/ou dans d'autres formats.

Copies of this document can be viewed or downloaded from the Council’s website at www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning

Further information about the Rotherham Local Development Framework is available from the Forward Planning Team using the above telephone number/email or write to us at the following address

Forward Planning
RMBC Planning and Transportation
2nd Floor Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham  S60 1TD
Respondent I.D.  958
Name:  Mrs Alice Rodgers
Organisation:  Maltby Environmental Group

Representation Number:  485

Policy:  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Paragraph 8.5

Summary of Representation:
Concern at the expression ‘Outlying Settlement’ being used in relation to Maltby.

Councils Response:
The five spatial 'sub-regions' or zones were established using the distinct differences in travel to work patterns as an evidence base. They provide the starting point for the preparation of the spatial options for the Core Strategy. A Background Paper entitled ‘Core Strategy 3: Identification of Spatial Planning Zones’ details the statistics and reasoning behind them being established.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 484

Object

Respondent I.D. 958

Name: Mrs Alice Rodgers

Organisation: Maltby Environmental Group

Representation Number: 484

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Paragraph 8.5

Summary of Representation:
Included in list of Outlying and Rural Settlements are West Maltby and East Maltby. No such geographical locations exist. Maltby is one united and indivisible settlement.

Councils Response:
The two distinct elements were inserted as it was felt that they each reflected the particular aspects of certain housing estates and how they related to areas both within and adjacent to Maltby. However we recognise that no such geographical locations exist in terms of two separate divisible settlements and therefore expressing it as such may lead to misunderstanding.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Remove reference to West and East Maltby, to be replaced by Maltby within submission draft Core Strategy.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 483

Respondent I.D. 958

Name: Mrs Alice Rodgers

Organisation: Maltby Environmental Group

Representation Number: 483

Policy: Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Paragraph 3.9

Summary of Representation:
Maltby is not a former mining settlement. It still has a working colliery which was recently purchased by a company whose stated intention is to operate until 2015.

Councils Response:
The lifetime of the plan is likely to extend beyond 2015 (the stated operational lifespan of the colliery) but recognition is made that the statement could be construed as misleading in terms of its present status.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Remove reference to Maltby being a former mining settlement within submission draft Core Strategy.
Respondent I.D.  958

Name:  Mrs Alice Rodgers

Organisation:  Maltby Environmental Group

Representation Number:  482

Policy:  Other   Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:  Key diagram

Summary of Representation:
Debate surrounding the extent of the pink line denoting a key transport corridor in Maltby including the lack of any indication as to where it might lead. Also missing is reference to the A634 which is felt to be a significant part of the road network.

Councils Response:
The Key diagram is intended to provide an indicative, broad overview of how Rotherham may develop over the next 15 years. As such it was not anticipated by Government guidance that it would provide specific details of sites or areas which would ultimately need to be covered by the Allocations DPD, therefore it is not felt that reference to the A634 would be necessary. However, indication has been made elsewhere on the Key diagram of where key transport corridors might lead and as such it should be made clear as part of the submission draft Core Strategy key diagram where the corridor through Maltby leads to.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Make explicit in submission draft Core Strategy Key diagram where the key transport corridor that goes through Maltby leads to.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 478

Comment

Respondent I.D. 958

Name: Mrs Alice Rodgers

Organisation: Maltby Environmental Group

Representation Number: 478

Policy: Object/Support: Comment

Section / Paragraph: Glossary

Summary of Representation:
Concerns over the need for differentiation between the definitions for sustainable communities and sustainable settlements. The planning portal definition of sustainable communities would be preferred.

Councils Response:
We acknowledge that the duplication of definitions appears to be confusing and as such dilutes the importance of each of the expressions.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Explore alternative definitions for sustainable communities including the suggested Planning Portal definition and amend as appropriate within the submission draft Core Strategy’s glossary.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 517

Support

Respondent I.D.  1364

Name:  Mr A Shaw

Organisation:  Dinnington St. John’s Town Council

Representation Number:  517

Policy:  

Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Whole of CS document

Summary of Representation:
No representation provided – simply a tick was inserted in ‘Supporting’ box.

Councils Response:
Support is welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support taken into account in preparing submission draft Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 623

\ Object

Respondent I.D.  1565

Name:  Mr Brian Davies

Organisation:  Natural England

Representation Number:  623

Policy:

Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Chapter 4

Summary of Representation:
Would like to see more on needs of rural areas including the preservation and enhancement of rural landscapes including accessibility to and the preservation and enhancement of rural landscapes

Councils Response:
A balanced must be struck in the words of the Vision between achieving brevity but at the same time capturing all relevant issues. It is accepted that it would be desirable to refer to the issues raised and further discussion with the respondents will be undertaken to seek to achieve this but noting that there is a wider need for the vision to be made more locally distinctive to Rotherham.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Discuss further with respondent possible means of achieving greater reflection of the needs of rural areas including accessibility to, and the preservation and enhancement of rural landscapes, but noting the need to make the vision more locally distinctive to Rotherham.

*******************************************************************************


Respondent I.D.  1565
Name:  Mr Brian Davies
Organisation:  Natural England

Representation Number:  622
Policy:  
Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Generally pleased with the overall core strategy vision. Encouraged by reference to the promotion of biodiversity and high quality environments and aspiration for sustainable communities.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action required.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  79
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  1568
Name:  Mr Richard Bennett
Organisation:  Bolsover District Council

Representation Number:  79
Policy:  
Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
"Members of the Planning Committee, on behalf of the Council resolved to express support for the policy directions set out in the Core Strategy Preferred Options Development Plan Document"

Councils Response:
Bolsover District Council's support for all policy directions is welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support noted.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 518
\ Other

Respondent I.D. 1578

Name: Mr Chris Telford

Organisation: Bassetlaw District Council

Representation Number: 518

Policy: Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Map 7

Summary of Representation:
Noted that in terms of housing development the nearest identified settlements – Harthill and Woodsetts – are designated as having potential only for minor change.

Councils Response:
Comments relating to Harthill and Woodsetts’ role in the settlement hierarchy are noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 173
\ Object

Respondent I.D. 1606
Name: Mr David Brewer
Organisation: Confederation Of U K Coal Producers (Coalpro)

Representation Number: 173

Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: 3.30

Summary of Representation:
It is coal combustion that increases CO² emissions, not coal production. Britain produces less than 20 m tonnes of the 70 m tonnes the country requires. These imports have a larger carbon footprint than producing that amount of coal in the UK. Increased coal production in the UK would help to reduce C0² emissions.

Councils Response:
The logic of this argument is understood but the issue of “cheap coal” from abroad is a matter that needs to be pursued at National rather than local level. The Council is supportive of the development and use of clean coal technologies.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include reference to the future role of coal, specifically through clean coal technology reducing carbon emissions, in the further development of PD8 in the Submission Core Strategy.
Respondent I.D. 1702
Name: Ms Georgina Bourne
Organisation: The Home Builders Federation

Representation Number: 377

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
With regards to the content of the Core Strategy, we would remind the Council of the intention of a Core Strategy document. As explained in PPS12, the Core Strategy should set out a spatial vision and strategic objectives for Rotherham. The Preferred Options document appears to contain a significant number of different topics, for example on local heritage, retail, transport and waste issues, and does not focus on identifying and addressing the critical issues for the area.

Councils Response:
It is acknowledged that the Core Strategy will need to be based on a vision and strategy objectives. It will also need to be coherent for the user in the transition from the Unitary Development Plan in providing a broad suite of updated strategic policies for a range of topics derived from the issues raised in consultations and objectives set out in Section 3 and Appendix 1 of the Preferred Options document. Some of the strategic policies may be detailed further in the supporting Policies and Allocations DPDs. The LDF also needs to avoid emulating the UDP and repeating policies in the Regional Spatial Strategy or national guidance. The Core Strategy will need to balance these sometimes conflicting requirements and it is accepted that it should be more focused on the critical issues with local specificity in the submission version.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Focus the submission Core Strategy on the most critical issues and local specificity.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 574

Respondent I.D.  1800
Name:  Mr Paul Bedwell
Organisation:  Spawforths (for Woodford Group)

Representation Number:  574
Policy:  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Whole document - conformity with RSS

Summary of Representation:
The timing of the consultation is premature to the emerging RSS; failure to conform to RSS will generate a false option and raise procedural issues under the tests of soundness in PPS12 (such as the settlement hierarchy not reflecting emerging RSS policy YH8).

The policies are too long and such policies become too ambiguous and unwieldy to apply. More and shorter policies would be appropriate.

Councils Response:
The draft RSS Examination in Public Panel Report has been published. Government Office now has to consider the Panel report in preparing the ‘Proposed Changes’ to the RSS to be published for consultation in the summer, with final RSS expected to be published late in 2007.

Rotherham’s Local Development Scheme (March 2007) shows the Core Strategy Submission programmed for early 2008.

In view of the imminent replacement of current RSS a pragmatic approach will be adopted to avoid significant delays to preparing the Core Strategy Submission document and subsequent DPDs. Account will be taken of the Panel report and any proposed changes to RSS in preparing the Submission Core Strategy, with recognition that any Core Strategy will be required to be in general conformity with RSS.

The Core Strategy Preferred Options document puts forward nine ‘policy directions’ which will be developed into final policies in the Submission Document. In line with the advice in PPS12 clear and concise policies will be prepared for the Core Strategy Submission Document. These policies will avoid repetition of regional and national guidance.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Preparation of the Core Strategy Submission Document will have regard to draft RSS and the implications of remaining stages prior to, and including publication as replacement RSS (envisaged for late 2007).

In line with the advice in PPS12 clear and concise policies will be prepared for the Core Strategy Submission Document.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 578
\ Support

Respondent I.D. 1800

Name: Mr Paul Bedwell

Organisation: Spawforths (for Woodford Group)

Representation Number: 578

Policy: 
Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Spatial Planning Zones

Summary of Representation:
Welcome the work undertaken to identify the spatial planning zones. In particular the spatial direction for the Dearne planning zone is welcomed, although it is considered that a greater role for Swinton/Kilnhurst and use of previously developed land could contribute to the areas sustainable future.

Woodford Group would like to see more background information informing the spatial direction as existing published information does not impart sufficient evidence as to the potential future direction of the borough. Woodford Group would appreciate being involved in this process.

Councils Response:
Comments regarding the spatial planning zones and the spatial direction for the Dearne in particular are noted. The comments will be taken into account and further consideration will be given to the appropriateness of the hierarchy, and the role of settlements within this.

Spatial planning zones have been defined as distinct sub-regions with similar travel to work characteristics. The spatial direction for the borough, for spatial planning zones and settlements has been derived from previous consultation on alternative options set out in sections 5 and 6 of the Core Strategy Preferred Option document. The South Yorkshire Settlement Study (Jacobs Babtie, 2005) has also had a fundamental influence on spatial direction as set out in section 7. However further work will be required for the Submission Core Strategy to establish a clearly justified spatial direction for the borough, for spatial planning zones and for individual settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The comments will be taken into account and further consideration will be given to the appropriateness of the hierarchy, and the role of settlements within this.
Further work will be required to ensure that the Core Strategy establishes a clearly justified spatial direction for the borough as a whole, and for the spatial planning zones and individual settlements. Further consideration will also be required regarding the potential involvement of stakeholders in taking this forward into the Submission Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  1841
Name:  Mr Nicholas James
Organisation:  Health and Safety Executive

Representation Number:  42
Policy:  Object/Support:  Comment

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The HSE has not considered the contents of the plan in detail, but makes general comments for information about the Planning (Control of Major Accident Hazards) Regulations 1999. In preparing development plans, local authorities will need to include policies relating to locations where hazardous substances are used or stored, and to the development of land within the vicinity of establishments where hazardous substances are present.
Attached Annex with a "Suggested General Statement on Dangerous Substance Establishments".

Councils Response:
Comments specifically relating to paragraphs 6.22 and 23 in PPG12, Development Plans, and reiterated in Annex B (para's 17 & 18) of PPS12 will be considered. The Council is also mindful of the need to avoid repeating national guidance and circulars and to concentrate on their local application, as appropriate.
The requirement for the LPA to consult the HSE about the siting of dangerous substance establishments under Circular 04/2000 is also noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the requirements of PPG12 (para's 6.22 and 23), or more appropriately PPS12 Annex B (para's 17 & 18) and Circular 04/2000 are taken into account in developing PD9 in the submission Core Strategy and in the supporting Policies DPD with emphasis on the appropriate interpretation of local application. Consideration will be given to preparing appropriate local policies to provide:  (a) Controls on the location of new establishments at which hazardous substances are present or likely to be present.  (b) Controls on modifications at existing establishments where hazardous substances are present.  (c) Controls on new development in the vicinity of existing establishments where hazardous substances are present.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 45

Respondent I.D. 2178

Name: Mr R. Appleyard

Organisation:

Representation Number: 45

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
An outpouring of frustration and criticism of the Council's track record and the development plan process including:

Another new development plan - more money spent changing things to make it worse
Since 1974 the Council has had ample time to change things - the vision again - we are fed up with visions - we don't want visions - we want people to live in the real world
Concern about proposals to redevelop All Saints Buildings
Public transport is running empty
Empty new flats no one wants with no parking spaces
Everything is done on Government instructions - wasting everyone's time communicating with the Council
Close buildings and tenements
Too many plans
Concern about the big screen
The Council fails to comply with European decisions on refuse
Every report about the Council is negative - they are told one thing and do another……

Councils Response:
The Council regrets the respondent's apparent frustration and anticipates that some of these concerns will be addressed in the LDF.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Concerns noted.
Report No: 205

Respondent I.D. 2203

Name: Mr Robert Fletcher

Organisation: Ian Baseley Associates

Representation Number: 205

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: 8.7 Spatial Directions

Summary of Representation:
It is considered that the possible spatial directions need to be reassessed to recognise that Thorpe Hesley has long been seen as a suitable and appropriate location for significant new housing development, particularly because of its optimum location within the Rotherham – Sheffield corridor and its proximity to the motorway network.

Councils Response:
Development concepts have moved on since Thorpe Hesley was first considered a suitable Growth area. Proximity to the national motorway system is not a positive sustainability factor since it encourages the use of private cars rather than public transport. Although the number of houses in Thorpe Hesley has grown over recent years this has increased pressure on existing services but has not attracted additional service provision into the area, thus decreasing the overall sustainability credentials of the settlement. Work underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD will help determine the need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support overall long-term development of the Borough’s settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes. Consider amendments to the Green Belt boundary at Thorpe Hesley to exclude UDP site H6 and to include this site within the Green Belt.
Summary of Representation:
Table 6, which suggests a potential housing supply of 67 for Thorpe Hesley, is considered inappropriate since it does not recognise the “genuine” potential of a conveniently accessible settlement such as this. This assessment has been drawn up within the very strict confines of the existing built framework and does not represent “actual” potential which should also embrace sensible and realistic opportunities for rounding off and even appropriate expansion of the settlement.

Councils Response:
The figure of 67 is a combination of existing permissions and areas identified in the Urban Potential Study. The strategy for Thorpe Hesley is based upon the Sustainable Settlements study which identifies the village as having “limited potential for change”. This also recognises that the major housing designation failed to win planning approval on appeal since the site does not conform to the Governments Greenfield strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 200
\ Object

Respondent I.D.  2203

Name:  Mr Robert Fletcher

Organisation:  Ian Baseley Associates

Representation Number:  200

Policy:  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  5.10 Alternative Options

Summary of Representation:
It is suggested that insufficient weight was attached to the advantages of the “Market Forces” option. Accordingly it is concluded that greater credence needs to be afforded to Market forces which would seek the location of some additional development within the principle development corridors into and out of town. Such corridors are usually existing, well defined public transport routes.

Councils Response:
The sustainable settlements strategy seeks to concentrate development into specific nodes along public transport corridors which already have the benefit of good service provision. Development outside these settlements, even those within major public transport corridors will by definition be less sustainable.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change be made to the direction of the LDF.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 201  
\ Object

Respondent I.D.  2203

Name:  Mr Robert Fletcher

Organisation:  Ian Baseley Associates

Representation Number:  201

Policy:  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  7.19 Achieving the vision

Summary of Representation:
It is considered that the approach used to define the settlement hierarchy, particularly in terms of the areas which are capable of accepting and absorbing change should be reassessed. This approach fails to recognise the clear opportunities which are available for creating sustainable communities by focusing on, for instance, the existing main arterial routes into and out of town, especially where these also form important public transport routes.

Councils Response:
The settlement hierarchy has taken into account numerous factors (detailed in paragraph 7.18) to determine the sustainability of settlements, accessibility is just one of the factors considered. The scope of any future development within a settlement will be determined by its potential to provide a positive contribution towards improving existing sustainability or to be planned in such a way that may give rise to sustainable patterns of development. The general extent and location of this growth will be assessed as art of the Allocations DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change be made to the direction of the plan
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  2211
Name:  Mr Matthew Naylor
Organisation:  Yorkshire Water Services Ltd.

Representation Number:  529
Policy:  
Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Paragraph 3.30

Summary of Representation:
Support points raised in subsection ‘efficient use of resources’. In particular, the coordination of new developments and infrastructure provision and the need for integrated water catchments. Supplementary information (including a policy suggestion) is provided that, aims to ensure that new development is co-ordinated with the provision of essential infrastructure.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed. Acknowledgement is made that PPS12 Paragraph B4 states that it is an important purpose of the planning system to co-ordinate new development with the infrastructure it demands. Policy Direction 8 makes reference to safeguarding utility infrastructure and the need to extend utility infrastructure networks to serve new development within sustainable settlements in addition to regulating development to the availability of water supplies and sewerage capacity. However the issue of co-ordination is not made explicit and as such PD8 will need to be amended to take account of this.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend PD8 to reflect importance of co-ordination of development and infrastructure provision. The policy suggestion and supporting text will be considered as part of the Policies DPD.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 530
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  2211
Name:  Mr Matthew Naylor
Organisation:  Yorkshire Water Services Ltd.

Representation Number:  530
Policy:  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Paragraph 3.35

Summary of Representation:
Support for key issues highlighted in sub-section ‘community safety and wellbeing’. The respondent made it explicit that locating sensitive development, such as housing, close to existing sewage works can have significant negative amenity issues for future occupiers. Policy suggestions and supporting text on Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems and Waste Water Treatment Works provided.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed. Policy Direction 8 makes explicit reference to achieving more integrated management of water catchments by encouraging sustainable urban drainage systems. Given the level of detail the policy suggestions and supporting text for both SuDS and waste water treatment works will be considered as part of the Policies DPD. The potential for disamenity to new developments proposed near to utility installations is recognised and the Council will seek relevant advice when considering planning applications for such developments.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Policy suggestions and supporting text for both SuDS and waste water treatment works will be considered as part of the Policies DPD. The Council will seek relevant advice when considering planning applications near to utility installations.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 335
\ Other

Respondent I.D. 2413

Name: Mr John Dunshea

Organisation: Atisreal UK

Representation Number: 335

Policy: Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Spatial Planning Zones - Section 8

Summary of Representation:
Support the proposed spatial direction of significant brownfield housing provision within a new mixed-use community at Waverley.

Councils Response:
The principles for creating a sustainable settlement should be an essential part in appraising and taking forward all future development opportunities in Rotherham particularly urban extensions and other major development opportunities. The principle of Waverley has not yet been accepted and further work needs to be done to justify the release of Waverley to meet Rotherham’s future housing need.

It is accepted that more work needs to be done on urban extensions/ new communities that will need to be justified in the context of national and regional policy and supported by Sustainability Appraisal. Waverley is a significant site with potential for a new mixed use community. Other urban extensions will be identified during the settlement appraisal and site options work. Justification of suitable urban extensions will be dependent on the final RSS requirements, Sustainability Appraisal and performance under other policy and spatial objectives including the housing trajectory, Housing Market Renewal objectives and sustainable transport considerations.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.

Further work needs to be undertaken to support the release of Waverley as a new settlement. Identify and appraise all urban extensions options including Waverley and
take forward with appropriate justification into the submission document. Confirm Waverley’s brownfield position with DCLG due to the omission of green/brownfield definitions in PPS3.

Discuss with Highways Agency/RMBC Transportation Unit the need for evidence, regarding mitigation of potential impacts on the strategic road network and Air Quality Management Areas, in support of further development in the Lower Don Valley - to include Waverley and other possibilities that might be identified in the current settlement appraisal/site options work.

Meet respondent to clarify further.
Respondent I.D. 2413

Name: Mr John Dunshea

Organisation: Atisreal UK

Representation Number: 336

Policy: Object

Section / Paragraph: South Yorkshire Settlement Study

Summary of Representation:
Suggests changes to the SYSS to reflect Waverley as a new community.

Councils Response:
PD 1 used the Babtie Sustainable Settlement Study as the basis for the proposed settlement hierarchy. The SYSS only assessed existing settlements it did not and could not analyse the impact of the creation of a sustainable new community at Waverley. The Babtie settlement study was undertaken at a point in time and the methodology behind the study is robust. However the policy directions will be developed into Core Strategy policies and will have a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development within the Borough.

The principles for creating a sustainable settlement should be an essential part in appraising and taking forward all future development opportunities in Rotherham particularly urban extensions and other major development opportunities. The principle of Waverley has not yet been accepted and further work needs to be done to justify the release of Waverley to meet Rotherham’s future housing need. The development of a new community at Waverley will be considered further and the emerging spatial strategy may or may not include Waverley.

It is accepted that more work needs to be done on urban extensions/ new communities that will need to be justified in the context of national and regional policy and supported by Sustainability Appraisal. Waverley is a significant site with potential for a new sustainable mixed use community. Other urban extensions will be identified during the settlement appraisal and site options work. Justification of suitable urban extensions will be dependent on the final RSS requirements, Sustainability Appraisal and performance under other policy and spatial objectives including the housing trajectory, Housing Market Renewal objectives and sustainable transport considerations.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD later in the year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.

Further work needs to be undertaken to support the release of Waverley as a sustainable new settlement. Identify and appraise all urban extensions options including Waverley and take forward with appropriate justification into the submission document. Confirm Waverley’s brownfield position with DCLG due to the omission of green/ brownfield definitions in PPS3.

Discuss with Highways Agency/RMBC Transportation Unit the need for evidence, regarding mitigation of potential impacts on the strategic road network and Air Quality Management Areas, in support of further development in the Lower Don Valley - to include Waverley and other possibilities that might be identified in the current settlement appraisal/site options work.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 315
\ Object

Respondent I.D. 2413

Name: Mr John Dunshea

Organisation: Atisreal UK

Representation Number: 315

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Section 8

Summary of Representation:
The Waverley Area Action Plan should be brought forward as soon as possible.

Councils Response:
The principles for creating a sustainable settlement should be an essential part in appraising and taking forward all future development opportunities in Rotherham particularly urban extensions and other major development opportunities. The principle of Waverley has not yet been accepted and further work needs to be done to justify the release of Waverley to meet Rotherham’s future housing need.

It is accepted that more work needs to be done on urban extensions/new communities that will need to be justified in the context of national and regional policy and supported by Sustainability Appraisal. Waverley is a significant site with potential for a new mixed use community. Other urban extensions will be identified during the settlement appraisal and site options work. Justification of suitable urban extensions will be dependent on the final RSS requirements, Sustainability Appraisal and performance under other policy and spatial objectives including the housing trajectory, Housing Market Renewal objectives and sustainable transport considerations.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD later in the year. This baseline information will be used to produce the “spatial development strategy” for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.

Further work needs to be undertaken to support the release of Waverley as a new settlement. Identify and appraise all urban extensions options including Waverley and take forward with appropriate justification into the submission document. Confirm
Waverley’s brownfield position with DCLG due to the omission of green/brownfield definitions in PPS3.

Without this evidence base and justification for the release of Waverley the masterplan cannot be brought forward. A robust evidence base needs to be created to support the release of Waverley and clear principles – such as high quality design and minimising the impact of and impact on climate change fully considered.

Discuss with Highways Agency/RMBC Transportation Unit the need for evidence, regarding mitigation of potential impacts on the strategic road network and Air Quality Management Areas, in support of further development in the Lower Don Valley - to include Waverley and other possibilities that might be identified in the current settlement appraisal/site options work.

Meet respondent to clarify further.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 2413
Name: Mr John Dunshea
Organisation: Atisreal UK

Representation Number: 337
Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: South Yorkshire Settlement Study

Summary of Representation:
The SYSS under estimates the potential for Waverley to provide a new mixed use community, with direct and sustainable connections to Rotherham and Sheffield town centres.

Councils Response:
PD 1 used the Babtie Sustainable Settlement Study as the basis for the proposed settlement hierarchy. The SYSS only assessed existing settlements it did not and could not analyse the impact of the creation of a sustainable new community at Waverley. The SYSS does not estimate any potential from Waverley – this was not the purpose of the Study. The Babtie settlement study was undertaken at a point in time and the methodology behind the study is robust. However the policy directions will be developed into Core Strategy policies and will have a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development within the Borough.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD later in the year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.

Further work needs to be undertaken to support the release of Waverley as a sustainable new settlement. Identify and appraise all urban extensions options including Waverley and take forward with appropriate justification into the submission document. Confirm Waverley’s brownfield position with DCLG due to the omission of green/ brownfield definitions in PPS3.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 38
\ Support

Respondent I.D. 2501
Name: Mrs J. Thorpe
Organisation:

Representation Number: 38
Policy: Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
I will support Option C for Green Belt environment.

Councils Response:
Support for Green Belt option C, from the earlier Regulation 25 consultation, noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action required.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 282
\ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 282

Policy: Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Section 4

Summary of Representation:

Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)

The Core Strategy should take account of the principles and characteristics of other relevant strategies/programmes (PPS12, para 1.9). For submission need to clearly demonstrate how these relate to the LDF vision, objectives and strategy.

Account needs to be taken of proposals in the plan and requirements for land and premises of utility companies and other service agencies operating within the Borough.

The Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) provides a strategic steer for transport management and investment seeking to reduce the need for personal travel and modal shift through land use planning. This is reflected in RSS focusing most new development in sub-regional centres.

The core strategy should not have unacceptable impact on the motorway network and the implications of development at Waverley and the Lower Don Valley need to be considered.

Councils Response:
The comments are generally accepted but it has proved difficult to distil the principles and aspirations of numerous, often spatially unspecific stakeholder plans/strategies into the Core Strategy. Difficulties have been experienced in engaging utility companies and other public services agencies who appear to prefer to react to LDF propositions which are likely to be clearer at the site allocations stage.

There is a need to check the implications of the RTS strategic transportation investment programme and to consider further the potential implications of proposals such as Waverley on the strategic road network. In keeping with Circular 02/2007, the Council is currently working with the Highways Agency concerning the assessment of the potential impact of possible site allocation options.
**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Review approach to incorporating principles from the most relevant stakeholder plans/strategies into the submission Core Strategy. Re-examine the potential implications of the RTS investment programme. Consider the need for further evidence concerning the potential impact/possible mitigation of Waverley in relation to the SRN. Continue to involve the Highways Agency and utility companies in vetting possible site options for the Allocations DPD.

*******************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 298
\ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635
Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton
Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 298
Policy: Other
Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: Section 6

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 7 (Justification of Alternative Options)

There should be a clear evidence trail showing why the preferred option(s) were selected. The extent of detail on the consultation responses means that the preferred options are not as clear.

At submission a clear trail of options generation, appraisal and rejection and the role SA and community engagement have played in the process needs to be demonstrated.

Councils Response:
It is contended that the options trail including SA and community response is adequately covered in the Preferred Options and previous Regulation 25 documentation. It is considered that Figures 8 to 11 in particular provide a convenient explanation of the options selection process and the resultant policy and spatial directions of the core strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
In view of the above comments, review the need to further explain the options lineage in the submission document. See also 2635/276, 281.

..........................................................
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  2635
Name:  Ms Rachel Wigginton
Organisation:  Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number:  297
Policy:  Other

Section / Paragraph:  Section 6

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 7 (Justification of Alternative Options)

In terms of infrastructure the delivery of Option B appears to be heavily dependent on a Public Transport Rapid Transit system with no mention of what might happen if this is not deliverable in the plan period.

Furthermore, no reference is made to other forms of infrastructure necessary for the delivery of this option.

Councils Response:
It is accepted that Option B and the subsequent preferred option is highly dependent on public transport but this is not untypical of the aspirations of national policy and is supportive of reducing carbon emissions. Deliverability of enhanced public transport is dependent on government funding regimes with a shorter timespan than the LDF which is seeking to be inspirational and positive. Other alternatives like road pricing are unlikely to be politically acceptable and car based transport is not sustainable in the long term.

Specifying in detail the other infrastructure required to ensure delivery of the preferred option will be dependent on the programmes of utility companies and other public service providers. To date they have indicated a reactive rather than proactive stance and detailing infrastructure plans as a feature of LDFs is likely to take considerable time and require resource commitments from the other parties concerned if prompt and appropriate engagement is to be achieved.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider policy contingencies in case enhanced public transport is not deliverable in the plan period. Specifically prompt utility company and public service provider involvement in
settlement appraisal/site options work to assist early quantification/feasibility of likely infrastructure requirements in support of the submission document. See also 2635/282.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  2635
Name:  Ms Rachel Wigginton
Organisation:  Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number:  281
Policy:  Other
Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Whole Document

Summary of Representation:
The document is too long - too detailed in some places, lacking in detail elsewhere. It tries
to cover too much and the amount of background information could impair effective
community/stakeholder engagement and obscure the spatial message.

PPS12, para 2.2 requires LDFs to be clear, succinct and easily understood by all. The
submission document needs to be shorter and clearer.

Councils Response:
It is accepted that the current document is too lengthy. As the present document will
remain as part of the Core Strategy evidence trail, it is intended to concentrate on refining
the policy and spatial directions in the second half of the present document rather than
reiterating the earlier background material (as appears to be suggested in 2635/276 and
278 about explaining the options evidence trail and including foundation objectives in the
main text). The balance and level of detail will be addressed and clarity will be assisted by
the continuing use of maps, diagrams and tables rather than extensive text.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Take every opportunity in redrafting and restructuring the submission document to reduce
its length whilst achieving clarity in explaining the application of the spatial strategy.
Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 6 (Coherence/consistency within/between DPDs)

Cross boundary issues should be more developed and discussed earlier in the final document.

Particular issues include:
• Planning for housing in the Sheffield/Rotherham Market Area (particularly post 2016)
• Implications of development in the Lower Don Valley on the motorway and local roads network
• Strategic Waste planning
• Meeting the South Yorkshire regional aggregates apportionment and maintaining an aggregates landbank.

It is important to demonstrate that such development is deliverable.

Councils Response:
Comments noted. It is intended to further emphasise cross boundary issues in the submission document.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the scope and positioning of cross boundary issues for the submission document. (See also 2635/289,288,292 and 5263/308-313.) together with the depiction of cross boundary issues on the Key Diagram.
Consider the implications of recent CURS Study of the Sheffield/Rotherham Economy. Discuss with Highways Agency/RMBCTransportation Unit the need for evidence, regarding mitigation of potential impacts on the strategic road network and AQMAs, in
support of further development in the Lower Don Valley - to include Waverley and other possibilities that might be identified in the current settlement appraisal/site options work.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 277
\ Other

Respondent I.D.  2635

Name:  Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation:  Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number:  277

Policy:               Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 2 (Consultation/SCI)

A Statement of Consultation (with a list of consultees) and confirmation of meeting minimum requirements should be included with Submission Core Strategy

Councils Response:
It is considered good practice to prepare and publish feedback reports following all DPD consultation stages. It is intended that a Statement of Consultation as specified will accompany the Core Strategy on submission.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Continue prompt publication of feedback reports following all consultation stages culminating in a Statement of Consultation to be submitted with the Core Strategy and subsequent supporting DPDs. Scope out structure and content of Statement in line with guidance alongside preparation of submission Core Strategy.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 306

Respondent I.D.  2635
Name:  Ms Rachel Wigginton
Organisation:  Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number:  306
Policy:  Other
Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  All PDs - Paras 7.9-7.13

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 8 (Implementation and Monitoring)

Monitoring and implementation sections in the core strategies with completed examinations have generally been found to be lacking.

Implementation and monitoring need to be worked up in the submission document. Targets and milestones should be clearly related to policy considerations with the detail of the monitoring framework related to the strategic nature of the document.

Core Strategies and DPDs more generally should be absolutely clear about delivery, targets and milestones if they are not to fail Soundness Test 8.

Councils Response:
Comments noted. There is concern about matching aspirations for improved monitoring with actual capabilities related to resources and data sources. The Council wishes to pursue a realistic and balanced approach. There is merit in rationalising and streamlining to achieve consistent monitoring indicators at the national, regional and local levels. There is also a need for more bespoke monitoring indicators related to the performance of locally distinctive policies. The monitoring and delivery sections under each of the current Policy Directions adopts the former approach but it is intended to look to more bespoke indicators in support of the strategic policies being prepared for submission. There will also need to be more specific delivery arrangements agreed with appropriate stakeholders prior to submission.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Look to achieving a balanced approach to monitoring on submission. Consider more bespoke local arrangements under each policy direction to be reflected in future Annual
Monitoring Reports. Agree delivery more specific arrangements with key stakeholders prior to submission.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 276

\ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 276

Policy: Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
To ensure soundness, it is important that the Core Strategy:

• is a spatial document
• makes strategic decisions not to be devolved down to lesser DPDs
• has a clear trails of options generation, appraisal and rejection linked to SA and community engagement
• has clear delivery mechanisms, targets and milestones

GOYH’s comments are arranged under appropriate Soundness Test and final document needs to be check for soundness prior to submission.

Councils Response:
These points are generally accepted although it is felt that sufficient has already been done, in Section 6 of the Preferred Options document, to establish the options evidence trail.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the submission Core Strategy is more spatially specific, makes appropriate strategic decisions and further addresses delivery, targets and milestones. Carry out and maintain soundness checking of all DPDs using the PAS checklist/template.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 280
\ Other

Respondent I.D.  2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 280

Policy: Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Sections 7 and 8

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)

A spatial plan needs to show how the Core strategy translates national policy and RSS into the local context with appropriate adjustments for local circumstances based on local evidence and distinctiveness.

Policies need to be locally distinctive.

The spatial element of the strategy needs strengthening. At present there are a series of parallel approaches to housing, employment, retailing and leisure with insufficient explanation of how these land uses relate to each other in each settlement within the hierarchy. The approaches should be drawn together in individual places (see page 8, PAS Core Strategy Guidance 2006)

Suggest the spatial planning zones in Section 8 be developed further drawing the locally distinctive elements in para 8.5 into a clear spatial strategy for each zone and for the Borough as a whole. This would provide a structure for the remainder of the document and result in a more spatial plan.

The raft of issues (policies??) in Section 7 are vague, generic and lack local specificity. They need to be refined and worked up into a list of clear priorities for the Borough drawing on the issues raised in Section 8.

Councils Response:
Comments are generally accepted. There is a need to translate how national and regional guidance is to be specifically applied in the Borough emphasising locally distinctive policies.
The present parallel approaches to the priority topics need to be integrated in their application within specific settlements. It is agreed that spatial planning zones would provide
Representations Report.doc

a suitable structure for the submission document in demonstrating how they collectively make up the Borough’s spatial strategy. The policy directions in Section 7 will be refined and worked up into spatially distinctive policies addressing the Borough’s most important strategic issues.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Take up the need for more spatial and locally distinctive policies and the use of spatial planning zones to collectively demonstrate the overall spatial strategy in the submission document. SPZs should also structure the Allocations DPD.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 279
\ Other

Respondent I.D.  2635

Name:  Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation:  Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number:  279

Policy:  
Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:  Appendix 1

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)

Objectives to be precise and specific to the Borough to be in main text not an appendix.

Councils Response:
Unlikely to be able to avoid placing the 30 foundation objectives in an Appendix but see 2635/278 regarding opportunities for more locally specific objectives in the submission document.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
See 2635/278 regarding more locally specific objectives for submission.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 295
\ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 295

Policy: Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Section 5

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 7 (Justification of Alternative Options)

There is a useful precis of alternative options (as recommended by PPS12, para 4.19) and good use is made of the findings of SA.

However, the extent to which the evidence base supports the scenarios could be clearer - eg why have Dinnington, Maltby and Wath been singled out as settlements for new housing in Option B? Are these sustainable locations, have alternatives been fully considered, where is the evidence base?

You will need to demonstrate the evidence trail at submission.

Councils Response:
The options in Section 5 were derived from considering the possible spatial effects of the core strategy objectives under three scenarios use previously in developing the draft RSS. The possible effects on settlements like Dinnington, Maltby and Wath were only put forward to facilitate debate amongst stakeholders to identify the direction of a preferred option and were not backed by alternatives or specific evidence at that stage. The future role of these settlements is to be refined for submission based on the spatial and policy directions of the preferred option with the current settlement appraisal and site options work forming the evidence base.

It is felt that sufficient has already been done, in Section 6 of the Preferred Options document, to establish the options evidence trail. In order to keep the submission document brief, it is intended to concentrate on refining the policy and spatial directions in the second half of the present document rather than reiterating/reworking the earlier background material which will remain available in the Preferred Options document.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the need to briefly recap on the earlier stages in the submission document in order to make clearer the definition of options and their purpose to solicit general debate. See also 2635/276.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 304
\

Other

Respondent I.D. 2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 304

Policy: Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: All PDs

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 7 (Justification of Alternative Options)

PAS Core Strategy Guidance 2006 may assist in presenting a clear and more integrated strategy for the Borough with examples of presenting policies that are place rather than topic based.

Councils Response:
Comment noted. This guidance will be considered in developing a clear and more integrated strategy supported by place-based policies before submission. There may still be a need to include some topic based policies.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Take into account PAS Core Strategy Guidance 2006 in preparing for submission.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Respondent I.D.  2635  
Name:  Ms Rachel Wigginton  
Organisation:  Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber  

Representation Number:  278  
Policy:  
Object/Support:  Other  
Section / Paragraph:  para 4.11  

Summary of Representation:  
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)  

The Vision needs to be more place specific/locally distinctive to convey the spatial strategy for the Borough (see page 7, PAS Guidance 2006).  

Needs to be a clear and logical progression from a succinct spatial portrait and key issues through to the vision and objectives.  

Objectives to be precise and specific to the Borough to be in main text not an appendix.  

30 Objectives cover too many generic issues and should be focused on how the strategy will address the key issues.  

Councils Response:  
Accept vision needs to be more locally distinctive for submission and that it will be up to the Council to justify its specific approach to setting the vision and objectives.  

There is concern over the comment about too many generic objectives and the need for them to stem from local issues - it is now rather late in the process to attempt to recast them. However, it may be possible to focus objectives more in finalising the vision and setting out spatial directions related to specific issues within individual settlements and spatial planning zones.  

There is also some confusion over the issues, vision, objectives sequence - in the absence of a spontaneous spatially coherent Community Strategy vision, the Council commenced with defining a broad foundation of social, economic, natural resource and environmental objectives from national guidance, known issues and stakeholder plans/strategies. These objectives were found to be supportive of sustainability under SA. The effect of these objectives on three RSS based scenarios assisted the definition of options. SA and
consultation selected the preferred option which presents the basis for a vision and supporting policy and spatial directions to be further focused and refined prior to submission.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Review PINs comments on recent examinations regarding locally distinctive visions. Ensure adequate opportunity to clearly convey the inter-relationship and approach to setting issues, the vision and objectives (particular to Rotherham's above circumstances) and the refocusing of objectives in spatial planning zones is provided in scoping the structure and content of the submission document.
Representations Report.doc

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 305
\ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 305

Policy: Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Section 8

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 7 (Justification of Alternative Options)

Section 8 - Spatial Directions provides a useful introduction to the spatial aspects of the Borough including how the settlements relate to each other and how the Borough relates to adjacent local authority areas.

This and the priorities for each "spatial planning zone" should be developed further. This is important and should be used to inform the key issues, the objectives and the spatial strategy.

This and the key diagram should be presented much earlier in the Core Strategy and it should be clear at submission how it has led to the development of options and the selection of the preferred option(s).

Councils Response:
Comments noted. It is agreed that Section 8 could be further developed in the submission document around spatial planning zones to include area focused issues and objectives. These zones could collectively contributing to the overall spatial strategy for the Borough as well as assisting more spatial and locally distinctive policies.

The present Key Diagram is only an illustration of direction of the preferred option. It is contended that the submission document should contain a suitably revised Key Diagram presented as the culmination of the spatial strategy for the Borough drawing from the preceding spatial planning zones. The content of the submission Key Diagram is under consideration but could include housing and employment land supply by either broad percentages for each SPZ or specific numbers distributed by key settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further develop Section 8 and the use of spatial planning zone in the submission document. Consider content and positioning of a revised Key Diagram depicting the Borough's broad spatial strategy in the structuring of the submission document. (See also 2635/278, 280 and 283).
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 299
\ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 299

Policy: Other

Section / Paragraph: Section 7

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 7 (Justification of Alternative Options)

Good that the document is not overloaded with a raft of development control policies.

The Core Strategy should only contain a limited suite of policies. It is essential that strategic decisions are not devolved to lower level DPDs.

Councils Response:
Comments noted. It is the intention to develop the existing nine policy directions into a similar number of specific strategic policies with emphasis on local distinctiveness.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Develop the nine policy directions into actual strategic policies specific to the Borough. Consider the need for a policy specifically to address climate change. Consider the demarcation between policies in the Core Strategy and supporting detailed Policies DPDs.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3148
Name:   Jim & Dora Humphries
Organisation:

Representation Number:  39
Policy:                      Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Support Option C.

Councils Response:
Support for Option C from the earlier Regulation 25 consultations is noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action required.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 221
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  3165

Name: Mr & Mrs J & S Dixon

Organisation:

Representation Number: 221

Policy: Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Spatial Directions

Summary of Representation:
The abandonment of the long-standing proposal for major housing development at Thorpe Hesley is endorsed. Thorpe Hesley has been omitted from the list of settlements in the Rotherham/Sheffield corridor on page 124.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support with this issue. The omission of Thorpe Hesley from the Rotherham/Sheffield corridor will be rectified.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include Thorpe Hesley in the list of settlements in the Rotherham/Sheffield corridor

******************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 3165
Name: Mr & Mrs J & S Dixon
Organisation:

Representation Number: 220
Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Key Diagram

Summary of Representation:
The Key Diagram fails to indicate how rural service infrastructure will be maintained or improved. Also it does not indicate where “planned” park and ride facilities are to be located.

Councils Response:
The Key Diagram provides a pictoral snapshot of the main elements of the plan. Putting too much detail into the Key Diagram would cause confusion and reduce its impact. Rural transport issues will, however, be covered in the transportation section of the plan. The Council does not have any “planned” park and ride facilities. Proposals for such facilities will require an extensive public consultation exercise to be undertaken.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to the Key Diagram

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 387

\ Object

Respondent I.D.  3207

Name: Ms Janet Hodson

Organisation: JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number: 387

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Para. 7.31 & 7.32

Summary of Representation:
The submitted core strategy should not be submitted until the RSS has been approved setting out clearly that the plan will run to 2026 and being totally clear about the housing requirement in the Borough. The RSS housing requirement will enable a full consideration of how and where the need should be met.

Councils Response:
It would be ideal to have the definitive RRS housing requirement when preparing the submission Core Strategy. However the timetable for the production of the Core Strategy is laid out in the Local Development Scheme, which is agreed by the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber. It may not be possible, therefore, to wait until the RSS is finalised to produce the submission Core Strategy. In this case the core strategy will need to have to make assumptions regarding the requirement figures given the latest information emerging from the RSS process, and provide flexibility to accommodate any possible change.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 394
\ Support

Respondent I.D. 3207

Name: Ms Janet Hodson

Organisation: JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number: 394

Policy: Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Para. 8.7

Summary of Representation:
Dearne

Support the changes for Kilnhurst where outdated employment land can be released to encourage regeneration.

Councils Response:
Support Welcome

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 393

Object

Respondent I.D.  3207
Name: Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation: JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number: 393
Policy: Object
Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Para. 7.115

Summary of Representation:
The Key Diagram should reflect the alterations to the settlement hierarchy suggested in our written submission (and dealt with as individual representations), and remove the Waverley notation for the reasons set out below:
- the RSS EIP debate raised concerns about the future development of Waverley as a mixed community.
- its location is poor compared to other more sustainable locations in the borough.
- the Waverley concept relies on the creation of new infrastructure, whereas additional development in existing settlements can support and aid regeneration.

Councils Response:
The submission Core Strategy will have a clear settlement hierarchy and it will provide a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development in the Borough.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Over the next few months, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation early next year. This baseline information will be used to produce the “spatial development strategy” for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved. Ensure the Core Strategy vision, policies and key diagram reflect a clear spatial development for the Borough.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 392

Object

Respondent I.D.  3207

Name:  Ms Janet Hodson

Organisation:  JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number:  392

Policy:  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Para. 7.56

Summary of Representation:
The housing trajectory speaks for itself. Rotherham needs to start delivering homes in order to meet requirements. It is a poor reflection that in 2003-6 when the housing market has been at its peak the level of completions in the Borough did not achieve the annual requirement. If the Borough is to deliver the targets envisaged in the emerging RSS then a step change has to occur.

Councils Response:
Comments noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Council will have regard to PPS3 Housing, particularly paragraphs 60, and 62 to 67, to manage the delivery of housing land to meet the Borough's requirements.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 391

Object

Respondent I.D. 3207
Name: Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation: JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number: 391
Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Para. 7.54. Table 6

Summary of Representation:
The LPA are including some of the UDP Greenfield allocations as other sites. Is it sensible that these are regarded as going forward into the future if they are in relatively unsustainable locations? It is unclear to me if you will seek to rely on these locations.

Councils Response:
Most of the remaining UDP Greenfield allocations were included as, given the amount of other land identified within the urban areas, it was considered likely that they may be needed to meet the RSS requirement. Some of these sites are obviously more sustainable than others and release of any given site would reflect a number of factors including strategic considerations regarding the role of settlements and the results of the SHLAA. The inclusion of these sites may mean that a review of the Green Belt boundary will not be necessary. However, if a review of the Green Belt boundary were deemed necessary, the existing greenfield allocations may then need to be compared to other greenfield sites currently in the Green Belt.

The inclusion of these sites was for the purposes of estimating the potential housing land likely to be available in various locations, but does not constitute a decision to allocate them in the LDF.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Over the next few months, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation early next year. This baseline information will be used to produce the “spatial development strategy” for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.
Respondent I.D.  3207
Name:  Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation:  JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number:  390
Policy:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Para. 7.48

Summary of Representation:
Waverley is not a done deal. It was made clear at the RSS EIP debate by the GOYH that this was the situation. This document reads as if it is an imperative to have this site. We do not agree with this. We consider that as a location it compares poorly to other more sustainable locations and should not be relied upon. It is not accepted that the higher RSS figure will necessitate the release of Green Belt. Although it may necessitate the release of some greenfield sites.

Councils Response:
It was not intended that in considering Waverley as a potential strategic housing development in the Core Strategy Preferred Options, that the inclusion of Waverley as an allocation in subsequent DPDs should be seen as a "done deal". Waverley was included in the possible scenarios discussed in the housing section as, given the scale of the site, its inclusion or exclusion has a significant effect on the overall picture. The CSPO does not at any point state that Waverley is relied upon. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) will determine exactly what land is available where, and when it is likely to come forward. The results of the SHLAA when compared to the RSS housing requirement will determine whether housing land needs to be released beyond the existing urban envelope. The comparative sustainability of the options available and alignment with wider policy objectives will need to be assessed to decide if, and if so, when Waverley is allocated for housing.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Over the next few months, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation early next year. This baseline information will be used to produce the “spatial development strategy” for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission
stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved. The need/justification for Waverley will need to be examined in light of strategic objectives, including RSS, and the results of the SHLAA. Further work needs to be undertaken to support the release of Waverley as a sustainable new settlement. Identify and appraise all urban extensions options including Waverley and take forward with appropriate justification into the Issues and Options (Regulation 25) Consultation on Site Allocations prior to possible future inclusion in the Submission Core Strategy.
Respondent I.D.  3207

Name:  Ms Janet Hodson

Organisation:  JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number:  395

Policy:  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Para. 8.7

Summary of Representation:
Brampton: Opportunity to improve housing choice within the built up areas, outdated and poor employment locations need not be retained given the location of Corton Wood and the scope to improve linkages.

Councils Response:
This is an issue that will be addressed in the Allocations DPD. Further work will be required to refine future housing and employment land requirements, and their spatial distribution. The baseline information from settlement reviews will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and this will be included within the Submission Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further work will be required to refine future housing and employment land requirements and their spatial distribution. The Site Allocations DPD will provide baseline information to guide the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough.
Representations Report.doc

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 388

\ Object

Respondent I.D.  3207

Name:  Ms Janet Hodson

Organisation:  JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number:  388

Policy:  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Para. 7.42

Summary of Representation:
This document relies heavily upon the UPS. Latest guidance is promoting the HLAAS process (PPS3). The LPA should adopt the latest guidance to produce a robust evidence base for the plan.

Councils Response:
The need to meet the requirements of PPS3 in this respect is accepted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Rotherham Housing Market Assessment and the joint SHLAA currently being undertaken with Sheffield City Council and North East Derbyshire District Council, will guide future housing policy. Consideration will be given to establishing the margins of flexibility to deliver any increase in the RSS housing requirement for the Sheffield/Rotherham Market Area.


Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 398
Support

Respondent I.D.  3207

Name:  Ms Janet Hodson

Organisation:  JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number:  398

Policy:  
Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Para. 8.7

Summary of Representation:  
Outlying Settlements

Agree that Dinnington/Laughton Common be treated for consolidation; should be reflected in the rest of the document. Greenfield sites may require release at an early stage to support regeneration of this Key Settlement.

Councils Response:  
Support welcome. The early release of Greenfield sites will need to be considered, where alternative brownfield sites are not available, to meet need and regeneration objectives.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
Support noted
Respondent I.D.  3207

Name:  Ms Janet Hodson

Organisation:  JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number:  389

Policy:  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Para. 7.45

Summary of Representation:
Should not rely on what the Employment Land Study has come up with. This document is considered to be very flawed and is the subject of objection on various matters. It is considered that the ELS seriously under estimates the amount of land that will come from outdated and poorly located employment sites.

Councils Response:
Following public consultation the Employment Land Review was adopted by the Council in May 2007. It is acknowledged that further work to refine housing and employment requirements is required.

The comments will also be taken into account in undertaking work on the Site Allocations DPD, which will include more detailed consideration of settlements and their requirements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further work will be required to refine future housing and employment land requirements. The comments will also be taken into account in undertaking work on the Site Allocations DPD, which will include more detailed consideration of settlements and their requirements.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Rep No:  547
\ Object

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3207
Name:  Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation:  JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number:  547

Policy: Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  General

Summary of Representation:
The document indicates that an objector would need sound reasons to object at the
deposit stage, however given the level of uncertainty that exists at this time of consultation
objectors may well have substantive matters to raise that cannot currently be foreseen.

Councils Response:
It is the Council’s intention that Regulation 25 consultations on the Allocations DPD will
take place before finalising the Core Strategy for submission, allowing further comments to
be made in relation to allocations, in light of more detailed information on site availability.

Settlement/sites surveys will have been carried out to inform the Regulation 25
consultations on the Allocations DPD. Depending on the results of this work, and their
consistency with the approach laid out in the Core Strategy Preferred Option,
consideration will need to be given to whether further work is required on the CSPO before
proceeding to submission stage.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider whether further work and consultation will be required on the CSPO, in light of
the results of the settlement/sites surveys, before proceeding to submission stage.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations Rep No: 397

Respondent I.D. 3207
Name: Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation: JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number: 397
Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Para. 8.7

Summary of Representation:
Rotherham/Sheffield Corridor
Disagree with Waverley for reasons set out.

Councils Response:
Comments noted. (see NW/3207/7.48)
(Representation No. 3207/390)

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The need/justification for Waverley will need to be examined in light of strategic objectives, including RSS, and the results of the SHLAA.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 399

Object

Respondent I.D.  3207
Name:  Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation:  JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number:  399

Policy:  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Para. 8.7

Summary of Representation:
Outlying Settlements

At Maltby new housing can be provided for to some extent within the urban area, by a restructuring of land uses. Maltby relates more to the Urban Fringe than the outlying and rural zone given the key links to Bramley and the intervening major employment area at Hellaby.

Councils Response:
The extent to which new housing can be provided within the urban area of Maltby will be determined by the settlement/sites appraisal and the SHLAA.
The scope of any future development will be determined by its potential to provide a positive contribution towards improving existing sustainability or to be planned in a way which may give rise to sustainable patterns of development. The general extent and location of this growth will be assessed as part of the Allocations DPD.
It is unlikely that the Council will consider moving the Maltby settlement from the outlying spatial planning zone(SPZ) to the urban fringe SPZ, given the criteria used to define the SPZ's initially: Travel to Work Patterns were a key factor in determining the boundaries of the SPZ's. Other factors considered included remoteness, boundaries such as main transport links e.g. M18 motorway, and rurality. Maltby serves a wide rural hinterland.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Over the next few months, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation early next year.
This baseline information will be used to produce the “spatial development strategy” for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 396
Object

Respondent I.D. 3207
Name: Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation: JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number: 396
Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Para. 8.7

Summary of Representation:
Urban Fringe: Not accepted that Bramley/Wickersley is suffering from lack of employment. Opportunities in Hellaby are close and well served by public transport. If need to expand, appropriate to expand existing employment sites. More prospect of success with expansion of large established estates, than retaining small, outdated pockets of employment land in areas where employers do not want to relocate or redevelop. New housing in the area is not necessarily going to lead to out commuting if the employment strategy seeks to provide new attractive sites as outlined above.

Councils Response:
Paragraph 7.72 of the Core Strategy identifies Bramley/Wickersley as settlement with little or no land available for development, and accordingly at paragraph 8.7 the possible spatial directions to address this lack of land for new development are set out.

It is acknowledged that further refinement of the spatial distribution of employment land is required and therefore further work will be required to address this.

The comments will be taken into account and further consideration will be given to the appropriateness of the hierarchy, and the role of settlements within this. The comments will also be taken into account in undertaking work on the Site Allocations DPD, which will include more detailed consideration of settlements and their requirements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further work will be required to refine future employment land requirements and spatial distribution of employment land.

The comments will be taken into account and further consideration will be given to the appropriateness of the hierarchy, and the role of settlements within this. The comments will also be taken into account in undertaking work on the Site Allocations DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  Rep No: 409

\ Object

Respondent I.D. 3239

Name: Mr Greg Smith

Organisation: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number: 409

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Section 8.7

Summary of Representation:
The potential for a mixed use settlement at Waverley may be unsound as it is not referred to in the Draft RSS (see comment at paragraph 3.17 – 3.18 above). The Panel Report will provide confirmation of the status of Waverley in strategic terms and if it is not included in the RSS then Map 10 – Key Diagram should be deleted.

Councils Response:
The LDF needs to be in general conformity with the RSS. However this does not preclude some variations from the RSS when evidence supports this, for example, if evidence not considered in producing the RSS becomes available. It is accepted that more work needs to be carried out to determine if Waverley is required and whether it can be justified. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment SHLAA will determine exactly what land is available where, and when it is likely to come forward. The results of the SHLAA when compared to the RSS housing requirement will determine whether housing land needs to be released beyond the existing urban envelope. The comparative sustainability of the options available and alignment with wider policy objectives will need to be assessed to decide if, and if so, when Waverley is allocated for housing.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The need/justification for Waverley will need to be examined in light of strategic objectives, including RSS, and the results of the SHLAA.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3239
Name:  Mr Greg Smith
Organisation:  Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number:  410
Policy:  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Section 8.7

Summary of Representation:
We agree that there is a need for additional housing and employment land in Maltby and that in any review of the Green Belt this should not result in further constraint in this regard.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction PD1 outlines the Council’s commitment to maintaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS. Policy Direction PD2 section 5 gives examples of where localised reviews may be necessary. Any such changes to the Green Belt would have to be justified by exceptional circumstances. Work underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD will help determine the need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long-term sustainable development of the Borough’s settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 550

Respondent I.D.  3239
Name: Mr Greg Smith
Organisation: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number: 550

Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Section 8.7

Summary of Representation:
Given the potential requirement for additional housing above the figures set out in the Draft RSS and the requirements of PPS3, it is not considered prudent to de-allocate housing sites within the Rotherham/Sheffield Corridor and re-designate them as Green Belt land. We are in support of a full Green Belt review but the intention of this should be to take potential sustainable locations out of the green belt for either housing or employment land in order to meet the Borough’s requirements in this respect. A further constraining of the Green Belt could potentially lead to unsustainable patterns of development which could result in higher levels of commuting and a tightening of the labour force thereby impacting on the potential economic growth of the Borough.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction PD1 outlines the Council’s commitment to maintaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS. Policy Direction PD2 section 5 gives examples of where localised reviews may be necessary. Any such changes to the Green Belt would have to be justified by exceptional circumstances. Work underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD will help determine the need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long-term sustainable development of the Borough’s settlements.

In light of a previous Inspector’s decision following a public inquiry, the Thorpe Hesley allocation (UDP allocation number 6 in the Rotherham/Sheffield Spatial Planning Zone) is considered unsuitable for housing due to its unsustainable location.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 411
\ Other

Respondent I.D. 3239

Name: Mr Greg Smith

Organisation: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number: 411

Policy: Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Section 8.7

Summary of Representation:
It is considered that there are opportunities within settlements such as Dinnington for some employment sites to be better utilised as housing sites which will contribute towards the overall housing requirement in this location.

Councils Response:
The requirements for housing and employment land in each location will need to be determined and compared to available sites. A balance will need to be reached in each settlement in order to achieve strategic objectives. This may require the re-allocation of surplus employment land in some cases.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
That comments be noted
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 412
\ Object

Respondent I.D.  3239

Name: Mr Greg Smith

Organisation: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number: 412

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Section 8.7

Summary of Representation:
We support the use of Spatial Planning Zones to direct and influence spatial development; however they should not be used as a tool to restrict development purely on the basis of the spatial direction proposed. This should be based on achieving the economic, environmental and natural resource objectives related to each settlement and its characteristics.

Councils Response:
It is acknowledged that achieving the economic, environmental and natural resource objectives related to each settlement and its characteristics is important, but this must be achieved in the context of a strategic framework which includes defining the future roles of settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 413  
\ Other  

Respondent I.D.  3239  
Name: Mr Greg Smith  
Organisation: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.  

Representation Number: 413  
Policy:  
Object/Support: Other  
Section / Paragraph: Section 8.7  

Summary of Representation:  
We consider that sustainable development can be achieved on previously developed sites within smaller settlements such as Todwick and that they help to deliver a greater range of residential accommodation and contribute towards the vitality of the settlement.  

Councils Response:  
The CSPO does not advocate restricting the release of previously developed sites within smaller settlements, such developments can contribute towards the vitality of such settlements. Point 3 in Policy Direction 2 promotes clear criteria for assessing new housing sites and a site search sequence.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
None  

...........................................................................................................................................
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 47
\ Object

Respondent I.D.  3284
Name:  Mr Colin Griffiths
Organisation:  Satnam Planning Services Limited

Representation Number:  47
Policy: Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  3.1 and 3.2

Summary of Representation:
The phraseology used within the document to describe current circumstances should be accurate and unbiased; at present the wording, and 3.1 and 3.2 are only examples, is optimistic and "gilds the lily" to a significant degree.

Councils Response:
It is accepted that some of the content of these paragraphs appear aspirational. However, it is considered that it is the role of the Core Strategy to promote a positive but deliverable vision for Rotherham Renaissance and future development in the rest of the Borough. The Strategic Development Framework for Rotherham is to be reviewed to identify sustainable and deliverable options as the basis for further consultations for the Allocations DPD to be undertaken prior to the submission of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Review the Rotherham Strategic Development Framework to identify appropriate site allocation options to assist in finalising a deliverable locally distinctive vision for the submission Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 108

Respondent I.D. 3328

Name: Ms Lucy Mitchell

Organisation: Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number: 108

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Vision

Summary of Representation:
The Core Strategy should reflect more clearly the Strategic Development Framework for Rotherham, especially the approach outlined for the renaissance of town centres.

Councils Response:
The Core Strategy vision adequately reflects the Rotherham Strategic Development Framework (SDF) along with the other strategies and plans affecting the Borough. However, the Council accepts that further refinement of the vision would be beneficial for the Submission Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further refine the vision for the Submission Core Strategy to take account of the refresh of the SDF and the need for a clearer spatial vision for Rotherham, incorporating more locational specificity.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 107
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  3328
Name: Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation: Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number: 107
Policy: Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: Vision

Summary of Representation:
The vision and objectives of the Core Strategy complementing the aims and objectives of
the Regional Economic Strategy is supported. Specifically those to build a prosperous and
diverse economy and minimise climate change.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 222
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  3403
Name:  Mr Patrick O'Reilly
Organisation:  Quarry Products Association

Representation Number:  222

Policy:          Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  7.2.2

Summary of Representation:
No comments at this time, please keep me informed.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your communication, we will notify you of further progress in due course.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action required
Respondent I.D.  3418

Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  136

Policy:  

Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:  Para 3.4, Fig 2

Summary of Representation:
Paragraph 3.4 uses the 2004 ONS Population projections as a basis for outlining the expected population change for Rotherham over the Plan period and beyond (illustrated in Figure 2). These figures, however, do not take into account policy interventions and other local issues likely to influence growth and therefore should be discussed with caution.

Councils Response:
Population projections are only ever a trend-based prediction at a given time. The figures given in section 3 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options are used to set the scene for the spatial options and policy directions that follow. The Council accepts that policy interventions can have an effect on population growth but, as such effects can be difficult to predict with any certainty, the Council chose to use the unmodified ONS figures in section 3 of the Core Strategy document.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Insert text in the Submission Core Strategy relating to the status of population projections and the potential for policy interventions to alter population growth.
Summary of Representation:
The Core Strategy would benefit from providing a greater emphasis on collaboration between adjoining local authorities, including those from South Yorkshire and also the East Midlands region.

Councils Response:
The Council continues to collaborate with neighbouring authorities, most notably via the South Yorkshire Planning Officers Group and the Heads of (Planning) Service meeting. The Council has also worked closely with Sheffield CC on housing numbers.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Submission Core Strategy will incorporate appropriate wording relating to collaboration with neighbouring authorities as appropriate.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 153
\ Other

Respondent I.D. 3418

Name: Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation: Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number: 153

Policy: Other

Section / Paragraph: Para 7.74

Summary of Representation:
This paragraph discussed the issue of site size. What could receive more attention in the final core strategy is the relationship between site size and the specific needs of growth sectors of the forecasted economy.

Councils Response:
The need to account for the relationship between site size and the needs of growth sectors is accepted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Submission Core Strategy will include wording relating to the relationship between site size and the needs of growth sectors.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 148

Object

Respondent I.D.  3418

Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  148

Policy:  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Table 6, Map 7

Summary of Representation:
The potential housing distribution outlined in Table 6 and illustrated in Map 7 provides us with some concern. While we acknowledge Rotherham is seeking higher housing figures than currently outlined in draft RSS, a key issue will be the distribution of this housing. From the figures put forward, it would seem that the proportion of housing to be provided within the Rotherham urban area is lower than we would have expected. There are several settlements in close proximity to Rotherham in which relatively significant levels of potential housing have been identified. We would be concerned that this could undermine the regeneration of Rotherham city centre and the work of Transform South Yorkshire.

Councils Response:
The Core Strategy has to achieve a balance between directing the majority of new development to the main urban area of Rotherham while allowing sufficient development in outlying settlements to maintain and enhance their sustainability. The Council accepts that this policy approach to a settlement hierarchy requires further refinement and clarification in the Submission Core Strategy. The capacity of the main urban area to absorb large numbers of new housing is still to be determined by the detailed survey work underway for the Allocations DPD. Other factors need to be taken into account such as the likelihood of city living proving successful in Rotherham town centre; the appropriate densities for urban areas; the feasibility or desirability of restructuring large parts of the urban area to accommodate higher numbers and increased densities; and the need to support the HMR Pathfinder.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Refine and clarify the settlement hierarchy in the Submission Core Strategy, informed by the settlement capacity work underway for the Allocations DPD, the refresh of the Rotherham SDF and the housing figures available in RSS at time of drafting.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3418
Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  147
Policy:  Other
Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Para 7.47

Summary of Representation:
The evidence for the inclusion of the 100 dwellings/year windfall assumption is not clear. We feel it is important to bear in mind that windfall figures will reduce if they are accounted for as part of the urban potential figures. An up to date allocations document based on a full review of housing land supply is also likely to lead to a reduction in the incidence of windfall.

Councils Response:
Reference to windfalls in the Preferred Options document was intended to assist the debate about prospects for the delivery of the likely regional requirement and apportionment between settlements based on current sources of capacity pending consideration of the extent of further provision needed in the supporting Allocations DPD. The Council's position on windfalls in the submission Core Strategy will need to take account of PPS3 now advising against a windfall allowance in the first 10 years supply unless demonstrated by robust evidence.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Review stance on windfalls for the submission Core Strategy in the light of PPS3 advising against a windfall allowance in the first 10 years supply unless demonstrated by robust evidence.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 146

\ Object

Respondent I.D.  3418

Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  146

Policy:  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Table 3

Summary of Representation:
While we understand the case put forward by the South Yorkshire Authorities for an increase in housing provision, we feel Table 3 is misleading in that it implies that these higher figures are actually draft RSS figures. Clarification with regard to housing figures should be available to inform the submission version of the Core Strategy and the inclusion of this table will not be necessary.

Councils Response:
Table 3 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options sought to present as up-to-date picture as possible in relation to likely housing figures required for the Borough. The Submission Core Strategy will reflect the RSS housing figures available at time of drafting.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Submission Core Strategy will reflect the RSS housing figures available at time of drafting.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 145

Respondent I.D. 3418

Name: Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation: Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number: 145

Policy: Object

Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Para 7.40

Summary of Representation:
While this paragraph will be unlikely to be included in the submission Core Strategy given that the Panel Report should be available by this time, we would like to point out that it is inappropriate to pre-empt the findings of this report within the Core Strategy.

Councils Response:
Paragraph 7.40 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options sought to present as up-to-date picture as possible in relation to likely housing figures required for the Borough. The Submission Core Strategy will reflect the RSS figures available at time of drafting.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Submission Core Strategy will reflect the RSS housing figures available at time of drafting.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 144
\ Other

Respondent I.D.  3418
Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  144
Policy:  Other
Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Para 7.37

Summary of Representation:
Paragraph 7.37 states that draft RSS expresses its housing requirement as a net figure. It should also acknowledge that the draft RSS includes gross figures, and we would suggest that both these figures were included in Table 2, which currently displays only the net requirement.

Councils Response:
For clarity, the Submission Core Strategy will include gross RSS figures in Table 2 (or its equivalent). The housing figures given in the Submission Core Strategy will reflect the RSS figures available at time of drafting.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Add gross RSS housing figures to the Submission Core Strategy reflecting the RSS figures available at time of drafting.

******************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No:  139  
\ Support  

Respondent I.D.  3418  

Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon  

Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly  

Representation Number:  139  

Policy:  
Object/Support:  Support  

Section / Paragraph:  Para 5.4 to 5.12  

Summary of Representation:  
We welcome the use of scenarios in the Core Strategy to encourage discussion of alternative options, which is consistent with the approach used in developing the draft RSS.  

Councils Response:  
Support noted.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
No further action.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 137

Respondent I.D. 3418
Name: Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation: Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number: 137
Policy: Other
Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: Para 3.11

Summary of Representation:
Paragraph 3.11 also uses the ONS projections as a basis for outlining the predicted number of households in Rotherham. As previously stated, these do not take into account policy interventions and other local issues likely to influence growth and therefore should be discussed with caution.

Councils Response:
Population projections are only ever a trend-based prediction at a given time. The figures given in section 3 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options are used to set the scene for the spatial options and policy directions that follow. The Council accepts that policy interventions can have an effect on population growth but as such effects can be difficult to predict with any certainty, the Council chose to use the unmodified ONS figures in section 3 of the Core Strategy document.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Insert text in the Submission Core Strategy relating to the status of population projections and the potential for policy interventions to alter population growth.

*****************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 3418

Name: Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation: Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number: 135

Policy: Support

Section / Paragraph: Paras 2.7-2.9, 2.23-2.25

Summary of Representation:
We welcome the references made in the Core Strategy to the Regional Spatial Strategy and its relationship with the Local Development Framework for Rotherham. In particular, the emphasis placed on the need for consistency between the RSS and development plan documents is considered positive.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 138
\ Object

Respondent I.D.  3418

Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  138

Policy:  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Para 5.1

Summary of Representation:
We welcome the alignment of the Core Strategy objectives with the themes of Rotherham’s Community Strategy. However, we feel that the grouping of these objectives under four aims simplifies matters somewhat and does not recognise some of the key issues apparent in Rotherham, such as transport. We acknowledge that it is not feasible to include all of the 30 objectives identified in Appendix 1 within the main document. We suggest, however, that it may be better to build on this approach and include a more comprehensive overview of specific issues facing the Rotherham district.

Councils Response:
Section 3 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options document sets out the issues facing Rotherham with 30 detailed objectives given in Appendix 1. The Council accepts that an overview of the main issues to be addressed by the Core Strategy and a greater focus in the objectives put forward would be beneficial.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Revise section 3 of the Submission Core Strategy to focus on major issues. Assess the feasibility of rationalising the 30 Core Strategy objectives to focus on the major issues and a revised vision for the Core Strategy.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 46

Object

Respondent I.D. 3424
Name: Mr Henryk Peterson
Organisation: Sport England

Representation Number: 46
Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
There is disappointment the Leisure and Recreation matters will not be fully addressed in the short term, given delays with further evidence gathering to support the production of a separate DPD. The proposed review and saving of existing Leisure and Recreation UDP policies (figure 12), as agreed with Government Office, may have hidden dangers in that:
- The policies are not in line with current government planning guidance (PPG17).
- UDP policies may not be said to have been adequately reviewed.
- UDP policies have inherent weaknesses relative to the preferred option(s) particularly as regards sustainability matters and standards to be achieved.
- The delivery of sport and recreation facilities will not reflect up to date need and quantitative and qualitative standards to adequately the strategic policy directions.
- There is no baseline in place to measure mitigation of development proposals.

Councils Response:
These comments are generally accepted but the new planning regime requires the Council to set out its priority LDF programme in the Local Development Scheme to be agreed with the Government Office. It was made clear that the LDF was not to be seen as a replacement UDP which has comprehensive topic coverage. PPG17, RSS and "Saved" UDP policies for community facilities will provide an interim planning policy framework for sport and recreation pending further work in providing the evidence base (particularly concerning need and appropriate local standards) to underpin policies and proposals in future Policies and Allocations DPDs to be programmed in a future LDS.
There is some scope to expand the strategic policy coverage of commercial leisure as part of the Retail and Leisure topic in the submission Core Strategy together with the identification of appropriate sites in the supporting Allocations DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Discuss with Sport England the scope to expand the strategic policy coverage of commercial leisure as part of the Retail and Leisure topic in the submission Core Strategy together with the identification of appropriate sites in the supporting Allocations DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 616

Object

Respondent I.D. 3763
Name: Mr Ian Smith
Organisation: English Heritage

Representation Number: 616
Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Para 3.17

Summary of Representation:
Para 3.17 page 25 - Penultimate line should read Townscape Heritage Initiative

Councils Response:
Agree.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Replace “Town Heritage Initiative” with “Townscape Heritage Initiative” in penultimate line of paragraph 3.17.(or its equivalent in the Submission draft).
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Object

Rep No: 617

Respondent I.D. 3763
Name: Mr Ian Smith
Organisation: English Heritage

Representation Number: 617
Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Para 3.27

Summary of Representation:
In para 3.27 page 28 - Mention should be made of the 5 Historic Parks and Gardens in Rotherham

Councils Response:
Agree

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include reference to the Borough’s 5 Historic Parks and Gardens in paragraph 3.27.(or its equivalent in the Submission draft).
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3763
Name:  Mr Ian Smith
Organisation:  English Heritage

Representation Number:  618
Policy:  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Para 3.28

Summary of Representation:
Questioning if stricter controls for the historic environment are actually necessary given national/local policy and guidance in place. The problems with the management of assets in Rotherham are likely to be the result of a failure to implement existing controls than the need for additional ones. Failings are likely to be by those undertaking developments and the Council to take full consideration of the impact which their proposal might have upon the historic environment and lack of a strategy to ensure that historic assets are adequately maintained. It recommends addressing these issues and gives some suggestions (education, conservation area appraisals, management plans and Supplementary Planning Documents etc). The Buildings at Risk Survey of its Listed Buildings could form the basis for the development of a strategy to improve the future management or Rotherham’s historic assets.

If there is a need for additional controls ideas suggested are:
• Identifying and safeguarding those aspects of the historic environment which are not currently protected by national designations.
• Consider a Council strategy to identify and protect locally important buildings, structures and assets across the Borough.
• Consider the need for other settlements which should have Conservation Areas designated within them.

Councils Response:
Although the Borough’s historic environment is not a priority topic for review in the first round of the LDF’s DPDs, Policy Direction PD7 (Local Heritage) is provided as a transitional strategic-level policy to enhance the UDP’s relevant “saved” policies pending their eventual review and replacement. As such the need to fully consider whether stricter controls are actually necessary will be considered during the preparation of the future DPD and likely associated guidance. In the meantime a review of the Borough’s existing and proposed Conservation Area’s is progressing, initially to identify priorities for review and associated preparation of management plans (the identification of priorities will be
informed by consultation). Alongside this, completion of the Borough’s Listed Buildings and Buildings at Risk Survey is being undertaken and proposals for a Buildings at Risk Survey are being considered.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
To be considered in a future Development Plan Document covering historic environmental policies, yet to be programmed in the Borough Council’s Local Development Scheme. Continue review of the Borough’s existing and proposed Conservation Area’s, secure completion of the Borough’s Listed Buildings and Buildings at Risk Surveys and consider proposals for a Buildings at Risk Survey.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 619
Object

Respondent I.D.  3763

Name:  Mr Ian Smith

Organisation:  English Heritage

Representation Number:  619

Policy:  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Para 3.30

Summary of Representation:
It should be made clear that this also includes the reuse or adaption of existing buildings

Councils Response:
Agree

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend first sentence of 4th bullet point of paragraph 3.30 (or its equivalent in the Submission draft) to include reference to the re-use or adaptation of existing buildings.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 607
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  3763
Name:  Mr Ian Smith
Organisation:  English Heritage

Representation Number:  607

Policy:  
Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Para 7.6 and 7.8

Summary of Representation:
The intention to produce a Core Strategy Policy dealing with Heritage is welcomed.

Assistance in evidence gathering to support this is offered.

Councils Response:
The offer of assistance welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Arrange meeting to discuss.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 606
Other

Respondent I.D. 3763

Name: Mr Ian Smith

Organisation: English Heritage

Representation Number: 606

Policy: Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Para 4.11

Summary of Representation:
Vision broadly supported. However the vision would benefit from a more clearly articulated intention to safeguard and reinforce the distinct identity of Rotherham.

Widen reference made to public spaces to encompass all public realm.

Suggested amendment to line 2 of the Vision to read"... enterprising economy. It will safeguard and reinforce the distinct identity of the Borough and have the best in architecture, urban design and public realm"

Councils Response:
Support for the vision is welcomed. Further drafting of the wording of the Core Strategy Vision is required to make it more locally distinctive to Rotherham. The suggested wording will be considered for inclusion.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider suggested wording in the drafting of a more locally distinctive vision for Rotherham.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 615

\ Support

Respondent I.D. 3763

Name: Mr Ian Smith

Organisation: English Heritage

Representation Number: 615

Policy: Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Page 141 Aim 1

Summary of Representation:
We support Aim 1 of the core strategy objectives and the following objectives
1.1 Urban renaissance
1.2 Green belt
1.4 Countryside and Landscape
1.5 Historic built Environment
1.6 Countryside and Heritage Assets
2.8 Tourism

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Noted.
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Assessment of Representations Rep No: 76

Respondent I.D. 4134

Name: Mr A. Smith

Organisation:

Representation Number: 76

Policy: Object Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The Core Strategy "Hybrid Preferred Option" is not a true reflection of what people prefer as it wasn’t a free choice; given a free choice of all options my own choice would be:
(B1) Role of settlements.
(B2) Housing. (C3) New industrial development. (B5) Travel and Transport. (A4) Shopping and Leisure.
(B6) Environment.

197 members of the general public filled in the original questionnaires which is hardly a cross section of a community of 300,000 people.

Councils Response:
This representation appears to raise concerns about the validity of the consultation response to the earlier Regulation 25 Issues and Options stage. The Council carries out consultations in line with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement but has no influence over the number of responses. The Council neither makes the claim nor has the resources to achieve a response from all the Borough's residents but does give the opportunity to do so. Section 6 of the Regulation 26 document explains how the preferred option was developed from majority support for options B and C. The choice of options cited by the respondent is unlikely to be prejudiced by developing the core strategy to submission and there will be a further opportunity to challenge its soundness at the Regulation 28 consultation stage. The Council undertook workshops with representatives from community partnerships/parish councils and local groups in each Area Assembly and with specific interest groups. The Consultation Statement relating to the Issues and Options Stage (Regulation 23) of the Core Strategy is available on the Forward Planning web page or from the Council. The questionnaire was not the only way that stakeholders' views were sought, but it did enable the wider public to get involved. Hard copies of the questionnaire were circulated via the Area Assembly networks.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 226
Object

Respondent I.D. 4175
Name: Mr R. Twynham
Organisation: 

Representation Number: 226
Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: whole plan

Summary of Representation:
No proper timescale given, particularly to local retail and residential development. Consultation but no action.

Councils Response:
The plan has to be realistic, so actions indicated in the plan should be capable of being undertaken within the plan period, in this case before 2021. Consultation is an important aspect of planning to ensure the local population have the opportunity to contribute to the process at specific stages of the plan, as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure the timescale of the plan is clearly stated in the foreword to the plan

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 307
\ Support

Respondent I.D. 4712
Name: Mr J. Hamer
Organisation: WECARE

Representation Number: 307
Policy: Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: Map 10

Summary of Representation:
General approval of all RMBC’s future plans.

Supertram extensions have support from the public (eg Nottingham where there was no existing infrastructure).

There has been a reduction in car use on the Halfway to Malin Bridge Supertram route.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed. The importance of new rapid transit systems like Supertram is recognised as being of considerable importance to the future spatial framework for the Borough based on sustainable locations, travel modes and patterns. Short term funding considerations may require investigation of alternative rapid transit technologies and contingencies if rapid transit systems are unable to be delivered.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Continue to promote rapid transit systems including less costly technologies such as Bus Rapid Transit in the submission document but consider contingencies if these prove to be undeliverable.
Summary of Representation:
Suggesting 1100 new houses in Kiveton Park will overload the school and exceed capacity of Primary Care facilities in the area without major investment in infrastructure.

Councils Response:
The figure provided in Map 7 provides an estimate of the supply of land available for housing, where it might be produced and any potential shortfalls which may exist. It also assists in determining whether the target for new dwellings built on previously developed land is likely to be met.

However, the potential land available is an estimate and further site identification work will need to be undertaken in line with PPS3 and the forthcoming companion guides. There is, therefore, a possibility that not all the land will prove to be available within the plan period. As such the figures should be treated with some caution.

Additional development (residential or otherwise) that does come forward will have potential to either provide a positive contribution towards improving sustainability or to be planned in such a way which may give rise to sustainable forms of development. A key element of this will be to ensure co-ordination of new development and infrastructure provision.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 89

Comment

Respondent I.D. 4845

Name: The Occupier

Organisation: H M Prison Service, The Secretariat

Representation Number: 89

Policy: Object/Support: Comment

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
We have had the opportunity to study the preferred options in detail and have no comments to make.

Councils Response:
No comment noted but government guidance requires the LDF to consider provision for prisons.
(See representation 5047-171)

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Council will consider the need for a criteria based policy on new prison development in the Policies DPD.

*****************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 431

\ Object

Respondent I.D.  4965

Name:  Mr Peter O'Brien

Organisation:  Transform South Yorkshire

Representation Number:  431

Policy:  
Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Section 7.115

Summary of Representation:
The Dearne Valley Parkway on Map 10 (the Key Diagram) could usefully be shown as extending to the M1, and onwards towards Manchester.

Councils Response:
Suggestion noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider suggestion when producing subsequent versions of the Key Diagram.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 430

Object

Respondent I.D. 4965

Name: Mr Peter O'Brien

Organisation: Transform South Yorkshire

Representation Number: 430

Policy: Object

Section / Paragraph: Object

Summary of Representation:
The housing policies, in as much as they relate to addressing housing market weakness/failure, managing land release, affordable housing and design/sustainability are all critical to the Pathfinder’s programme and we would therefore look to them being explicitly addressed by the LDF Core Strategy.

Councils Response:
Housing policy will need to address these issues, supported by evidence provided by Transform South Yorkshire. Housing policies will also need to address the fact that many of the problems that the HMR pathfinder seeks to address exist elsewhere in the Borough, beyond the HMR pathfinder boundary.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Note comments in the production of subsequent DPDs.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 429

Object

Respondent I.D. 4965
Name: Mr Peter O'Brien
Organisation: Transform South Yorkshire

Representation Number: 429
Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Section 4

Summary of Representation:
Section 4 is a summary of the visions and/or strategies of a range of partner organisations. Although these are translated into a single "core strategy vision", it would perhaps have been more helpful if their implications had been translated into a set of "challenges/opportunities" for the Borough. These could then be linked to a series of core objectives for the LDF. In terms of the HMR Pathfinder for example, we would expect a clear strategic commitment to "transform under-performing housing markets", derived from the evidence base in our Scheme Prospectus, to which RMBC is a partner.

Councils Response:
Comments noted but PPS12 specifically requires the Core Strategy to be based on a vision. The suggested vision in paragraph 4.11 mentions clean, safe, green, well maintained neighbourhoods …….. good quality homes and accessible local facilities and services …….. creating sustainable communities. The aims of the TSY Prospectus are reproduced in Section 2. All these references are intended to be supportive of the HMR initiative. A brief vision statement is not able to specifically quote from all stakeholder objectives. These need to be assimilated into policy development and included in the evidence base. The TSY Prospectus will assist further development of PD2 under Objective 4.4 Housing Choice and 4.5 (Re-invigorating) Areas of low housing demand.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Make links with the objectives of the TSY Prospectus more explicit in the development of PD2 to the submission stage. The Prospectus to be part of the evidence base.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 428
\ Object

Respondent I.D. 4965

Name: Mr Peter O'Brien

Organisation: Transform South Yorkshire

Representation Number: 428

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Section 4

Summary of Representation:
Still with regard to Section 4, the significance of the draft RSS is reduced to a single paragraph. The RSS is probably the single most important (planning) influence on the LDF, and merits a much fuller explanation of what it means.

Councils Response:
The main issues from RSS are covered in Section 2, and Section 4 is intended to cover the make up of Rotherham's vision in the light of those contained in other key plans and strategies. The RSS is an important influence on LDF production and the need for the Core Strategy to be in “general conformity” the RSS is stated. The RSS is one factor among many that need to be taken into account when producing the Core strategy. Other factors, such as the Community Strategy and the also local evidence base need to be taken into account and the policies in the RSS need to be applied in light of these. It is not possible to detail all the factors that fed into the CSPO, and Government guidance advises on brevity and to avoid repeating national and regional policies.

The Core Strategy is unlikely to be submitted in advance of consideration of the final published RSS and the submission Core Strategy text will need to be amended accordingly.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend/expand text of the submission Core Strategy to reflect the main messages arising from the final published version of RSS.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 427

Object

Respondent I.D. 4965
Name: Mr Peter O'Brien
Organisation: Transform South Yorkshire

Representation Number: 427
Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Section 4.11

Summary of Representation:
The first half of the document is interesting but its length detracts from the thrust of the document; a more succinct synopsis, with a fuller Annex, may be clearer.

Councils Response:
Comment noted. The submission Core Strategy will not include this sort of pre-amble. Background information will be included in annexes/appendices or separate documents.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 227

\ Support

Respondent I.D. 4969
Name: Mr Ian Rowe
Organisation: Signet Planning (for Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estates)

Representation Number: 227

Policy: Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: 7.27

Summary of Representation:
Support the need for the emerging LDF to fully take into account the strategic requirements, particularly with respect to future housing land provision, insofar as it requires a 15 year housing land supply to be made available as part of the LDF.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of this policy direction

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action required

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 171

Object

Respondent I.D.  5047

Name:   Naomi Kellett

Organisation: Atkins (for National Offender Management Service)

Representation Number:  171

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Policy omission

Summary of Representation:
The Council should consider the inclusion of a criteria based policy to deal with a firm prison proposal, should it arise during the plan period.

Councils Response:
The Council does not consider that there is a pressing need to include a policy on new prison development in the Submission Core Strategy. The respondent states that there are no specific proposals at present nor specific sites identified in Rotherham. The Council will consider the need for a criteria based policy on new prison development in drafting the Policies DPD.
(See representation 4845-89)

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the need for a criteria based policy on new prison development in the Policies DPD.

(Note the offer by NOMS to propose policy wording.)

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 583

Respondent I.D. 5135

Name: Ms Annette Elliott

Organisation: United Co-operatives Ltd

Representation Number: 583

Policy: Other

Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Other

Summary of Representation:
Consideration should be given to threshold populations required to sustain specific local services, including retail. Where the immediate population is too small to support local shopping permitting facilities on through roads may create viable opportunities.

Councils Response:
This is an issue more appropriately addressed in preparing the Site Allocation and Supporting Policies DPDs. Further work will be undertaken to assess the requirements for settlements, and further consideration will be given to including a consideration of threshold populations.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further consideration should be given to the potential to consider threshold populations required to support local retail facilities as part of additional retail work required to support the Allocations and Policies DPDs. It may be appropriate to ask the respondent to put provide further information or detail of threshold populations which they believe are appropriate.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 582
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5135

Name: Ms Annette Elliott

Organisation: United Co-operatives Ltd

Representation Number: 582

Policy: Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Appendix 4: evidence base

Summary of Representation:
Identify importance of up to date ‘needs’ studies and pleased to see importance placed upon this in appendix 4. Stress the importance of maintaining annual reviews in respect of retail needs information in support of a defined hierarchy of centres.

Councils Response:
Welcome the comments regarding the evidence base.

In line with advice in Planning Policy Statement 6 (Planning for Town Centres) further work will be required to provide up-to-date retail needs information for centres identified in the retail hierarchy in Policy Direction 4. This will inform the Core Strategy Submission Document and the Site Allocations DPD. Paragraph 4.3 of PPS6 identifies that the need for further development should be kept under regular review. As part of establishing LDF monitoring requirements, and with regard to resource implications, further consideration will be given to whether annual updates or other intervals are appropriate to ensure retail needs data is updated regularly.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further work will be undertaken to ensure that preparation of the Core Strategy Submission Document and Site Allocations DPD are informed by up-to-date retail needs information. Further consideration will be required to determine the appropriate interval for updating retail needs information to ensure compliance with requirements in PPS6.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  443
Policy:  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Section 7.67 & 7.68

Summary of Representation:
Concerned that twice the level of employment land is being proposed compared to the RSS figure (further comment under para. 7.78). 184 Ha. are favoured for retention, exceeding the RSS figure by 76 Ha. There is, therefore, no need to allocate the extra 46 Ha(*this should be 76Ha). The RSS figure can be accommodated without allocating extra land. Surplus employment land must be incorporated in Green Belt where possible, to counter any projected incursions for new housing.

Councils Response:
The employment land requirement projections in draft RSS utilise out-of-date data which do not appropriately reflect Rotherham’s future employment land requirements. Indeed recommendation 4.3 (iii) of the Draft RSS Examination in Public Panel Report is that the employment projections in RSS should take account of the most up-to-date runs of the Econometric Model.

The forecast employment land requirements in Rotherham determined as part of the employment land review represent the use of more up-to-date information, and its use is in line with draft RSS policy E3(a)(i). The Yorkshire and Humber Assembly have supported the Council's approach to identifying its employment land requirements. (See representations from Yorkshire and Humber Assembly, 3418-154, 3418-155, 3418-158.)

It is acknowledged however that refinement of future projections and spatial distribution of employment land is required.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further work will be required to refine future employment land requirements and their spatial distribution between and within settlements at the strategic level, taking account of the settlement hierarchy, the findings of the employment land review and other supporting information regarding likely job need in the Borough. The Issues and Options Stage of the
Allocations DPD will also support the further development of the Core Strategy. There will be consultation on the Allocations DPD prior to submission of the Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 442

Support

Respondent I.D. 5147

Name: Mr John King

Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 442

Policy: Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Section 7.52

Summary of Representation:
Support for including Waverley within the housing calculations. Must incorporate sustainable a mixed use options with sufficient services and facilities. This should not be simply an enormous housing estate and must incorporate/include:
• Design/technologies to reduce use of natural resources (opportunity for Rotherham to demonstrate that it can achieve a high quality sustainable development on this scale)
• Improvements to rail transport infrastructure (rail terminal on Sheffield – Lincoln line)
• Design to encourage non-motorised transport i.e. cycle and pedestrian friendly.

Councils Response:
Support for the inclusion of Waverley in the housing calculations is noted, although Waverley was included only as a possible proposal. It has yet to be fully justified in comparison with other potential urban extensions that may be required to achieve the Borough's requirement for future housing (and employment) provision as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. The issues referred to are, amongst others, an important part of the likely sustainability of any proposed development at Waverley and are duly noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Identify and appraise all urban extensions options including Waverley and take forward with appropriate justification into the submission document. If proposals for a major housing development at Waverley are progressed the above issues are considered.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 440

\ Object

Respondent I.D. 5147
Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 440
Policy: 
Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Sections 1-6

Summary of Representation:
The document is too long; much of the first half of the document could have been in appendices, the first planning policy does not appear until page 70. The document is too lengthy for consultation with the public.

Councils Response:
The first half of the document attempts to explain the background to Policy Directions and how the earlier consultation exercise contributed to their formulation. It is accepted that the policy document is long and that it may have been helpful to put some information into appendices. This is a working document that explains process, as well as laying out the policy directions for the Core Strategy, whereas the Submission Draft of the Core Strategy will deal only with policy and will, therefore, be much shorter. Central Government guidance requires that there is a clear evidence trail provided. Representations from GOYH (2635-298) make clear that compliance with Soundness Test 7 (Justification of Alternative Options) is essential.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Concerns noted.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 441  
\ Support

Respondent I.D. 5147

Name: Mr John King

Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 441

Policy:  
Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Section 6.27

Summary of Representation:
Support hybrid B&C option; it is clear from consultation and Sustainability Appraisal that that market driven approach would not meet the required environmental and social considerations. Support conditional on rural environment receiving equal consideration in the submission draft.

Councils Response:
Support is welcome and it is acknowledged that the rural environment is equally important to the urban.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments should be noted in the production of the submission draft.
Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  444
Policy:  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Section 7.69

Summary of Representation:
Sites not favoured for Employment uses that are not suitable for housing, due to unsustainable locations, should be incorporated into the Green Belt. Unfavourable brownfield sites should be restored for agriculture/leisure/ecology.

Councils Response:
Where sites currently allocated for employment, but considered no longer suitable for employment, are located next to the Green Belt, the re-allocation of the site as Green Belt will be considered along with other possible uses for the site.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments should be noted in the production of the submission draft Core Strategy.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5186
Name:  Mr P Horne
Organisation:  Merryweathers 1832 (for G.W. Woolhouse & Son)

Representation Number:  541
Policy:  
Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Para 5.11

Summary of Representation:
Support for Option B and in particular policies relating to housing and environment.

Councils Response:
Section 5 was intended to give details of the alternative options which were put forward within the Regulation 25 pre-submission public consultation stage of the Core Strategy. As such they were put forward as devices to assist discussion and debate about how the Core Strategy could be developed. The results of this consultation culminated in establishing the detail within sections 7 to 9 of the Core Strategy preferred options draft.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 542
\ Support

Respondent I.D. 5186

Name: Mr P Horne

Organisation: Merryweathers 1832 (for G.W. Woolhouse & Son)

Representation Number: 542

Policy: Support

Section / Paragraph: Para 5.12

Summary of Representation:
Objection to Option C, particularly restricted policies relating to environment.

Councils Response:
Section 5 was intended to give details of the alternative options which were put forward within the Regulation 25 pre-submission public consultation stage of the Core Strategy. As such they were put forward as devices to assist discussion and debate about how the Core Strategy could be developed. The results of this consultation culminated in establishing the detail within sections 7 to 9 of the Core Strategy preferred options draft.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 268
\ Other

Respondent I.D.  5200
Name:  Claire Whittaker
Organisation:  Fairhurst Consultants (for Lafarge Aggregates Ltd)

Representation Number:  268
Policy:  Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Map 10 Key Diagram

Summary of Representation:
The hybrid preferred option should not preclude extensions to quarries and the allocation of an extension to Harrycroft quarry should be included on Map 10

Councils Response:
The hybrid preferred option does not preclude quarry extensions in appropriate circumstances (See also 1837b). The Local Development Scheme agreed with the Government Office indicates minerals is not a priority topic for the first round of LDF documents.
A broad strategic policy for minerals will be promoted in the submission Core Strategy based on the fourth bullet in PD8. This could extend to mentioning Harrycrofts Quarry as the Borough's only existing source of limestone aggregates. However, the specific issue of extensions to Harrycrofts quarry will continued to be assessed in detail against appropriate "saved" UDP minerals policies and prevailing national and regional guidance (including RAWP production apportionment) until replaced by updated minerals policies in a future Policies DPD.

For clarity it is only intended to include the broad spatial implications of the LDF's initial priority topics of housing, employment and transportation in the Key Diagram (Map 10).

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include reference to current mineral working sites in the further development of PD8 in the submission Core Strategy to assist spatial specificity under soundness test 4.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 267
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5200
Name: Claire Whittaker
Organisation: Fairhurst Consultants (for Lafarge Aggregates Ltd)

Representation Number:  267
Policy: Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: Para 5.11 and Map 4

Summary of Representation:
Support for quarry extensions under Option B.

Councils Response:
Support noted. A small majority of consultees at the earlier Issues and Options stage also felt that the Core Strategy’s mining and quarrying objective (Objective 2.11) was best served by Option B which implies support for some quarry extensions. There was also significant support for strict limits on quarry extensions under Option C which implies extensions are only to be allowed in appropriate circumstances which are touched on in the fourth bullet of PD8: Efficient Use of Resources in promoting the direction of the preferred hybrid option.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Note support for quarry extensions
Respondent I.D.  5200

Name:   Claire Whittaker

Organisation:  Fairhurst Consultants (for Lafarge Aggregates Ltd)

Representation Number:  269

Policy:                  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Page 22 (Housing Issues)

Summary of Representation:
Support the need for different types of housing including executive homes (architecturally
designed dwellings in a high quality landscape setting).

Councils Response:
The need to provide a choice of housing offer is recognised in PD2.2 to assist social
objective 4.4 and economic objective 2.7. The Borough's housing requirements will be
informed by RSS and the outcome of the Rotherham Strategic Housing Market
Assessment.
Provision of "executive homes" will also need to be considered alongside objectives
ensuring the efficient use of land, sustainable locations, urban renaissance, better design
and the need to safeguard green belt, countryside and landscape.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider provision for suitable sites for executive homes in the Allocations DPD in keeping
with the above mentioned objectives.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 237
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5220

Name:  Mr & Mrs SP & D Zammito

Organisation:

Representation Number:  237

Policy:  

Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
No comments made

Councills Response:
Thank you for your support

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action required

*******************************************************************************
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 43
\ Comment

Respondent I.D.  5227
Name:   Elizabeth Pearson
Organisation:

Representation Number:  43

Policy: Object/Support: Comment

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
I think things which would be very important in the planning of the new centre for Rotherham are:
A vibrant new identity which rebrands it
A landmark community centre - very architectural building
A new education centre/college
More specialist boutique shops
A centre for culture/cultural quarter
Leisure/gym facility
Identifying the concept of the family

Councils Response:
Suggestions noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Suggestions to be considered in options for Rotherham Town Centre within the Allocations DPD.

*******************************************************************************
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations  
Rep No: 75
\Comment

Respondent I.D.  5233
Name:  Betty Johnson
Organisation:

Representation Number:  75
Policy:  Object/Support:  Comment

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
When planning permission is approved for new buildings please consider other buildings in the vicinity, e.g. replacing the All Saints building consider a design that will blend in and enhance The Minster and Imperial Buildings. The area around the square could be made into an astounding feature, the basis is already there The Minster and wonderful architecture above many of the shops. Firstly the T.V. should come down (this does not enhance, and cannot be environmentally friendly), the shop which replaced Horace Brookes greengrocery shop is an eye sore and not inkeeping with the area should be demolished and premises to blend in should be built.
(full response)

Councils Response:
Concerns about the big screen and the greengrocers shop and the need for sensitivity in the design of future new buildings (particularly the redevelopment of All Saints Buildings) in All Saints Square are noted. However, it is not appropriate for the submission core strategy to deal with such matters of specific detail. These will need to be considered at the planning application stage taking into account appropriate "saved" UDP policies (pending replacement in a future LDF Policies DPD and Design SPD) and conservation area management issues in the Townscape Heritage Initiative.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Refer comments to RIDO Development Team for consideration in the redevelopment of All Saints Buildings. Consider how to cover such issues in the integration of an updated Strategic Development Framework with the Allocations DPD and future LDF DPDs/SPD.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 350

\ Object

Respondent I.D.  5241
Name:  Mr Peter Ludlam
Organisation:

Representation Number:  350
Policy:  Object  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Introduction; Strategy aims; PD2.

Summary of Representation:
Concern that the introduction: the strategy aims and PD2 (housing numbers provided for individual communities) are incompatible. It appears that precise sites have been identified and this should be shared within the wider public arena.

Councils Response:
The figures for new house building (provided in the Core Strategy) are indicative only no precise sites have been identified at this stage. It is only when survey work to assess potential new development needs in a settlement has been completed, that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken and sites identified for development purposes. During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation later in the year.

Paragraph 7.43 states existing commitments are from planning permissions not yet completed and the remaining residential allocations in the existing Unitary Development Plan (June 1999). Other sources (para 7.44) come from the Urban Potential Study that provided an estimate of land potentially available for residential development in urban areas up to 2016. This document is publicly available. Table 6 makes clear that the figures for individual settlements includes dwellings that have already got planning permission (at June 2006) the remainder includes some large sites allocated in the Unitary Development Plan but not yet developed. There will also be an element (of the housing numbers) that was included as part of the Urban Potential Study but these may be small windfall sites or sites that could potentially be identified in a future Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).

It is only after consideration of all potential development sites that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken. Table 6 and Map 7 of the draft Core
Strategy sought to provide an indication of the current position using information from the existing UDP and the Urban Potential Study

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD later in the year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  346
\ Object

Respondent I.D.  5241
Name:  Mr Peter Ludlam
Organisation:

Representation Number:  346
Policy:          Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Paragraph 8.5 Map 11

Summary of Representation:
Spatial planning zones definition uses SOA's but the map lists the settlements within the Zones. Concern re: inconsistency with the way the information is presented.

Councils Response:
Paragraph 8.5 does list the Super Output Areas (SOA's) although the names provided to SOA’s reflect local settlement names within that SOA. The information has not been presented inconsistently.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure clarity in presenting information in future documents.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 345
\ Object

Respondent I.D. 5241

Name: Mr Peter Ludlam

Organisation:

Representation Number: 345

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Paragraph 8.5

Summary of Representation:
Concern that certain parishes and settlements are not discussed in the Core Strategy e.g. Laughton. Why not?

Councils Response:
I understand that there has been some confusion re: the settlements listed within the Spatial Planning Zones and included within paragraph 8.5, however my response to the representation - 5241/346 makes clear that this paragraph refers to the Super Output Areas and not all settlements within the SOA. Paragraph 8.5 does list the Super Output Areas (SOAs) although the identification names provided to SOAs reflect local settlement names within that SOA. It is not considered that the information has been presented inconsistently however redrafting of this paragraph any subsequent sections may be required to aid understanding.

Also see responses to representations 5241/348 and 5241/351.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure clarity in presenting information in future documents.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 352
\ Other

Respondent I.D. 5243

Name: PS Rachel Usher

Organisation: South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number: 352

Policy: Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
In the areas where elderly people reside should be no cold calling zones.

Councils Response:
This is not an issue for spatial planning. Designation of a “no cold calling” zone would not be enforceable under planning policy. This is an issue more appropriately dealt with through the Safer Neighbourhood Teams and Neighbourhood Wardens. Is appropriate legislation available elsewhere to designate such zones?

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action.

*******************************************************************************
Respondent I.D.  5243

Name:  PS Rachel Usher

Organisation:  South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number:  353

Policy:  Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Security measures and the management of new developments during construction phases.

Councils Response:
This is not an issue for spatial planning. This issue is more appropriately dealt with by the developers of new buildings in their construction activities. The security of construction sites is an important issue as poor security as well as creating opportunities for malicious damage / theft etc can also create a bad image to potential inward investors. All developers working in partnership with the Borough Council should be encouraged / requested to ensure that their construction sites are made safe and restrict accesss.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 369
\ Object

Respondent I.D.  5245
Name:  Mr Sam Thistlethwaite
Organisation:  Banks Development

Representation Number:  369
Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Para. 7.50

Summary of Representation:
Support the exclusion of Waverley from the housing figures for Rotherham. Its inclusion would lead to uneven residential development in the borough.

Councils Response:
It is clear that this representation submitted by Banks Development relates to their own proposals to redevelop the Laycast site for residential purposes (or for uses with a higher commercial value).

The submission Core Strategy will have a clear settlement hierarchy. PD 1 used the Babtie Sustainable Settlement Study as the basis for creating a settlement hierarchy. However the Core Strategy will develop the Council’s thinking further and will consider the inclusion of Waverley as a sustainable new community within the Borough. The policy directions of the Core strategy Preferred Options document will be developed into Core Strategy policies in the Submission document and will have a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development within the Borough.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD later in the year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.

*****************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 239
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5246

Name:  Mr Alistair Flatman

Organisation:  Scott Wilson Ltd (for St Paul's Developments plc)

Representation Number:  239

Policy:  
Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Preferred options DPD

Summary of Representation:
The aspirations of the preferred options DPD, as it relates to the Brampton area are broadly supported. The Cortonwood site has the potential to make a wide-ranging contribution to the future development of Brampton and the northern part of the Rotherham authority area, providing the Cortonwood site is considered for alternative uses to employment uses(i.e. residential) so that;
A) The site can make a significant contribution to the regeneration aspirations of the area;
B) The site can contribute towards the RSS target of 65% of development on brownfield sites;
C) Development of the site would make a sensible and sustainable contribution to Brampton in terms of strengthening the community and supporting existing services and opportunities in the area.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your general support for the aspirations of the Preferred Options DPD. The Council is currently working on the Land Allocations DPD and your suggestions for the Cortonwood site will be given full consideration.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider all options for industrial land use as part of the allocations DPD
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 587  
\ Object

Respondent I.D. 5247

Name: Mr Edward Uwechue

Organisation: The Development Planning Partnership

Representation Number: 587

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Para. 7.2

Summary of Representation:
Generally agree with the strategic policy directions in paragraphs 7.1 and 7.2 but recommend that the replacement proposals map for the town centre should form part of the core strategy.

Councils Response:
Support for the strategic policy directions is noted.

A Proposals Map will be prepared to accompany all Development Plan Documents in line with PPS12.

With regard to Core Strategies paragraph 2.13 of Planning Policy Statement 12 (Local Development Frameworks) notes that “…A key diagram will not be sufficient where the core strategy contains policies which need to be defined on an Ordnance Survey or similar map base at a registered scale as these must be illustrated on a submission proposals map.” It is not envisaged that the Core Strategy Submission Document will include policies for Rotherham Town Centre which will require a replacement proposals map. However the Core Strategy Preferred Options document does identify an Action Area Plan for Rotherham Town Centre as a future document yet to be programmed in the Local Development Scheme.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for the strategic policy directions will be taken into account in preparing the Core Strategy Submission Document.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5248
Name:  Mr R.D. Butters
Organisation:  Hallam Land Management Ltd

Representation Number:  493
Policy: Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  4.5

Summary of Representation:
The vision for the development programme is likely to fall short of the aspirations if
sufficient development is not properly planned through the LDF process.

Councils Response:
It is accepted that the vision of the development programme for Sheffield City Region will
fall short of aspirations if the constituent LDFs fail to deliver sufficient properly planned
development in acknowledgement of cross boundary issues and opportunities.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the submission Core Strategy takes full account of significant cross boundary
issues and fully acknowledges the Sheffield City Region development programme.
We believe that for the reasons contained in the attached responses the CS-PO document faces a number of significant difficulties in terms of its ‘soundness’ in informing the preparation of the Submission Draft Core Strategy document.

Chapter 9 considers the Sustainability Appraisal of the Preferred Option and states ‘The Core Strategy should also aim to ensure that all development proposals meet the needs of the surrounding area and population. It should attempt to identify these needs in advance so that development can be planned and respond proactively rather then reactively.’

Currently in respect of the matters of housing provision, employment land, and Green Belt changes, these are all addressed in a manner that will result in reactive responses not proactive ones and as such are contrary to national planning policy guidance set out in PPS1, PPG2 and PPS3 and the objectives of the sustainability appraisal of the preferred option.

Councils Response:
It is the Council’s intention that Regulation 25 consultations on the allocations DPD will take place before finalising the Core Strategy for submission, allowing further comments to be made in relation to allocations, in light of more detailed information on site availability. Settlement/sites surveys will have been carried out to inform the Regulation 25 consultations on the allocations DPD. Depending on the results of this work, and their consistency with the approach laid out in the Core Strategy Preferred Option, consideration will need to be given to whether further work and consultation is required on the CSPO before proceeding to submission stage.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider whether further work and consultation will be required on the CSPO, in light of the results of the settlement/sites surveys, before proceeding to submission stage.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  245
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5260

Name:   Jane Hanson

Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  245

Policy:                              Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  2.3

Summary of Representation:
The sentence “without compromising the quality of life for future generations” is a critical part to the interpretation of the new LDF. The needs and priorities of the Borough and retaining the character of areas should be a priority.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of this wording

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 247

Support

Respondent I.D. 5260

Name: Jane Hanson

Organisation: Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number: 247

Policy: Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: 2.24

Summary of Representation:
The “Chain of Conformity” should reflect the needs of the Borough first and foremost. Future planning applications should concentrate predominantly upon realising the ambitions of existing regeneration initiatives in Rotherham Town Centre.

Councils Response:
Reference to paragraphs 2.23 and 2.24 make clear that local policy contained within the Local Development Framework must be in accord with Central Government planning policy statements (national policy) and the Regional Spatial Strategy. These paragraphs do not focus on priorities for new development or regeneration activities throughout the Borough.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Noted.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 248
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5260

Name:   Jane Hanson

Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  248

Policy:                          Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  3.10

Summary of Representation:
Whilst we support the comments regarding “public concern over potential loss of Green Belt” we understand Brownfield sites to be based on redundant or derelict land or ex-industrial land, not on existing residential dwellings.

Councils Response:
The definition of brownfield land has been determined by Central Government in Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing. The definition states that residential properties and their curtilages are brownfield sites. Rotherham Council has to abide by this ruling.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 250

Object

Respondent I.D. 5260

Name: Jane Hanson

Organisation: Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number: 250

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: 3.24 biodiversity

Summary of Representation:
Special protection is needed for residential gardens which help to link areas of Green Belt land and increase biodiversity within the Borough. For instance, gardens at Wickersley Road, Herringthorpe Valley Road and Herringthorpe Avenue serve as important links for wildlife, connecting “green” areas such as the Pitches, Herringthorpe Junior School and Gibbing Greave Woods.

Councils Response:
The Council is keen to retain wildlife green corridors and will endeavour to do so where threatened by development proposals. However the Council must act within the guidelines provided by central government. These guidelines currently recognise the curtilages of residential property as brownfield sites, hence the strong developer interest in such sites. The Council will, when faced with development proposals for such sites, negotiate for the retention of a wildlife corridor, of some form through the site.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments noted.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 251
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5260

Name:   Jane Hanson

Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  251

Policy:            Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  3.25

Summary of Representation:
This paragraph states that the Borough has 10% woodland coverage, which is lower than the national average and considerably lower than the European Union average. Tree planting initiatives are needed to increase woodland habitat within the Borough.

Councils Response:
Agreed, the Council works closely with the South Yorkshire Forest Partnership to encourage planting initiatives. The increased interest in renewable energy could also result in woodland planting to provide wood fuel, and better management of existing woodland areas.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Emphasise this issue more in the plan
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 252
\ Support

Respondent I.D. 5260

Name: Jane Hanson

Organisation: Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number: 252

Policy: Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: 3.28

Summary of Representation:
We support the “safeguarding green space and wildlife corridors” which is an important consideration when assessing the merits of developments on brownfield sites.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of this matter. Policy Direction 7, Local Heritage, promotes this issue.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan

..........................................................................................................................................................................................
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 253

Support

Respondent I.D. 5260

Name: Jane Hanson

Organisation: Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number: 253

Policy: Support

Section / Paragraph: 3.29 greater housing densities

Summary of Representation:
Increased housing densities, particularly in respect of apartments outside the town centre are a cause of concern. The emphasis for high density living should be on the Town Centre as highlighted in the LDF.

Councils Response:
Planning Policy Statement 3 and Regional Spatial Strategy expects developers to achieve a mix of housing types and tenure within developments, and to meet densities of 30 to 50 dwellings per hectare. The Council has reflected this guidance in Policy Direction 8, (achieving a minimum net density … with an indicative range of densities for urban, suburban and rural locations to be defined in the Policies DPD). However the development of apartments is likely to be considered in appropriate locations throughout the borough.

The Council will require that new apartment developments have good access to public transport and this will tend to guide such developments toward town centres and along key transport corridors.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Concerns noted.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 254
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5260
Name:  Jane Hanson
Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  254
Policy:  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  4.7

Summary of Representation:
These measures are supported, and feel it is essential that the town centre is placed within a green landscape setting of parks and green spaces.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of the Rotherham Strategic Development Framework. This document is currently being refreshed and consultation will be undertaken in the next few months.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations
Rep No: 255
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5260
Name:  Jane Hanson
Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  255
Policy:  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  4.9 community involvement

Summary of Representation:
This point is strongly supported. In terms of the planning process we believe that only through effective communication between developers, the planning department and existing residents, can future development work achieve a result that benefits all parties. This is a particularly pertinent point when dealing with proposed windfall sites and would welcome measures to encourage greater communication between developers and not only neighbouring properties affected, but the wider community.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of the Rotherham Community Strategy. Many planning decisions are reached after detailed consideration - the LPA try to reach a balanced decision, by addressing the concerns of local communities and meeting the wider needs of the Borough for example to provide sufficient housing in a variety of locations of a suitable size and tenure.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments noted.
Respondent I.D.  5260

Name:   Jane Hanson

Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  256

Policy:       Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  5.10 responding to market forces

Summary of Representation:
This option would increase the Borough’s existing urban sprawl and greater erosion of the Green Belt

Councils Response:
Agreed. This option A- Responding to Market Forces, was not favoured at the earlier consultation into Core Strategy Issues and Options. The CSPO has been developed as a hybrid option melding elements of option B - matching needs with opportunities and option c - managing the environment as a key resource. Section 6 of the CSPO ‘Developing a Preferred Option' and Section 7 'Achieving the Vision' develop the Council's thinking further.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5260

Name:  Jane Hanson

Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  257

Policy:  
Section / Paragraph:  5.11 matching needs with opportunities

Summary of Representation:
This option is supported since future development will be concentrated in the main urban areas. Some concerns about possible use of Green Belt land to create “Sustainable Communities”

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of this option see response to your earlier representation: 5260/256.

The Council may consider including some land in the Green Belt and also in exceptional circumstances releasing Green Belt land to assist in the creation of sustainable communities. The Council is committed to retaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS. Work is underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD that will help determine the need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long term sustainable development of the Borough's settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 258
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5260
Name:   Jane Hanson
Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  258
Policy:      Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  5.12 expansion of the Green Belt

Summary of Representation:
The Green Belt should be expanded to incorporate large gardens which represent a
unique feature, or create a link between existing wildlife habitats. This would allow existing
dwellings to be redeveloped/ converted without loss of garden areas.

Councils Response:
Government Guidance on Green Belts (PPG2) specifies 5 purposes of including land in
Green Belts, these are:
to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;
to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and

to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban
land.

The Council can only include land within the Green Belt if it fulfils one of the five purposes
above.

Work is underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD that will help determine the
need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long term
sustainable development of the Borough’s settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and
employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the
need for localised Green Belt changes. Where gardens fulfil any of the above criteria
consider a Green Belt designation.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 261

Respondent I.D. 5260
Name: Jane Hanson
Organisation: Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number: 261
Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: 7.71

Summary of Representation:
Why isn’t Herringthorpe mentioned in this paragraph? Further consultation on any specific proposals would be welcomed

Councils Response:
Herringthorpe is seen as part of the main urban area of Rotherham for the purposes of the Local Development Framework, rather than a settlement in its own right. Specific proposals will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation early next year.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Site surveys and settlement analyses if all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA over the next few months. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 262
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5260

Name:   Jane Hanson

Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  262

Policy:             Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  7.72

Summary of Representation:
The inclusion of Broom in this category is supported

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of this matter. There may be opportunities that arise for small scale development for both employment and housing uses.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Site surveys and settlement analyses if all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA over the next few months. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 246
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5260

Name:   Jane Hanson

Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  246

Policy:          Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  2.9

Summary of Representation:
The point “Increase and enhance urban planting, greenspace and biodiversity networks” is particularly welcomed. Protection should be extended to cover undeveloped gardens in residential areas.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of the biodiversity networks. The Protection of large, undeveloped gardens is more problematical, given that national guidance considers them to be brownfield sites. Where such gardens are within a Conservation Area, or are within the curtilage of Listed Buildings the Council has more powers and can limit development if it is considered necessary.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan

...........................................................................................................................................
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No:  249  
\ Object  

Respondent I.D.  5260  

Name:  Jane Hanson  

Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group  

Representation Number:  249  

Policy:  
Object/Support:  Object  

Section / Paragraph:  3.13  

Summary of Representation:  
The Council is too dependent upon windfall sites to assist meeting housing supply. Additional planning guidelines are needed to deal specifically with the issue of windfall sites.  

Councils Response:  
The Council needs to meet its target (established by the Regional Spatial Strategy) for new housebuilding in the development plan period. Over the next few months, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all these sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation early next year.  
Some smaller sites may be of sufficient size and suitability to be identified in the Allocations DPD. Since the publication of the CSPO, PPS3 has changed central government policy in relation to the inclusion of an assumed rate of windfalls in the housing supply. PPS3 advises against a windfall allowance in the first 10 year supply unless it is supported by robust evidence.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
Ensure that windfalls are only included in the housing supply if they can be justified according to paragraph 59 of PPS3.  

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 244
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5260
Name:   Jane Hanson
Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  244
Policy: Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  1.2

Summary of Representation:
There is support for the “promotion of sustainable development and addressing climate change”. Developments must, however also reflect the character of the surrounding area.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of this matter.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
PD1 promotes locally distinctive design, consideration will be given as appropriate to supplementing this policy direction through Supplementary Planning Documents in the future.

.................................................................................................................................................................................................
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 313
\ Comment

Respondent I.D.  5263

Name:  Mr Bob Wolfe

Organisation:  Airport Planning & Development Ltd (for Peel Airports Group)

Representation Number:  313

Policy:  

Object/Support:  Comment

Section / Paragraph:  Para 7.71 and 7.78

Summary of Representation:
Para 7.78 recognises the potential economic benefits of RHADS. The "Future of Air Transport - Progress Report" (DfT, Dec 2006) recognises the employment potential of RHADS. Regional airports serve a wide range of international destinations and have significant implications for local economies. The Report estimates that RHADS will create 4000 jobs before 2008 with a further 3000 by 2014.

The lack of employment land in Maltby is noted in Para 7.71 and improved transportation links with the airport will assist in fulfilling the aspiration of sustainable employment growth.

Councils Response:
The potential economic benefits of RHADS to the Borough are acknowledged along with its potential to provide employment opportunities for Maltby which is likely to have and employment land shortfall in the longer term.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The potential economic benefits of RHADS to Maltby and the whole Borough to be reflected in the submission document.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 312
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5263

Name:  Mr Bob Wolfe

Organisation:  Airport Planning & Development Ltd (for Peel Airports Group)

Representation Number:  312

Policy: Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Section 3, page 27

Summary of Representation:
Whilst Sheffield is a major source of employment for Rotherham's workforce, actions taken on the transportation infrastructure into and out of Rotherham including improved rail and road links to RHADS will make a positive impact on the ability of those in the area to find a range of business locations, employment and training opportunities.

Councils Response:
Agree

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Acknowledge improved surface access to RHADS may assist business formation and widen employment and training opportunities for the Borough.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 310
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5263

Name:  Mr Bob Wolfe

Organisation:  Airport Planning & Development Ltd (for Peel Airports Group)

Representation Number:  310

Policy:  

Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Section 3, page 25

Summary of Representation:
Investment levels indicate the attractiveness of Robin Hood Airport Doncaster Sheffield to investors, passengers and businesses and the importance of a positive planning framework to the airports continuing success.

Strengthening connections to a successful airport will assist Rotherham as an up and coming location.

Councils Response:
The importance of Rotherham’s connectivity to the airport is recognised.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Acknowledge potential benefits of airport connectivity in submission document
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 309
\ Support

Respondent I.D. 5263

Name: Mr Bob Wolfe

Organisation: Airport Planning & Development Ltd (for Peel Airports Group)

Representation Number: 309

Policy: Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Para 4.7

Summary of Representation:
Supports reference to Robin Hood Airport Doncaster Sheffield in Goal 4 of Rotherham Town Centre Strategic Development Framework.

Given the strategic importance placed on the airport, consideration should be given to widening the area covered by the context plans in the Core Strategy to include the airport and potential linkages to it, including regeneration and transportation (Surface Access Strategy and SYPTE Bus network).

Councils Response:
The importance of cross boundary connectivity with the Airport is recognised and will be emphasised in the submission Core Strategy and key diagram in line with Soundness Test 6.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure cross boundary connectivity with Robin Hood Airport is adequately covered in the submission document and key diagram.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 308
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5263

Name:  Mr Bob Wolfe

Organisation:  Airport Planning & Development Ltd (for Peel Airports Group)

Representation Number:  308

Policy:  
Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Overall positive support for Core Strategy approach

Councils Response:
Support welcomed

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Noted

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 544
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5265

Name:  Mr Peter Horne

Organisation:  Merryweathers (for Trustees of GMT Foljambe's 1996 Discretionary Settlement)

Representation Number:  544

Policy:  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Para 5.11

Summary of Representation:
Support Option B with particular support given to paragraph entitled environment.

Councils Response:
Section 5 was intended to give details of the alternative options which were put forward within the Regulation 25 pre-submission public consultation stage of the Core Strategy. As such they were put forward as devices to assist discussion and debate about how the Core Strategy could be developed. The results of this consultation culminated in establishing the detail within sections 7 to 9 of the Core Strategy preferred options draft.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.

..................................................................................................................................................................................
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 545
\ Object

Respondent I.D. 5265
Name: Mr Peter Horne
Organisation: Merryweathers (for Trustees of GMT Foljambe's 1996 Discretionary Settlement)

Representation Number: 545
Policy: Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Para 5.12
Summary of Representation:
Do not support Option C particularly paragraph entitled environment.

Councils Response:
Section 5 was intended to give details of the alternative options which were put forward within the Regulation 25 pre-submission public consultation stage of the Core Strategy. As such they were put forward as devices to assist discussion and debate about how the Core Strategy could be developed. The results of this consultation culminated in establishing the detail within sections 7 to 9 of the Core Strategy preferred options draft.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 557
\ Support

Respondent I.D. 5266
Name: Mr D.W. Short
Organisation: The Emerson Group

Representation Number: 557
Policy: Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: Para 7.115

Summary of Representation:
Support in principle the spatial effects outlined as a broad package.

Councils Response:
Support is welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support will be taken into account in preparing the submission draft Core Strategy.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 556
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5266

Name:  Mr D.W. Short

Organisation:  The Emerson Group

Representation Number:  556

Policy: Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Para 7.48

Summary of Representation:
Waverley should form part of the medium and long term housing and employment supply. Its potential for regulated supply should avoid the need to carry out development in the Green Belt within the Plan Period.

Councils Response:
Support for Waverley is noted. However the principle of development of a new community at Waverley has yet to be justified in comparison with other potential urban extensions that may be required to achieve the Borough’s requirement for future housing and employment provision as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy.

In the light of the above the scale, mix and phasing of any major development at Waverley will be set out in the submission Core Strategy and supporting Allocations and Policies DPDs.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments noted.
Appreciated that the Council are in a period of uncertainty pending the adoption of finalised figures on housing arising from the RSS review. The Council must therefore base its submitted Core Strategy on the most up to date figures available. Submission should await adoption of RSS.

Councils Response:
Agree with comments made. It is recognised that to ensure conformity with RSS it will be prudent to await its adoption prior to the submission of the Core Strategy. This is reflected within the timetable put in place within the March 2007 Version of the Local Development Scheme.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 554
\ Support

Respondent I.D. 5266

Name: Mr D.W. Short

Organisation: The Emerson Group

Representation Number: 554

Policy: Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Para 6.26

Summary of Representation:
Caution is needed in interpreting the results of the earlier consultation as it is likely to contain a skewed view given the prominence that environmental concerns have taken in the past two years. The hybrid solution in principle is correct as it combines the best of all the options.

Councils Response:
Support is welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 553
\ Support

Respondent I.D. 5266

Name: Mr D.W. Short

Organisation: The Emerson Group

Representation Number: 553

Policy: Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Para 5.12

Summary of Representation:
In general this option (detailed in sub-section Option C: Managing the Environment as a Key Resource) has features that commend it, if realism is not a major factor. It is not realistic to provide local jobs for every settlement, nor is it likely that all new housing can be built on previously developed land. The limitation on development in the Green Belt is logical subject to any non strategic review that may be necessary to accommodate projected development requirements.

Councils Response:
Section 5 was intended to give details of the alternative options which were put forward within the Regulation 25 pre-submission public consultation stage of the Core Strategy. As such they were established as devices to assist discussion and debate about how the Core Strategy could be developed. The results of this consultation culminated in establishing the detail within sections 7 to 9 of the Core Strategy preferred options draft.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 552
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5266
Name:  Mr D.W. Short
Organisation:  The Emerson Group

Representation Number:  552
Policy:          Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Para 5.11

Summary of Representation:
This option (detailed in sub-section Option B: Matching Needs with Opportunities) seemed to be a good option on its own and follows baseline work done in the South Yorkshire Settlement Study. The selection of growth points seems logical and the support to smaller towns and villages is a feature that needs to be retained to ensure their continued viability.

Councils Response:
Section 5 was intended to give details of the alternative options which were put forward within the Regulation 25 pre-submission public consultation stage of the Core Strategy. As such they were put forward as devices to assist discussion and debate about how the Core Strategy could be developed. The results of this consultation culminated in establishing the detail within sections 7 to 9 of the Core Strategy preferred options draft.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.

............................................................................................................
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 551
\ Support

Respondent I.D. 5266

Name: Mr D.W. Short

Organisation: The Emerson Group

Representation Number: 551

Policy: Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Para 5.10

Summary of Representation:
Policy stance based solely on market forces (detailed in sub-section Option A: Responding to Market Forces) would tend to be biased against some parts of the Borough. Unequal distribution and some less sustainable development would result. However, if it is necessary to accept that the market is able to provide an overview on viability, marketing etc that should be taken into account in finalisation of the core strategy and subsequent development plan documents.

Councils Response:
Agree. The consultation mechanisms put in place via the adopted SCI and implemented so far with regard to the Core Strategy are designed to ensure that a diverse cross section of the Rotherham community is able to make comment. A key element of this consultation does include engaging with the business sector (including events such as workshops with Rotherham Chamber) as it is recognised that such groups and organisations are vital to the future implementation of the new LDF for Rotherham.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 549
\ Other

Respondent I.D.  5266
Name:  Mr D.W. Short
Organisation:  The Emerson Group

Representation Number:  549
Policy:  
Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Para 5.9

Summary of Representation:
Agree that the continuation of all of the UDP policies (detailed in sub-section Baseline Position: Unitary Development Plan) would not be a sustainable way of planning for the future given that the national and regional policy background has changed significantly since the policies in the UDP were originally formulated.

Councils Response:
Support for the conclusions of the sustainability commentary is welcomed. The baseline scenario illustrating the spatial effects of the current Unitary Development Plan position was included for comparison purposes to put into context the three options used as devices to assist discussion and debate about how the Core Strategy could be developed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 548
\ Other

Respondent I.D. 5266
Name: Mr D.W. Short
Organisation: The Emerson Group

Representation Number: 548

Policy: Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Para 3.11

Summary of Representation:
Proactive approach taken to population growth and to the emerging RSS is welcomed. It is noted that the latest household projection figures may affect the emerging RSS housing requirement in that they indicate a further rise in annual household formation. It is critical to provide adequate housing to meet local demand and those necessary to meet in migration.

Councils Response:
Agree with sentiments of comment made. We are awaiting confirmation of Rotherham’s housing requirement that emerges from RSS and any future necessary amendments will be recognised within the submission draft core strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Reflect any changes to Rotherham’s housing requirement in submission draft Core Strategy.

..................................................................................................................
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 565
\ Other

Respondent I.D. 5270
Name: Mr Keith Ellis
Organisation:

Representation Number: 565
Policy: Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: Para 5.12

Summary of Representation:
Option C is too restrictive - parts of Options B & C should be incorporated.

Councils Response:
Section 5 was intended to give details of the alternative options which were put forward within the Regulation 25 pre-submission public consultation stage of the Core Strategy. As such they were put forward as devices to assist discussion and debate about how the Core Strategy could be developed. The results of this consultation culminated in establishing the detail within sections 7 to 9 of the Core Strategy preferred options draft.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.

*******************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 373

Object

Respondent I.D. 5271

Name: Mr Eric Stowe

Organisation: RMBC Access Officer

Representation Number: 373

Policy: Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Key diagram

Summary of Representation:
There are no circular links; need to still come into Rotherham to go out again. Need to link leisure, hospitals, health etc. by direct routes.

Councils Response:
Agreed the CSPO document does not promote the development of circular routes throughout the Borough linking communities directly to services and facilities. Whilst there are limited opportunities for this type of activity to be delivered by the LDF Core Strategy, support within the Strategy for circular links - linking communities - is essential to enable S106 agreements to be negotiated with developers to deliver these services. The Core Strategy should also be the long term spatial vision for the Local Transport Plan where some of these activities could in the future be delivered.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend the Core Strategy to reflect the need to negotiate and deliver direct routes from local communities (via a circular service if required) to essential community and leisure facilities. The delivery of these routes will further aid the sustainability of these communities.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 376
\ Support

Respondent I.D.  5271
Name:  Mr Eric Stowe
Organisation:  RMBC Access Officer

Representation Number:  376
Policy:  
Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Vision

Summary of Representation:
Support the document but there are areas of weakness outlined in other representations made, particularly transport and housing.

Councils Response:
Noted

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action
Respondent I.D.  958

Name:  Mrs Alice Rodgers

Organisation:  Maltby Environmental Group

Representation Number:  486

Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Comment

Section / Paragraph:  Locally distinctive design

Summary of Representation:
Envisaged and hoped that future development will be more sympathetic with more respect shown towards the best of twentieth century development.

Councils Response:
Agree with comments made. The aspirations of this policy aim for the retention of the high quality existing buildings. New development should enhance and harmonise with the surrounding environment.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 503
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 1018

Name: Cllr T. G. Bell

Organisation: Laughton Common Residents

Representation Number: 503

Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Settlement hierarchy

Summary of Representation:
Acceptance that Laughton Common is likely to grow but it must ultimately remain a village.

Councils Response:
Support is welcomed. As regards Laughton Common remaining a village the scope of any future development will be determined by its potential to provide a positive contribution towards improving existing sustainability or to be planned in a way which may give rise to sustainable patterns of development. The general extent and location of this growth will be assessed as part of the Allocations DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
General extent and location of the growth will be assessed as part of the Allocations DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 508
PD1 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  1018
Name: Cllr T. G. Bell
Organisation: Laughton Common Residents

Representation Number:  508
Policy: PD1          Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: Community infrastructure

Summary of Representation:
A care home and surgery would be desirable/suited to the Station Road area of Laughton Common.

Councils Response:
The appropriateness of particular types of uses within specific localities will be examined as part of the Allocations DPD. It is not considered necessary to look at this as part of the more strategic, over-arching document that the Core Strategy is intended to be.
A new Council owned elderly persons home is to be provided off Coronation Avenue, Dinnington. It is highly unlikely that there will be sufficient demand for further care homes in the locality in the short term.
However the private sector can submit proposals to build care homes on specific sites identified for residential development and these will be positively considered subject to the usual planning requirements: layout, orientation, sustainable construction, landscaping, accessibility, access, car parking, design, etc.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider comments for new community facilities as part of Allocation DPD site survey assessments.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Summary of Representation:
PD1: Sustainable Communities
The Core Strategy has identified the settlements in the Rotherham area that could accommodate different levels or new development. Rotherham Town Centre, along with Dinnington/North Anston and Brampton/West Melton has been identified as areas with a “Key Focus for Change”. Other settlements have been identified as areas for “High Potential for Change” (in terms of new development).

The settlements identified above will be linked using an existing Key Transport Corridor. This corridor is mostly made of Trunk roads and rail line. The Key Diagram in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (Map 10) indicates that the only segment of the Strategic Highway Network (SHN) used by the ‘key transport corridor’ is between J1 of the M18 and J32 on the M1. It is considered that given the importance and level of use of the SHN in the South Yorkshire area, more of the SHN network would represent a key transport corridor (unless substantial modal shift could be achieved). The Core Strategy needs to reflect and incorporate this sustainability point in its policies.

The Agency supports the choice to develop areas which are currently accessible urban areas. These areas will therefore have services and facilities already located close by, so there would be a greater opportunity for shared trips and the development may not have as great an impact on the SHN than if sited in less sustainable locations. The location of these areas would support the Agency’s objectives of making best use of existing resources.

Councils Response:
Support for locating new development in accessible urban areas is noted. It should have been implicit in Map10 that the M1 and M18 were to be regarded as key transport corridors, albeit that the Council has a lesser remit over this part of the strategic road network.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Review the treatment of the strategic road network and key transport corridors in the notation of the submission key diagram.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 103
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  1561
Name:  Mr Peter White
Organisation:  Derbyshire County Council

Representation Number:  103
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  PD1.4

Summary of Representation:
The Trans Pennine Trail links Derbyshire CC and Rotherham MBC. The trail will also connect with the proposed YES development. Subsequent policies should appreciate the significance of connecting cross boundary rights of way.

Councils Response:
The significance of cross boundary rights of way is accepted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Insert text relating to strategic cross boundary rights of way in the Submission Core Strategy.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 625
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1565
Name: Mr Brian Davies
Organisation: Natural England

Representation Number: 625
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Point 3

Summary of Representation:
The contribution of positive management of urban fringe areas has not been fully addressed – they offer key benefits for helping achieve sustainable communities.

Significant benefits can be achieved through developer contributions that can be used to fund environmental enhancements as noted by the SA report. Creation and enhancement of natural greenspace could also be worked into point 4 developer’s contributions as a required contribution by developers.

In point 3 widen term of greenspace beyond parks and sports pitches to other greenspaces that are potentially accessible and provide multi functional links.

Councils Response:
Whilst it is not considered appropriate to include specific reference to urban fringe areas within Policy Direction 1 or its successor, this aspect could be highlighted in the successor to Policy Direction 7 (Local Heritage) either under the issues of Countryside resources and/ or greenspace networks.

It is agreed that the creation and enhancement of natural greenspace could be included under the Policy Direction’s developer contributions requirements. The current list in the Policy Direction is not intended to be an exhaustive list, consideration will be given to clarifying this policy further. The detail will be included in a future LDF document yet to be programmed into the Local Development Scheme.

Whilst covered under Policy Direction 7, it is agreed that in point 3 of Policy Direction 1, the term greenspace should be widened beyond parks and sports pitches as suggested.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend Policy Direction 7 (Local Heritage) to refer to the management of urban fringe areas. Amend Policy Direction 1 to further clarify Section 106 contributions. Consideration needs to be given to including bio-diversity and public art and ensuring that the final policy does not preclude negotiation for Section 106 contributions to achieve the creation of sustainable communities and improve quality of life.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 1565
Name: Mr Brian Davies
Organisation: Natural England

Representation Number: 624
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Natural England considers the inclusion of overall sustainable development aims and issues surrounding climate change and how the effects can be reduced and mitigated in the future would enhance this policy direction.

Councils Response:
The principle of making more explicit reference to climate change is accepted and the means of inclusion will be considered for the submission Core Strategy noting that the Sustainability Appraisal Report recommended an alternative approach to that being suggested by the respondent. The Report concluded that the cross cutting theme of responding to the effects of climate change could be highlighted by making reference to these issues across all of the spatial Policy Directions.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Submission Core Strategy to include greater reference to the climate change by means yet to be determined.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  1565
Name:  Mr Brian Davies
Organisation:  Natural England

Representation Number:  626
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Point 3 and 5

Summary of Representation:
Point 3 - Natural England is encouraged by the inclusion of greenspace within the range of quality services and social infrastructure.

Point 5 – Natural England is pleased to see the inclusion of locally distinctive design that can help conserve and enhance the local character in urban and rural areas.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action required.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 519
PD1 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 1578

Name: Mr Chris Telford

Organisation: Bassetlaw District Council

Representation Number: 519

Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Green belt

Summary of Representation:
It is noted that the Greenbelt would limit opportunities for major development immediately adjacent to Bassetlaw.

Councils Response:
Although it is intended that the general extent of the Green Belt will be maintained, the work on the Allocations DPD will involve detailed settlement studies to identify potential sites for development. This work could involve amendments to the Green Belt boundary, if justifiable, to either exclude land from or include land in the Green Belt.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Accept comment.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 80
PD1 \ Comment

Respondent I.D. 1682

Name: Mr Anthony Barber-Lomax FRICS

Organisation: Fitzwilliam (Wentworth) Estates

Representation Number: 80

Policy: PD1

Object/Support: Comment

Section / Paragraph: para 4/5

Summary of Representation:
Para.4: Section 106 obligations must be sensible and (proportionate in terms of scope and cost) to the scale of developments.
Para.5: Community participation in design matters is important where there are distinctive design characteristics within a settlement which set a good precedent.

Councils Response:
Comments agreed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments be noted and used to ensure the preparation of robust policies in the Core Strategy and future DPD's.

*******************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 378  
PD1 \ Object  

Respondent I.D. 1702  

Name: Ms Georgina Bourne  

Organisation: The Home Builders Federation  

Representation Number: 378  

Policy: PD1  
Object/Support: Object  

Section / Paragraph:  

Summary of Representation:  
The inclusion of the settlement hierarchy as set out in this policy direction appears to be based on the South Yorkshire Settlement Assessment Study prepared in 2005. HBF wishes to ensure that the core strategy is based on up to date and robust information to have a sound basis. On this basis, we would question whether this study will be reviewed/updated prior to submission of the Core Strategy.  

Councils Response:  
South Yorkshire Settlement Assessment Study forms an important part of the evidence base supporting the LDF. The results of the study are strategic in nature but much of the information underpinning it relates to a detailed assessment of each settlement or area. While some of the details may have changed, it is unlikely that, in the relatively short time since the study was produced, that the overall strategic picture that the study paints has changed significantly. It is however acknowledged that this cannot be taken for granted, and that an assessment of whether this study needs updating will be carried out.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
Carry out an assessment of whether the South Yorkshire Settlement Assessment Study needs updating.

*******************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 575
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1800
Name: Mr Paul Bedwell
Organisation: Spawforths (for Woodford Group)

Representation Number: 575
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Summary of Representation:
The policy is too long and unclear; several elements are inappropriate for the core strategy (including reference to design and access statements) some of which may be more suited to the development control DPD (locally distinctive design and developer contributions).

The settlement hierarchy is unclear and unsustainable and does not accord with emerging RSS policy. It does not show Rotherham urban area as the most sustainable location, surrounded by a satellite of lower order towns. It unduly promotes less sustainable settlements (like Brampton/West Melton) up the hierarchy without strategic justification. Swinton/Kilnhurst is a more sustainable location and should be promoted up the hierarchy.

The definition of the roles of settlements is confusing and does not intimate a particular function. The hierarchy which prioritises “key focus for change” locations is fundamentally flawed as it will shift development into less sustainable settlements, contrary to government guidance. It is also suggested that promoting development in locations on the premise that it will increase viability of additional infrastructure and service provision is flawed and that previous experience indicates that this approach does not work.

Councils Response:
The Core Strategy Preferred Options document puts forward nine ‘policy directions’ which will be developed into final policies in the Submission Document. In line with the advice in PPS12 clear and concise policies will be prepared for the Core Strategy Submission Document. These policies will avoid repetition of regional and national guidance.

The comments will be taken into account and further consideration given to whether elements of core strategy policy directions should more appropriately be included within the Development Control Policies DPD.

The draft RSS Examination in Public Panel Report recommends that RSS should identify only Regional and Sub Regional Settlements. It recommends that RSS should set out the
functions of centres below these levels but that the choice of such centres is more appropriately determined through LDFs and LDDs (paragraph 3.28/recommendation 3.16). Sections 5 and 6 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options document set out clearly how the preferred option has been derived from consultation on alternative options, and section 7 highlights the fundamental influence that the South Yorkshire Settlement Study has had on the Core Strategy. This Study considered sustainability of settlements and the capacity and suitability of settlements to accept new development to support sustainable patterns of development.

The definitions set out in paragraph 7.19 of the Core Strategy Preferred Options document indicate that within settlements identified as key focus for change, that this could include qualitative change. Whilst PD2 identifies that the location of new housing will be broadly distributed in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, Section 2 of PD1 which sets out the settlement hierarchy clarifies this by supporting “new development opportunities to bring about growth and qualitative change”.

The comments will be taken into account and further consideration will be given to the appropriateness of the hierarchy, and the role of settlements within this (including the need for clearer definition of the role and function of settlements).

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
In line with the advice in PPS12 clear and concise policies will be prepared for the Core Strategy Submission Document.

The comments will be taken into account and further consideration given to whether elements of core strategy policy directions should more appropriately be included within the Development Control Policies DPD.

The comments will be taken into account and further consideration will be given to the appropriateness of the hierarchy, and the role of settlements within this (including the need for clearer definition of the role and function of settlements). In particular this will consider the roles of Brampton/West Melton and Swinton/Kilnhurst within the hierarchy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 202  
PD1 \ Object  

Respondent I.D. 2203  

Name: Mr Robert Fletcher  

Organisation: Ian Baseley Associates  

Representation Number: 202  

Policy: PD1  
Object/Support: Object  

Section / Paragraph: sustainable Communities  

Summary of Representation:  
The definition of Thorpe Hesley as a settlement with “potential for little change” is erroneous given its location within the Sheffield/ Rotherham corridor. It is requested that this classification be reassessed since until recently Thorpe Hesley was identified as a location of major change with good links to the motorway network, Rotherham and Sheffield (see also rep. 2203b).  

Councils Response:  
Substantial growth in Thorpe Hesley would not be sustainable without massive investment in retail services, schools, health provision, employment provision etc. Whilst the settlement’s location is a positive, significant development in this locality is outweighed by negative factors.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
No change to Thorpe Hesley’s designation as a settlement with potential for little change.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 531
PD1 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  2211

Name:  Mr Matthew Naylor
Organisation:  Yorkshire Water Services Ltd.

Representation Number:  531
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:  Developer contributions

Summary of Representation:
Coordination of new development with infrastructure plays a key role in a sustainable community. In some areas capacity at sewage works may not be available in the current period (2005-2010), it is essential that Yorkshire Water Services are made aware of what level of development will happen and where in order for the increase in population for the next period (2010-2015). If Yorkshire Water Services do not make provision for new development they may seek developer contributions for the additional capacity. (Please note that Yorkshire Water works within the water industry’s five year financial periods). Two sewage works at capacity that serve parts of Rotherham are Long Lane and Woodhouse Mill (map provided showing current catchments).

Councils Response:
Consideration of the exact scale and types of development appropriate within particular settlements will be assessed as part of the allocations DPD. Policy Direction 8 emphasises that more integrated management of water catchments will be achieved regulating development to the availability of water supplies and sewerage capacity. Acknowledgement is made of those sewage works that serve parts of Rotherham which currently are at capacity.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consideration of the exact scale and types of development appropriate within particular settlements will include an assessment of utility infrastructure issues that may arise. The overall results of this work will be reflected within the allocations DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 271
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 2243
Name: Mr Michael Long
Organisation: South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE)

Representation Number: 271
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: 1.4

Summary of Representation:
The accessibility of the area should be a key criteria in making provision for sustainable development.

Welcome the acknowledgement that developer contributions will be used to support and enhance public transport services. This could be expanded to include public transport infrastructure (e.g. shelters) and discounted ticketing.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed. Agree that accessibility is a key factor in the selection of sustainable settlements and specific sites for future development.

The Preferred Options document only covers broad policy directions at this stage. The scope of developer contribution policy and supplementary guidance has yet to be determined for the submission Core Strategy, the detailed Policies DPD and supporting SPD taking into account the proposed Planning Gain Supplement. The full extent of developer contributions to public transport will be included in appropriate LDF documents in due course. Consideration will be given to clarifying this aspect of PD1 further.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Continue to perfect accessibility maps and criteria for LDF work in conjunction with SYPTE and include policy and guidance on the full extent of developer contributions to public transport in appropriate LDF documents.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  2413
Name:  Mr John Dunshea
Organisation:  Atisreal UK

Representation Number:  317
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The SYSS does not fully assess the sustainability of proposed new settlements (such as urban extensions) or their potential to provide sustainable change. Waverley does not fit simply within the settlement hierarchy in PD1.

Councils Response:
PD 1 used the Babtie Sustainable Settlement Study as the basis for the proposed settlement hierarchy. The SYSS only assessed existing settlements it did not and could not analyse the impact of the creation of a sustainable new community at Waverley. The Babtie settlement study was undertaken at a point in time and the methodology behind the study is robust. However the policy directions will be developed into Core Strategy policies and will have a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development within the Borough.

The principles for creating a sustainable settlement should be an essential part in appraising and taking forward all future development opportunities in Rotherham particularly urban extensions and other major development opportunities. The principle of Waverley has not yet been accepted and further work needs to be done to justify the release of Waverley to meet Rotherham's future housing need. The development of a new community at Waverley will be considered further and the emerging spatial strategy may or may not include Waverley.

It is accepted that more work needs to be done on urban extensions/ new communities that will need to be justified in the context of national and regional policy and supported by Sustainability Appraisal. Waverley is a significant site with potential for a new sustainable mixed use community. Other urban extensions will be identified during the settlement appraisal and site options work. Justification of suitable urban extensions will be dependent on the final RSS requirements, Sustainability Appraisal and performance under other policy and spatial objectives including the housing trajectory, Housing Market Renewal objectives and sustainable transport considerations.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD next year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.

Further work needs to be undertaken to support the release of Waverley as a sustainable new settlement. Identify and appraise all urban extensions options including Waverley and take forward with appropriate justification into the submission document. Confirm Waverley's brownfield position with DCLG due to the omission of green/ brownfield definitions in PPS3.

Discuss with Highways Agency/RMBC Transportation Unit the need for evidence, regarding mitigation of potential impacts on the strategic road network and Air Quality Management Areas, in support of further development in the Lower Don Valley - to include Waverley and other possibilities that might be identified in the current settlement appraisal/site options work.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 300
PD1 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 300

Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Paras 7.14 to 7.20

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 7 (Justification of Alternative Options)

The sub section on "Sustainable Communities" contains too much background information on the settlement study whilst lacking detail and specificity, in PD1, on the development planned for settlements in the hierarchy, particularly those identified as "key focus for change" and "high potential for change".

The strategy for housing and employment appears to be site rather than strategy led.

The Core Strategy should explain and justify the distribution and balance of development both between and within settlements at the strategic level without detailing sites.

Councils Response:
Comments noted. It is intended to explain in more detail the spatial strategy and the role of settlements selected for most change at submission stage.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the submission document explains and justifies the distribution and balance of development both between and within settlements at the strategic level. See also 2635/280,291,293.

*****************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 290
PD1 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  2635

Name:  Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation:  Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number:  290

Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:  1.2 Map 6

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)

Policies P1,E4 and H1 in current RSS establish Rotherham urban area as the main focus for housing and economic development with smaller scale development directed to market and coalfield towns within the Dearne Valley. Draft RSS emphasise the role of Rotherham town, identifies Dinnington as a "Main Town" and supports regeneration linked development in the Dearne Valley local centres (may be subject to change in imminent Panel Report).

The settlement hierarchy needs to be consistent with the RSS approach. Priority to the main Rotherham Urban area is supported but justification will be needed that all settlements in the next level down is consistent with RSS.

Current and Draft RSS only support limited development outside Rotherham urban area, Dinnington and the Dearne Valley. A strategy identifying Brampton as a key focus for change and Maltby, Catcliffe/Treeton, Aston/Swallownest and Wales/Kiveton Park as settlements with high potential for change in Map 6 will need to be justified.

Councils Response:
Comments noted. It is accepted that the approach to the settlement hierarchy needs to be consistent with final RSS and that any divergence will need to be strongly justified. It is noted that the recent Panel Report recommends that the role of lower order settlements should be at the discretion of LPAs. See also Representation No: 1800/575.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Review the feasibility of the Babtie settlement hierarchy in the light of current settlement appraisal/site options work. Ensure the Core Strategy aligns with final RSS before submission.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 209
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3165
Name: Mr & Mrs J & S Dixon
Organisation:

Representation Number: 209
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Thoroughly endorse ARUP consultants suggestions regarding developer contributions to fund biodiversity, heritage, greenspace and landscape enhancements.

Councils Response:
The Council is seeking to make improvements in the use of developer contributions. The Sustainability Appraisal will be considered fully in drafting the strategy for Section 106 (developer) contributions.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that strategy for developer contributions takes full account of the Sustainability Appraisal's suggestions.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 3165
Name: Mr & Mrs J & S Dixon
Organisation:

Representation Number: 208
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: Sustainable Communities

Summary of Representation:
Thoroughly endorse PD1 as it relates to Thorpe Hesley, the Green Belt boundary around the village needs to be changed (made tighter) to support this stance.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of this policy direction. Policy Direction PD1 outlines the Council’s commitment to maintaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS. Policy Direction PD2 section 5 gives examples of where localised reviews may be necessary. Any such changes to the Green Belt would have to be justified by exceptional circumstances. Work underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD will help determine the need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long-term sustainable development of the Borough’s settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider amendments to the Green Belt boundary at Thorpe Hesley to exclude UDP site H6 and proposals to include this site within the Green Belt. Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 3165
Name: Mr & Mrs J & S Dixon
Organisation:

Representation Number: 210
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: table 6

Summary of Representation:
Table 6 (and Map 7) suggest 67 houses/ flats could be built in Thorpe Hesley and Scholes, Where might these be located?

Councils Response:
This figure represents a combination of sites with planning permission and a more theoretical estimate derived from the 2004 Urban Potential Study. They are an estimation of land potentially available and, due to the methodology used, not all of the sites can be specifically identified.

The unimplemented planning permissions that contribute to the figure are set out below; this information reflects the situation as at June 2006.

Reference Address No. of Dwellings
RB1998/0708 Land rear of 27 -29 Scholes Lane, Scholes 1
RB2001/1523 Land at Brook Hill, Thorpe Hesley 1
RB2003/0621 Land at 544 Upper Wortley Road, Thorpe Hesley 4
RB2003/1479 Land at 65 Windsor Road, Thorpe Hesley 6
RB2005/0211 Former Sunday School, Chapelfield Lane, Thorpe Hesley 1
RB2005/0366 Land at 544 Upper Wortley Road, Thorpe Hesley 3
RB2005/0679 112 Thorpe Street, Thorpe Hesley 1
RB2006/0885 69-71 Brook Hill, Thorpe Hesley 4
RB2006/0913 Holly Farm, Harley Road, Harley 3
Total 24

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new developments will be consulted upon in the Allocations DPD next year. This baseline information will produce the "spatial development strategy" for the
Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations Rep No: 211

Respondent I.D.  3165
Name:  Mr & Mrs J & S Dixon
Organisation:

Representation Number:  211
Policy:  PD1 Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Safeguarding and improving community infrastructure

Summary of Representation:
This paragraph fails to include allotments as part of the community infrastructure

Councils Response:
This omission will be rectified. Allotments are likely to grow in popularity as the pressure for higher density development results in less private space around dwellings.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include allotments as community infrastructure under PD1

******************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  400
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3207
Name:  Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation:  JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number:  400
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Section 2

Summary of Representation:
The RSS key diagram notes only Rotherham as a Sub-Regional Strategy and Dinnington as a Main Town. Map 6 denotes areas within Rotherham urban area as locations for change, and change in some of the freestanding settlements. It is considered that Dinnington/Laughton Common should be viewed as a single entity coming under the category as a Key Location reflecting the Main Town allocation in the RSS. Swinton/Kilnhurst and Wath should also be Key Locations, supporting Brampton/West Melton. Bramley/Wickersley appear to have more scope for significant development given the size and disposition in the urban area.

Councils Response:
Comments noted; amendments to the hierarchy will be considered on completion of settlement/sites assessments, with regard to RSS requirements, infrastructure capacity and physical constraints.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider amendments to the hierarchy in the Submission Core Strategy in light of evidence base and RSS requirements.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 401
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3207
Name:  Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation:  JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number:  401
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The RSS requirement is fundamental to the Core Strategy. Once this is available, the draft Core Strategy should be reviewed to reflect the level of housing growth before going to deposit stage.

Councils Response:
It would be ideal to have the definitive RRS housing requirement when preparing the submission Core Strategy. However the timetable for the production of the Core Strategy is laid out in the Local Development Scheme, which is agreed by the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber. It may not be possible, therefore, to wait until the RSS is finalised to produce the submission Core Strategy. In this case the core strategy will need to have to make assumptions regarding the requirement figures given the latest information emerging from the RSS process, and provide flexibility to accommodate any possible change.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None

*******************************************************************************
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 416
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3239

Name: Mr Greg Smith

Organisation: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number: 416

Policy: PD1  Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Section 1

Summary of Representation:
In locations such as Maltby, it is considered that the Green Belt should not be tightened further but remain unchanged or relaxed in the interests of regeneration, employment growth and protecting residential amenity. This would require that routes identified in the current UDP as potential strategic highway routes, but not yet developed, should be left as potential future alignments.

This would have the additional benefit of protecting land currently allocated for employment. The ability to attract inward investment to settlements such as Maltby and to ensure their long term vitality is dependent on the sufficient availability of suitable land for employment purposes in such locations to meet their future needs. The provision of sufficient employment land in major settlements such as Maltby will, contribute towards the sustainability of such locations and act as a catalyst for the long term regeneration and further inward investment in such communities. A further tightening of the Green Belt in such locations would not serve the long term sustainability and viability of such communities and would be counter-productive.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction PD1 outlines the Council’s commitment to maintaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS. Any such changes to the Green Belt would have to be justified by exceptional circumstances. Work underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD will help determine the need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long-term sustainable development of the Borough’s settlements.

A report by the Transportation Unit to Councillor Gerald Smith under Regeneration and Development Services matters will outline which major Highway Schemes (identified in the UDP) will be abandoned and what measures will be adopted in their place.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.

Take into consideration comments regarding road schemes within Policies DPD. Explore implications of report presented by Transportation Unit to Gerald Smith under Regeneration and Development Services matters.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 417
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3239
Name: Mr Greg Smith
Organisation: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number: 417

Policy: PD1
Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Section 3

Summary of Representation:
This particular element of the Policy appears only to deal with the provision of new or enhanced infrastructure. The potential for new residential development or other investments on local facilities by providing increased threshold populations for local amenities has been overlooked. With the provision of services needing to be commensurate with the requirements and scale of new development within the settlement hierarchy set out in the second part of this policy, there is a failure to support what is needed for existing communities, particularly in rural areas where declining household size reduces the customer base for local shops and services.

Councils Response:
The purpose of this policy is to ensure that new development does not overload community infrastructure and, where appropriate, contributes towards improving it. This policy, in general terms, deals with publicly provided infrastructure which, in some cases, can be supported by increased population but in others increased population means an increased burden. It does not, therefore, follow that increased population is necessarily beneficial. This section does not deal with shops and privately owned services, to which this argument can be applied more simply. The support that increased population can bring to businesses in smaller communities is acknowledged and this issue is dealt with in the South Yorkshire Settlement Study and subsequently is reflected in the settlement hierarchy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The submission Core Strategy needs to be clear about additional community infrastructure requirements in support of new development within particular settlements.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 418
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3239
Name: Mr Greg Smith
Organisation: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number: 418
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Section 4

Summary of Representation:
It is considered that there should be a proven local need for particular elements of new or enhanced community infrastructure. The onus is on the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate evidence of that need before requiring any developer to deliver such obligations through Section 106 agreements. Evidence of need should be based on up to date information which is clear, transparent and soundly based.
Any contribution or works secured through the mechanism of a legal agreement must reasonably relate to the development which is proposed. Policy PD1 is over simplistic in its description of what developers may be required to contribute to. This may create an unrealistic expectation of contributions from all sites and proposals regardless of their size or the context in which development is proposed.

Councils Response:
This is a “Policy Direction” and not a detailed policy, and is intended to be general in nature. The comments relating to need and a robust evidence base are accepted, and will be developed in the future when more detailed policies are drafted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action required in drafting the emerging strategic policy but detailed policies and supporting explanatory text will need to be developed in the future.
Support for review of Green Belt boundaries, proposing a localised review at 160 Kiveton Lane Todwick.

A planning application for 160 Kiveton Lane was submitted to the Council earlier in the year and subsequently withdrawn (the application was written up for refusal). The applicants are reconsidering the planning application but concerns raised by Forward Planning highlighted the potential for over development of the site including the associated need for substantial car parking.

Monitor the progress of any future planning applications, agreement upon the definitive Green Belt boundary may prove problematic (it is clear that part of the garden of 160 has been included within the Green Belt but it appears from a recent site visit that this has been done to reflect the location of a group of TPO’d trees within the garden). Consideration of the green belt boundary to include all of the grounds of 160 is a matter that will be considered within the Allocations DPD.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 414
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3239
Name:  Mr Greg Smith
Organisation:  Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number: 414
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Section 1

Summary of Representation:
This policy states that localised boundary reviews of the Green Belt may be necessary. However, it is our opinion that such localised changes to the Green Belt would be contrary to PPG2 which requires that once approved, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances.
A full scale strategic review of the Green Belt should be undertaken in order that the Borough is able to provide sufficient housing and employment land to meet its future needs and as such this would represent the exceptional circumstances needed. This will also provide the opportunity to address minor anomalies and allow small scale opportunities to provide additional housing and employment land.

It is considered that this is an appropriate time to make Green Belt deletions in order to provide for the economic and social needs of the Borough for the next 20 years, particularly as the current Green Belt boundary is very tightly drawn.

In the interests of economic development and prosperity and the ability to deliver the housing requirements of the borough we consider that there should be no further tightening of the Green Belt boundary.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction PD1 outlines the Council’s commitment to maintaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS. Policy Direction PD2 section 5 gives examples of where localised reviews may be necessary. Any such changes to the Green Belt would have to be justified by exceptional circumstances. Work underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD will help determine the need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long-term sustainable development of the Borough’s settlements.

Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 states:
“Once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt.”

Alteration of the Green Belt should only take place in exceptional circumstances, failure to find sufficient suitable land for housing and other activities, on sites that are not in the Green Belt, may constitute exceptional circumstances. The scale of the review of the Green Belt boundary, in these circumstances, would depend on the size of the shortfall. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will determine the amount of suitable housing land available, this will need to be compared to the RSS housing requirement.

Paragraph 2.1 of PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence, if the Green Belt boundary needs to be altered this alteration should, therefore be kept to a minimum. There is no evidence to support the requirement for a comprehensive review of the Green Belt.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations
Rep No: 415
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3239
Name: Mr Greg Smith
Organisation: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number: 415
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Section 1

Summary of Representation:
It is considered that where it can be shown that particular Green Belt locations would be more sustainable than some brownfield locations, these areas of land should be released for housing provided that such a release would not compromise the purpose of Green Belts as set out in PPG2, these being:
• To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas;
• To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;
• To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
• To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
• To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Councils Response:
It is accepted that not all brownfield sites are suitable for housing and that they should not be allocated just because they are brownfield. It is also true that some Green Belt sites may be more sustainable than some brownfield sites, but the fact that land is currently allocated as Green Belt is a significant issue to address. As stated in DLPs own comments alteration of the Green Belt should only take place in exceptional circumstances (NW/3239/PD1a), merely stating that Green Belt land is more sustainable than a brownfield site is an overly simplistic approach. If the results of the SHLAA assessment, when compared to the RSS housing requirement, show that the requirement can’t be met within the existing urban envelope then this may constitute exceptional circumstances to justify releasing sites in the Green Belt. PPS3 requires that PDL sites are given priority and requires that sites are assessed in terms of their “suitability” i.e. it would contribute to a sustainable, mixed community (PPS3 paragraph 54).

This process may effectively mean that some brownfield sites are deemed not to be suitable and that, as a result, there is a shortage of land that would require the release of Green Belt land. This is not the same as comparing the relative sustainability of Green Belt sites with suitable previously developed land.
**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Over the next few months, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation early next year. This baseline information will be used to produce the “spatial development strategy” for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved. Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.

*******************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 110
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3328
Name: Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation: Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number: 110
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: PD1.4

Summary of Representation:
The commitment to utilise S106 Agreements to support or enhance community infrastructure is supported.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
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Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3328
Name:  Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation:  Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number:  109
Policy:  PD1
Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  PD1.2

Summary of Representation:
The elements of the settlement hierarchy outlined in the Core Strategy are supported. Specifically the identification of Rotherham Urban Area as a settlement for key change, thus supporting the urban renaissance programme.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 111
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3328

Name: Ms Lucy Mitchell

Organisation: Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number: 111

Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: PD1.2

Summary of Representation:
Rotherham Urban Area should be the principal focus for new development and the settlement hierarchy should reflect this more clearly. A hierarchy based on the scale and overall sustainability of a settlement would provide clearer support for the urban renaissance of Rotherham town centre.

Councils Response:
The Core Strategy has to achieve a balance between directing the majority of new development to the main urban area of Rotherham while allowing sufficient development in outlying settlements to maintain and enhance their sustainability. The Council accepts that this policy approach to a settlement hierarchy requires further refinement and clarification in the Submission Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Refine and clarify the settlement hierarchy in the Submission Core Strategy, informed by the settlement capacity work underway for the Allocations DPD, the refresh of the Rotherham SDF and the emerging RSS. Achieve a better integration between the settlement and retail centre hierarchy.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Summary of Representation:
Policy PD1 also refers to the possibility of including additional land within the Green Belt, which is consistent with both Policy P2 of current and YH9 of draft RSS. Current RSS leaves making the case for adding land to the green belt to the discretion of the Local Planning Authority. However the Assembly would be concerned to ensure that any proposals to add land to the Green Belt do not close off longer term options to promote more sustainable patterns of development. Furthermore in view of the policy and text in the current RSS any case to add land to the green belt would have to rest very clearly on the local circumstances.

The Courts have over the years considered various matters relating to the implementation of green belt policy. For many years the ‘Carpets of Worth’ case has been cited, however a more recent case Copas v The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead ([2001] J.P.L. 1169) now provides a very specific test to be applied to the exceptional circumstances (see paragraph 2.7 of PPG2) for adding land to the green belt. This test requires that ‘some fundamental assumption which caused the land initially to be excluded from the Green Belt is there after clearly and permanently falsified by a later event’. This would clearly be a difficult test to satisfy should Rotherham wish to pursue this issue.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction PD1 outlines the Council’s commitment to maintaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS. Localised reviews may be necessary but would have to be justified by exceptional circumstances. Work underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD will help determine the need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long-term sustainable development of the Borough’s settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Look at the implications of the case law quoted and the capacity of possible future land allocations to deliver the housing and employment land requirements arising from published RSS when considering possible changes to Green Belt boundaries in the submission Core Strategy and supporting Policies and Allocations DPDs.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 140
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3418
Name: Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation: Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number: 140
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Para 7.14 to 7.19, Map 6

Summary of Representation:
It is pleasing to see that the South Yorkshire Settlement Study (2005) has influenced the Core Strategy and provided a basis for the development of a settlement hierarchy for Rotherham.

While paragraph 7.19 outlines the opportunities associated with each of these settlements, clear roles have not been defined. Policy PD1 lists the settlements included within the hierarchy, but fails to outline the level and type of appropriate development for each of the settlements. Furthermore, the settlement hierarchy does not appear to translate into other policies in the Core Strategy. The potential housing land identified in Map 6 does not appear to promote a hierarchical approach, with for example, Brampton/West Melton (identified as a Key Focus for Change) having a potential housing figure of less than that of Thurcroft (identified for only Limited Change). This is also the case for employment land potential. The approach to Retail and Leisure further confuses matters by identifying a hierarchy consisting of town, district and local centres, this is the only time this terminology is used within the Core Strategy.

Councils Response:
The Core Strategy has to achieve a balance between directing the majority of new development to the main urban area of Rotherham while allowing sufficient development in outlying settlements to maintain and enhance their sustainability. The Council accepts that this policy approach to a settlement hierarchy requires further refinement and clarification in the Submission Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Refine and clarify the settlement hierarchy in the Submission Core Strategy, informed by the settlement capacity work underway for the Allocations DPD, the refresh of the Rotherham SDF and the emerging RSS. Achieve a better integration between the settlement and retail centre hierarchy.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 141
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3418

Name: Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation: Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number: 141

Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
While PD1 provides some overarching guidance for development in the district, we feel it could go further in identifying a clear spatial direction for Rotherham. While we acknowledge that the scope of the policy is to guide development to the most sustainable settlements, it could be improved by concentrating on the wider issues associated with sustainable communities.

Councils Response:
The Core Strategy vision adequately reflects the strategies and plans affecting the Borough. However, the Council accepts that further refinement of the vision and development of its spatial aspects would be beneficial for the Submission Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further refine the vision for the Submission Core Strategy to take account of the refresh of the Rotherham SDF and the need for a clearer spatial vision for Rotherham, incorporating more locational specificity, closer links to the settlement hierarchy and the wider issues of sustainable communities.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 142
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3418
Name: Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation: Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number: 142
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The policy states that localised boundary reviews may be necessary to meet employment and housing needs. Policy P2 of current RSS and YH9 of draft RSS state that localised reviews of the green belt may be necessary in some places, but only if justified by exceptional local circumstances. In addition, Policy SY1 of draft RSS states that maintaining the general extent of the South Yorkshire Green Belt is a key priority for the sub area. We do not feel that the existence of such ‘exceptional circumstances’ has been demonstrated within the Core Strategy and are therefore concerned at the inclusion of these references.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction PD1 outlines the Council’s commitment to maintaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS. Localised reviews may be necessary but would have to be justified by exceptional circumstances. Work underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD will help determine the need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long-term sustainable development of the Borough’s settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 50
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3424

Name:  Mr Henryk Peterson

Organisation:  Sport England

Representation Number:  50

Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Although provisional monitoring indicators will be used to measure greenspace, satisfaction with greenspace, use of certain sports facilities (which Sport England would support in principle, and which could eventually be expanded upon to use Sport England's own KPI's), the weakness identified could affect the soundness of the preferred options and their ability to provide sustainable communities (PD1), irrespective of Arup's reference to the strength of this policy being its ability to match the needs of communities.

Councils Response:
The contribution of sport and recreation facilities to achieving sustainable communities is acknowledged and should be further emphasised in developing the submission version of PD1. The Council is anxious to include a manageable number of feasible and meaningful indicators that are also consistent with those set out in guidance and those included in RSS. Sport England's KPIs will be considered when finalising performance indicators under the strategic policies within the submission document. These KPIs will also be considered in future Policies DPDs and AMRs.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Discuss with Sport England scope to expand the contribution of sport and recreation to the sustainable communities policy and the use of Sport England's KPIs in the submission document.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 224
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3463
Name:  Mr C .J. Harper
Organisation:

Representation Number:  224
Policy:  PD1                       Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Agree with sustainable communities, a sound strategy for developing local services is essential.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of this policy direction

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action required

........................................................................................................................................
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**Assessment of Representations**

Rep No: 579  
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 3727

Name: Mr Ian Gilder

Organisation: Environmental Resources Management (for UPM Kymmene)

Representation Number: 579

Policy: PD1  Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

**Summary of Representation:**
Support this policy direction, in particular the reference to Dinnington as a key focus for change in the settlement hierarchy.

**Councils Response:**
Support for Policy Direction 1, in particular the reference to Dinnington as a key focus for change in the settlement hierarchy is noted.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Support for Policy Direction 1 will be taken into account in preparing Sustainable Communities policies and finalising the settlement hierarchy in the Core Strategy Submission Document.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 620
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3763
Name: Mr Ian Smith
Organisation: English Heritage

Representation Number: 620
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Page 71 criterion 5

Summary of Representation:
Support desire for locally distinctive design

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Noted.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 608  
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3763

Name: Mr Ian Smith

Organisation: English Heritage

Representation Number: 608

Policy: PD1  
Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Page 70 criterion 2

Summary of Representation:
The policy should make it clear that sites located within a "focus" of development settlement (as identified in PD1) will not automatically be granted approval and that they will need to meet sustainability criteria outlined elsewhere.

Councils Response:
Agree.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All the Core Strategy Policies should be read together (and with other Development Plan policies, when developed) and this will be made clear in the next draft of the Document.
Respondent I.D. 3763
Name: Mr Ian Smith
Organisation: English Heritage

Representation Number: 609
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Criterion 4

Summary of Representation:
“Public spaces should be amended to read “public realm”

Councils Response:
Part Accepted. For the purposes of clarity, and to avoid conflicting definitions, it is proposed reference to both public spaces and public realm be included.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend Criterion 4 of PD1 to refer to public spaces and public realm.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 621
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3763

Name: Mr Ian Smith

Organisation: English Heritage

Representation Number: 621

Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Page 71 criterion 5

Summary of Representation:
Suggested amendment given “Promoting urban renaissance, where good design which safeguards and helps reinforce the distinctive character of Rotherham’s settlements and inclusive accessible environments are incorporated in all developments”

Councils Response:
Agree. The suggested wording to better highlight the need to secure locally distinctive design is welcomed and can be used to inform translation of the Policy Direction to Policy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure the translation of the Policy Direction to Policy highlights the need to secure locally distinctive design by use of the wording suggested or similar.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 532
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3856
Name: Mr G. Clay
Organisation: G. M. Clay Architectural Designs

Representation Number:  532
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: General

Summary of Representation:
Site allocation representations (SAS42 & 43) received for Ladyfield Road and Little Wood Lane, Thorpe Salvin. Proposed use is for low cost housing on both sites.

Councils Response:
Sites to be considered as part of Allocations DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Refer to response given above. The respondent submitted a response form supporting PD1 in the CSPO, hence its inclusion within the Consultation Statement.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

**Assessment of Representations**

**Rep No:** 178

**PD1 \ Support**

**Respondent I.D.** 4183

**Name:** Mr G Blunn

**Organisation:**

**Representation Number:** 178

**Policy:** PD1  **Object/Support:** Support

**Section / Paragraph:** 5

**Summary of Representation:**
Design and Access statements will allow full community participation at the pre-application stage

**Councils Response:**
Thank you for your support of this issue.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
No further action required
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 177
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183
Name: Mr G Blun
Organisation:

Representation Number: 177
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: 4

Summary of Representation:
Developers should not be given the premise that “they may be required to contribute”. Developers should be able to choose from a list which additional service(s) they can and will provide.

Councils Response:
Government guidance for developer contributions (Section 106 Agreements) state that they can only be sought where they meet the following tests:
- Necessary
- Relevant to planning
- Directly related to the proposed development
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; and
- Reasonable in all other respects.

Developer contributions have, therefore, to be directly related to the proposed development so cannot be chosen from a preset menu. The Council accepts that the wording in the Local Development Framework needs to be strengthened to “require developer contributions”

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Local Development Framework will require developers to make appropriate Section 106 contributions and clarify what, when and where these contributions will be expected, dependent on local circumstances.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 175
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183
Name: Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number: 175

Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: settlement Hierarchy

Summary of Representation:
The separation of settlements into four categories will just add more bureaucracy to decision making.

Councils Response:
These categories are a tool which will assist the Council and developers in meeting the sustainability agenda for Rotherham, by identifying the more sustainable locations for development.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to the methodology
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 176

PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183

Name: Mr G Blunn

Organisation:

Representation Number: 176

Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: 3

Summary of Representation:
This paragraph is unnecessary since much community infrastructure has already been destroyed or damaged by the actions of the Council.

Councils Response:
Although some settlements have lost facilities, others have gained and any future development proposals may assist in the creation of and support for further community infrastructure, so this is still a valid aim to incorporate within the Local Development Framework.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Retain this paragraph
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 228
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 4969

Name: Mr Ian Rowe

Organisation: Signet Planning (for Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estates)

Representation Number: 228

Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Generally support the policy principles of PD1, however, In order to support sustainable settlements it will be appropriate to make adjustments to the detailed Green Belt boundaries, particularly where a Key or High Focus for Change is proposed.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction PD1 outlines the Council’s commitment to maintaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS. Policy Direction PD2 section 5 gives examples of where localised reviews may be necessary. Any such changes to the Green Belt would have to be justified by exceptional circumstances. Work underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD will help determine the need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long-term sustainable development of the Borough’s settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Critically assess the Green Belt boundary as part of the Allocations DPD work. Consider the housing and employment land targets in emerging Regional Spatial Strategy and other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  4969
Name:  Mr Ian Rowe
Organisation:  Signet Planning (for Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estates)

Representation Number:  229
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Generally support the policy principles of PD1, however, the inclusion of additional land within the Green Belt requires particularly careful consideration. Consideration should be given to adopting the “safeguarded land” approach.

Councils Response:
The Council would have to show exceptional circumstances for including land within the Green Belt. If it cannot do so another option is Safeguarded Land.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the Safeguarded land approach is given serious consideration as the allocations DPD progresses
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 230
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  4969

Name:  Mr Ian Rowe

Organisation:  Signet Planning (for Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estates)

Representation Number:  230

Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Generally support the settlement hierarchy in terms of the settlements identified as a Key and High Potential for Change. Potential for Limited Change should not prevent appropriate developments which would bring positive benefits.

Councils Response:
Agreed, appropriate developments that can be shown to improve a settlement’s sustainability will be given due consideration.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
To be aware of the needs of settlements to be able to assess “appropriate development”. All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD next year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy.

*****************************************************************************
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  581
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5012

Name:  Miss Julie Deptford

Organisation:  GVA Grimley (Sheffield Business Park Ltd)

Representation Number:  581

Policy:  PD1   Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Greenbelt

Summary of Representation:
This is supported but does not go far enough to set out the mechanism for review. Further guidance and certainty needs to be provided.

Councils Response:
The LDF accepts the policy guidance in the Regional Spatial Strategy with regards to the Green Belt. Policy YH9 states:

The Green Belts in North, South and West Yorkshire have a valuable role in supporting urban renaissance and concentration, as well as conserving countryside, and their general extent should not be changed. More localised review of Green Belt boundaries may be necessary in some places through Development Plan reviews, but only if justified by exceptional local circumstances. Any such review should clearly demonstrate, having regard to the Plan’s policies, that release of land:
i) Is necessary to meet the wider principles of sustainable development in comparison with other available options
ii) Is justified by reference to the capacity of the existing urban area, and the need to enable development to proceed to achieve economic regeneration or to maintain a buoyant economy or to meet housing requirements
iii) Does not materially harm the fundamental aim of national Green Belt policy in the area concerned.
Localised reviews should also consider whether exceptional circumstances exist to include additional land as Green Belt.

The up-coming work on the Allocations DPD will involve detailed settlement studies to identify potential sites for development. This work could involve the amendments to the Green Belt boundary, if justifiable, to either exclude land from or include land in the Green Belt.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Submission Core Strategy clarifies the mechanism for localised Green Belt reviews.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 340
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5024
Name: Ms Nicola Sewell
Organisation: Indigo Planning

Representation Number:  340
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
There are development opportunities in and adjacent to Catcliffe that will assist in improving existing services and facilities and contribute to a more sustainable pattern of development.

Councils Response:
Many people have put forward suggestions for sites to be looked at for development in the future. During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken. It is anticipated that the sites will then be put out to consultation later in the year for all stakeholders to consider.

However at this stage the figures for new house building and employment land supply (provided in the Core Strategy) are indicative only. The retail hierarchy reflects existing retail opportunities in each settlement, not future likely need if the community / settlement were to grow or if Waverley were to be developed as a sustainable new community. It is only when the survey work to assess potential new development needs in a settlement has been completed, that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken.

If the development of Waverley as a new sustainable community is accepted for inclusion within the submission Core Strategy, then consideration will be given to the status of Catcliffe in the retail hierarchy.

It is only when the survey work to assess potential new development needs in a settlement has been completed, that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy"
for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
My Client (Royal Mail Property Group) supports the settlement hierarchy, specifically the settlements with high potential for change.

Councils Response: Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action: Support for the settlement hierarchy, specifically the settlements with high potential for change, be noted.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 584
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 5135
Name: Ms Annette Elliott
Organisation: United Co-operatives Ltd

Representation Number: 584
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Settlement Hierarchy

Summary of Representation:
Broadly support the Council’s proposals as outlined. Development of appropriate size and scale should be directed to these centres within this hierarchy.

Councils Response:
Support for the settlement hierarchy is noted.

In line with advice in PPS6 further work will be required to identify indicative upper limits for the scale of development which is likely to be acceptable in particular centres for different facilities. This will inform the preparation of the Core Strategy Submission Document and the Site Allocations DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further work will be required to identify indicative upper limits for the scale of development which is likely to be acceptable in particular centres in the retail centre hierarchy.

..........................................................................................................................
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 234
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5137
Name:  Mrs Angela Anson
Organisation:

Representation Number:  234

Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Limited and small scale qualitative growth

Summary of Representation:
The use of the phrase “Limited Change” in relation to Thorpe Hesley is not specific enough. What exactly does this statement mean?

Councils Response:
The Council will consider development proposals that will improve the sustainability of settlements, in the case of Thorpe Hesley it is expected that such proposals will only be small scale in nature.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
To be aware of the needs of Thorpe Hesley so as to know how proposals will affect the sustainability of the settlement. All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD next year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included in the Submission Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 447
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5147
Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 447
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Part 5

Summary of Representation:
More regard to sustainable design needed, as highlighted by SA report on page 73. The Government has recently published its companion guide to PPS1: Climate change and the Code for Sustainable Homes, these must be incorporated.

Councils Response:
The sustainability appraisal for this policy direction does identify a weakness in that it focuses sustainability in terms of hierarchy and relationship of settlements. It does not highlight the importance of having settlements that are designed using sustainable principles in order to create the basis for sustainable communities.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments should be noted in the production of the submission draft.
**Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council**

**CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS**

---

**Assessment of Representations**

**Rep No: 446**

**PD1 \ Object**

**Respondent I.D. 5147**

**Name:** Mr John King

**Organisation:** CPRE

**Representation Number:** 446

**Policy:** PD1

**Object/Support:** Object

**Section / Paragraph:** Part 2

**Summary of Representation:**
Without the housing allocations for each settlement, it difficult to assess the impact the settlement hierarchy will have. Concerned that Dinnington is shown as a “Key Focus for Change”; not sufficient transport links or infrastructure to support substantial growth. Increasing housing allocations without further increasing employment within the settlement will lead to increased commuter traffic.

**Councils Response:**
The South Yorkshire Settlement Assessment Study (Jacobs Babtie Consultants 2005) provides a settlement hierarchy forming part of the evidence base for all the South Yorkshire LDFs. The hierarchy underpins the principal Policy Direction for Rotherham’s Core Strategy Preferred Option providing an indication of the likely distribution of new development throughout the Borough and setting out the capacity for growth available from existing information sources. In some settlements the existing capacity does not match the anticipated future role of the settlement indicated by the Jacobs Babtie Study. This, together with likely higher growth levels in the yet to be published final RSS requires further work to identify future site allocations, for the priorities of housing, the economy and transportation in support of the future role of settlements.

This work is needed to progress to the Issues and Options stage of the Allocations DPD which will also support refinement of the Core Strategy. There will be consultation on the Allocations DPD prior to submission of the Core Strategy which will assist understanding of the functioning of the settlement hierarchy in determining the spatial distribution of development and supporting infrastructure.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Ensure that the structure and content of the initial "frontloading" consultations for the Allocations DPD informs the function of the settlement hierarchy and the determination of the spatial development strategy in the submission Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 445
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  445
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Part 1

Summary of Representation:
Support commitment to maintaining general extent of the Green Belt, should refer to PD2 and PD3 to ensure that GB land is only developed when most sustainable option. Needs greater commitment to increase GB.

Councils Response:
Support is welcomed. References to other policies that support Green Belt policy may be useful for the purposes of clarifying how Green Belt Policy will be implemented in relation to specific issues. However, the benefits of cross-referencing policies, in all cases should be balanced with the need to keep policies as brief as possible.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments should be noted in the production of the submission draft.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5167
Name:  Mr Brian Upstone
Organisation:  RAP Residents Against Pollution

Representation Number:  536
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Locally distinctive design

Summary of Representation:
Do not demolish existing good quality buildings.

Councils Response:
Agree. Safeguarding, maintaining and enhancing good quality buildings is considered essential to ensure the special quality and character of the Borough’s heritage is retained. Any specific proposals that come forward via submission of planning applications will offer opportunity for further comment by the public.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 236
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5185
Name:  Mr David Anson
Organisation:  STAG

Representation Number:  236
Policy:  PD1     Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  limited and small scale qualitative change

Summary of Representation:
Support the strategy which removes large housing allocations from Thorpe Hesley

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support for this strategy. Policy Direction PD1 outlines the Council’s commitment to maintaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS. Policy Direction PD2 section 5 gives examples of where localised reviews may be necessary. Any such changes to the Green Belt would have to be justified by exceptional circumstances. Work underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD will help determine the need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long-term sustainable development of the Borough’s settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider amendments to the Green Belt boundary a Thorpe Hesley to exclude UDP Site H6 and proposals to include this site within the Green Belt.
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5205
Name:  Mr Sam Kipling
Organisation:  Environment Agency

Representation Number:  57
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Comment

Section / Paragraph:  Page 72 (PMI's)

Summary of Representation:
Page 72 – Provisional Monitoring Indicators:
It would be relevant to include an indicator or indicators relating to the incorporation of water and energy efficiency measures, given that section 5 of Policy PD1 makes explicit mention of ‘good design’ and ‘reducing carbon emissions’.

Councils Response:
The suggestion is noted but may be of more relevance in developing PD8. However, at this early stage the Council is anxious to focus on feasible indicators that are consistent with those recommended in guidance, those used corporately and those in RSS. With this in mind the indicators included in the Preferred Options document are provisional and drawn from existing sources pending development of more pertinent local indicators as the LDF evolves.
It is agreed that there is scope to pursue the suggestion and the Council wishes to explore devising more specific indicators and related data collection and management measures with the respondent in the future development of the LDF and in AMRs.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Discuss with the respondent the selection of more specific indicators with related data collection and management measures. Appropriate indicators can be included within the Core Strategy, the Annual Monitoring Review and other DPD's as appropriate.
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**Assessment of Representations**

Rep No: 56  
PD1 \ Comment

**Respondent I.D.**  5205

**Name:**  Mr Sam Kipling

**Organisation:**  Environment Agency

**Representation Number:**  56

**Policy:**  PD1  
**Object/Support:**  Comment

**Section / Paragraph:**  Number 4: Developer Contributions

**Summary of Representation:**
Policy PD1: Sustainable Communities  
Number 4: Developer Contributions – The following should be added to the list of possible Developer Contributions - ‘Habitat Improvement and Creation’, and ‘Flood Defence Maintenance and Improvement’.

**Councils Response:**
The list in PD1.4 was not intended to be exhaustive but consideration will be given to the suggestions in developing the strategic policy for submission bearing in mind the implications of the proposed Planning Gain Supplement.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Dependent on scope and format of final submission PD1.4 consider including reference to "habitat improvement and creation" and "Flood defence maintenance and improvement". Or ensure that it is clear in the Policies that the "list" is not exhaustive and developers may be asked to contribute to other activities not identified at the time of writing, but appropriate in scale to the development proposed.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5241
Name:  Mr Peter Ludlam
Organisation:

Representation Number:  347
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Map 9

Summary of Representation:
Retail and Service provision in Kiveton Park should increase to at least the level of a district centre

Councils Response:
This is an interesting point many people have also put forward suggestions for sites to be looked at for development in the future. During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken. It is anticipated that the sites will then be put out to consultation later in the year for all stakeholders to consider.

However at this stage the figures for new house building and employment land supply (provided in the Core Strategy) are indicative only. The retail hierarchy reflects existing retail opportunities in each settlement, not future likely need if the community / settlement were to grow. It is only when the survey work to assess potential new development needs in a settlement has been completed, that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken. Table 6 and Map 7 of the draft Core Strategy provide an indication of the current housing potential using information from the existing Unitary Development Plan and the Urban Potential Study. It is the likely ranking of a settlement in the settlement hierarchy (PD1) that will determine its status as a district or local centre.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD later in the year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 238
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5242
Name:  Mr Paul Bedwell
Organisation:  Spawforths (for Taylor Woodrow Developments

Representation Number:  238
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The LDF should contain a commitment to undertake a fundamental review of the extent of the Green Belt in order to accommodate sustainable development within and beyond the plan period. The anticipated requirement for housing supply and for the delivery of affordable housing both within the plan period and beyond represent exceptional circumstances that warrant a transparent review of the extent of the Green Belt boundaries and that this exercise should be undertaken as part of the plan process. The Core Strategy should include a policy to confirm that a full review of the extent of the Green Belt in Rotherham will be undertaken and should specify the criteria that will inform that review.

Councils Response:
There is no requirement in the Regional Spatial Strategy for the LDF to include a fundamental review of the extent of the Green Belt at this time. The timescales agreed with the Government Office for the production of this LDF would preclude such an undertaking. Up-coming work to produce an Allocations DPD may well suggest a few localised amendments to the Green Belt to enable sustainable settlement growth. Naturally such changes will have to be justified with reference to PPG2 Green Belts.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to the Core Strategy wording.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 355
PD1 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  5243
Name:  PS Rachel Usher
Organisation:  South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number:  355
Policy:  PD1 Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Community infrastructure

Summary of Representation:
An increase in population will require increased police resources. This will be over and above the police establishment as it is today.

Councils Response:
This is not an issue for spatial planning. This is an issue more appropriately dealt with through South Yorkshire Police business planning and the Safer Neighbourhoods Team initiative. The police could also consider, in partnership with other Agencies, the use of town centre ambassadors to discourage low level crime and anti social behaviour.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 354
PD1 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 5243
Name: PS Rachel Usher
Organisation: South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number: 354
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Reduce the opportunities for comfortable congregation such as bus-shelters, low-level walls and other seating opportunities. (But need to provide sufficient youth and community centres alongside sufficient leisure facilities.)

Councils Response:
This response is understandable from SYP who are tasked with tackling crime and reducing anti-social behaviour, however the impact of such a policy were these principles to be included within planning policies, would be to restrict potentially high quality design opportunities. This approach is not favoured. The provision of appropriate community infrastructure should support the creation of sustainable communities. However, the provision of ongoing management and maintenance of youth centres/community centres has resource implications for local communities and these should not be under-estimated.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action. The negative impacts of such a policy on quality design would place too rigid a restriction on potential developers to the detriment of the wider environment. The provision of further community infrastructure to support the ongoing sustainability of a community is supported by the Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 356
PD1 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  5243

Name:  PS Rachel Usher

Organisation:  South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number:  356

Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:  Community infrastructure

Summary of Representation:
Key focus for change is Rotherham town centre need to give consideration to the management of noise and also night time refuse created by town centre revellers. Will there be sufficient space for secure parking areas for town centre dwellers?

Councils Response:
The management of noise and refuse collection is more appropriately dealt with by other Service areas – Environmental Health and Streetpride. Through its Allocations DPD the Council can ensure that potential “bad neighbour” uses are separated by an appropriate buffer, utilising alternative sites such as offices and retail outlets. The Council’s desire to promote town centre living could give rise to potential conflict of uses, but these conflicts will be minimised through appropriate use of planning conditions and the creation of buffer zones.

Secure car parking for town centre dwellers will be discussed with colleagues in Transportation.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that planning permission is not granted for conflicting uses (town centre dwellers) adjacent to noisy late night uses. Careful consideration needs to be given to the needs of secure car parking for town centre dwellers and appropriate provision provided – policies to guide maximum car parking standards should be included within a future policies DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5244
Name:  Miss Beverley Smith
Organisation:  GVA Grimley (for David Wilson Estates)

Representation Number:  368
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Settlement hierarchy

Summary of Representation:
Lack of clarity re: Core Strategy definitions of settlement categories.  Issues relating to the outcome of the Jacobs Babtie study.  (See representation submitted for further details).  The respondent suggests that the Core Strategy treats Maltby the same as Dinnington because it shares similar characteristics as an urban area and Maltby has significant potential for step change in line with an increasing population size and long-term demand for housing growth.  The respondent also promotes Waverley as one of the parts of the Rotherham Urban area under the category of Settlements as a key focus for change in PD1.

Councils Response:
The submission Core Strategy will have a clear settlement hierarchy.  PD 1 used the Babtie Sustainable Settlement Study as the basis for creating a settlement hierarchy.  However the Core Strategy will develop the Council’s thinking further.  The Babtie settlement study was undertaken at a point in time and the methodology behind the study is robust.  However the policy directions will be developed into Core Strategy policies and will have a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development within the Borough.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA.  It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation later in the year.  This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy.  It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5244
Name:  Miss Beverley Smith
Organisation:  GVA Grimley (for David Wilson Estates)

Representation Number:  367
Policy:  PD1 Object/Support:  Comment
Section / Paragraph:  Green Belt

Summary of Representation:
Clarity required of the future mechanism for reviewing the Green Belt Boundary in the Borough.

Councils Response:
Detailed settlement survey work to assess potential new development needs in a settlement will commence this summer and it is only after this survey work has been completed that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken and sites identified for development purposes. This may also involve the identification of small areas of Green Belt and / or greenspace to assist in the creation of a sustainable settlement with a variety of housing, employment opportunities, retail and other commercial and community facilities to ensure the long term sustainability of any existing settlements.

Consideration will be given to the potential for urban extensions into the Green Belt but these will only be considered where alternative options such as the reuse of previously developed land and the development of sites allocated but not taken up during the Rotherham Unitary Development period.

During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation later in the year.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
* Settlement survey criteria will be placed on the Forward Planning web page and all appropriate allocations will be consulted upon as part of the Allocations informal early engagement later in the year. As part of the CSPO consultation and information sharing, suggestions were sought for potential sites (including urban extensions into the Green Belt) that the community would like us to consider as part of the forthcoming sites
allocations surveys. Whilst these sites may ultimately be dismissed by the Council, their inclusion as a potential development site would have been rigorously appraised.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 588
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 5247

Name: Mr Edward Uwechue

Organisation: The Development Planning Partnership

Representation Number: 588

Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Welcome the 5 broad principles of the core strategy and the general approach on delivering sustainable communities. Support the identification of Rotherham town centre as a key focus for change.

Councils Response:
Support for the five broad principles in Policy Direction 1, the general approach on delivering sustainable communities, and the identification of Rotherham town centre as a key focus for change are noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for Policy Direction 1 will be taken into account in preparing Sustainable Communities policies and finalising the settlement hierarchy in the Core Strategy Submission Document.
Summary of Representation:
The reference to ‘Infrastructure justified by local needs’ requires additional guidance on what the nature of the justification will be, and, as is the case with affordable housing, that where developer contributions are sought these will be quantified by negotiation with the developer and not predetermined. Development derived funding for infrastructure works is a finite resource and any expectations that development can and will fund a plethora of different works, particularly to overcome existing problems, should be tempered to ensure a level of realism.

Councils Response:
Requirements for developer contributions must to be clearly defined and relate to need, but they must also be realistic; it is acknowledged development derived funding for infrastructure works is a finite resource. Policies must clearly state what is expected from developers, to allow them to take the associated cost of these requirements at the earliest possible stage, for example, when negotiating the price of land. If policies merely state that contributions will be determined through negotiation, it is unlikely that the necessary levels of contribution would be achieved. It is important however, to ensure that levels set are realistic and do not affect the viability of developments, and take into account the fact that there may be several types of requirement on many developments. There may be some instances where additional costs, not taken into account when setting requirement levels, associated with a particular development, mean that developers will need to negotiate a reduction in the requirement.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that requirements for developer contributions are realistic, clearly defined and based on need. Policies should acknowledge that there may be cases where exceptional circumstances may be argued by developers.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 502
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5248
Name: Mr R.D. Butters
Organisation: Hallam Land Management Ltd

Representation Number: 502
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Evidence Base

Summary of Representation:
Evidence Base
Core Strategy – Preferred Options (CS-PO) PD2 relies on the information to be provided in documents listed in the Evidence Base that are not yet available. The identification of deliverable sites needs to have regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment that is currently not available. It is therefore hard to see how the CS-PO nor the Submission Draft Core Strategy documents can be considered sound when no matter which option is preferred the underlying assumptions on both housing requirements and housing supply are unreliable and unsound and not founded on an up to date evidence base.
The CS–PO also fails to properly address the housing mix on offer in terms of the existing housing stock and future development. No evidence base is currently available on this point in terms of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

Councils Response:
It is the Council’s intention that Regulation 25 consultations on the Allocations DPD will take place before finalising the Core Strategy for submission, enabling comments to be made in relation to site allocations. Settlement/sites surveys will be undertaken over the next few months to inform the Regulation 25 consultations on the Allocations DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD next year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved. The Rotherham Housing Market Assessment and the joint SHLAA with Sheffield City Council will guide future housing policy. Consideration will be given to establishing the margins of flexibility to deliver increased RSS Housing Supply in the Sheffield/Rotherham Market Area.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5248
Name:  Mr R.D. Butters
Organisation:  Hallam Land Management Ltd

Representation Number:  497
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Section 1

Summary of Representation:
Green Belt
Paragraph 7.53 of the Core Strategy – Preferred Options (CS-PO) document recognise that if the RSS requirements are changed as referred to above in terms of increased annual requirements and a longer plan period then the additional dwellings would have to be accommodated on Greenbelt/greenfield land. However the CS-PO only makes occasional references to minor changes to the Green Belt and there is no suggestion of a Green Belt review as part of the LDF process. National policy states that the Green Belt should only changed in exceptional circumstances. A serious shortage of housing land supply, in our view is an exceptional circumstance and the whole of the Green Belt should be reviewed in a strategic and planned way as part of the overall considerations examined in the LDF process. CS-PO PD1 also suggests Green Belt changes both adding and deleting land for the Green Belt in localised boundary reviews. It would be more appropriate to review the whole of the Green Belt and re-examine the contribution that particular areas fulfil in meeting the PPG2 purposes of Green Belt to help inform and plan changes to the Green Belt. The approach being put forward in the CS-PO document is not consistent with good planning in terms of meeting the broad objectives set out in PPS1. This piece meal approach is reiterated at CS-PO paragraph 7.115.

Councils Response:
Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 states:

“Once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt.”

Alteration of the Green Belt should only take place in exceptional circumstances, failure to find sufficient suitable land for housing and other, on sites that are not in the Green Belt,
may constitute exceptional circumstances. The scale of the review of the Green Belt boundary, in these circumstances, would depend on the size of the shortfall. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will determine the amount of suitable housing land available, this will need to be compared to the RSS housing requirement.

Paragraph 2.1 of PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence, if the Green Belt boundary needs to be altered this alteration should, therefore be kept to a minimum. There is no evidence to support the requirement for a comprehensive review of the Green Belt.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 500
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5248

Name: Mr R.D. Butters

Organisation: Hallam Land Management Ltd

Representation Number: 500

Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Sustainability Appraisal

Summary of Representation:
Should identify the inherent weakness of not focussing on the need to balance facilities and services within a given community, commensurate with its size, but irrespective of its categorisation within the identified settlement hierarchy.

The potential overburdening of development with infrastructure costs is also a potential weakness of PD1.

Councils Response:
These points have arisen from the SA commentary to PD1. It is acknowledged that there needs to be a balance between development and service/community infrastructure in specific settlements to achieve sustainable communities. This may require infrastructure to be reinforced to cater for new development or, conversely, to realise potential development to assist the viability of existing infrastructure.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure the submission Core Strategy addresses the need for a balance between development and service/community infrastructure (including retail and leisure provision) within particular settlements and that this is reflected in the supporting Policies and Allocations DPDs.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  501
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5248
Name:  Mr R.D. Butters
Organisation:  Hallam Land Management Ltd

Representation Number:  501
Policy:  PD1          Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The extension of the plan period to 2026 should also be accompanied by a review of the
Previously Developed Land targets, which, as the brownfield sites are used up, should be
reduced given that these sites are a finite source of housing land and in many cases their
loss to housing will be at the expense of employment land.

The housing land supply is supplemented in CS-PO Table 5 by the addition of 3,500
dwellings from the Waverley site that are identified as a brownfield supply. The Waverley
site however does not conform to the definition of previously developed land and does not
therefore represent a source of brownfield housing land.

Councils Response:
It is acknowledged that at some point the supply of previously developed land will reduce
dramatically, Previously Developed Land targets are, however, set out in the RSS.

Advice issued by the Department of Communities and Local Government, relating to
former minerals sites, stated that where the land was reclaimed with the intention to re-
develop it (rather than restored to a green state), then it should be treated as previously
developed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Annual Monitoring Report for the LDF/RSS will detail the extent and availability of
previously developed land in the Borough. In due course any targets in the Development
Plan for redeveloping previously developed land may need to be revised as potential
supply is utilised, or it is apparent that the site can only be used for non-housing purposes.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  241
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5252

Name:  Miss Beverley Smith

Organisation:  GVA Grimley (for Express Park Developments Ltd)

Representation Number:  241

Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  7.19

Summary of Representation:
Wath should be identified as a settlement of “Key Focus for Change” and not just as “High Potential for Change” Developments currently underway, and proposals for the town centre as part of the Pathfinder initiative, will lead to a significant step change for the area. Proposed developments will allow Wath to meet the criteria set out within the definition at paragraph 7.19.

Councils Response:
The South Yorkshire Settlements Study (Jacobs Babtie2005) was a major influence on the Core Strategy. There may be instances where developments in the years since the study was produced mean that a reassessment is required. The next phase of the LDF, the Allocations DPD, will involve detailed studies of settlements for potential development sites and should provide a good indication of any settlements that need to be reassessed under the sustainable settlements criteria.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Use the Allocations DPD study to highlight those settlements which need to be reassessed under the Sustainable Settlements Criteria.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 240
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5252
Name:  Miss Beverley Smith
Organisation:  GVA Grimley (for Express Park Developments Ltd)

Representation Number:  240
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
It is appropriate to consider amending Green Belt boundaries where justified. It is not clear within the core strategy what the mechanism for reviewing the Green Belt boundary will be. A localised amendment to the Green Belt is suggested to the east of the Express Parks site at Manvers.

Councils Response:
The LDF accepts the policy guidance in the Regional Spatial Strategy with regards to the Green Belt. Policy YH9 states:

POLICY
The Green Belts in North, South and West Yorkshire have a valuable role in supporting urban renaissance and concentration, as well as conserving countryside, and their general extent should not be changed.
More localised review of Green Belt boundaries may be necessary in some places through Development Plan reviews, but only if justified by exceptional local circumstances. Any such review should clearly demonstrate, having regard to the Plan’s policies, that release of land:
i) Is necessary to meet the wider principles of sustainable development in comparison with other available options
ii) Is justified by reference to the capacity of the existing urban area, and the need to enable development to proceed to achieve economic regeneration or to maintain a buoyant economy or to meet housing requirements
iii) Does not materially harm the fundamental aim of national Green Belt policy in the area concerned.
Localised reviews should also consider whether exceptional circumstances exist to include additional land as Green Belt.

The up-coming work on the Allocations DPD will involve detailed settlement studies to identify potential sites for development. This work could involve the amendments to the
Green Belt boundary, if justifiable, to either exclude land from or include land in the Green Belt. Your suggested Green Belt amendment is noted.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Ensure the Green Belt site to the east of Express Parks at Manvers be looked at as a potential GB release for development.
Respondent I.D. 5252
Name: Miss Beverley Smith
Organisation: GVA Grimley (for Express Park Developments Ltd)

Representation Number: 598
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Summary of Representation:
Greater emphasis should be given to the importance of promoting the renaissance of Rotherham town centre, and should be done so as a separate heading under Greenbelt Suggested wording:
2. Rotherham Town Centre
Promoting the comprehensive regeneration of the Town Centre and strategic sites on the edge of the town centre to foster economic and social development and to create a vital and viable town centre.

Councils Response:
Support for Rotherham Renaissance is in line with the sustainable communities approach and is a cross cutting theme inherent across the Core Strategy Preferred Option document. PD1 identifies Rotherham town centre as a key focus for change; reflected in housing, employment and retail and main town centre uses policy directions. Whilst it is considered appropriate that the Core Strategy Submission document should highlight Rotherham Renaissance and how it will be supported through Core Strategy policies, it is not considered necessary to introduce a separate policy which repeats provision made in other policies.

Paragraph 2.16 of PPS6 also sets out the broad requirements for local planning authorities in planning for town centres, including assessing the need for new floorspace for retail, leisure and other main town centre uses, identifying deficiencies in provision, and assessing the capacity of existing centres to accommodate new development, including where appropriate, the scope for extending the primary shopping area and/or town centre. Paragraph 2.6 notes that in such cases, local planning authorities should seek to identify, designate and assemble larger sites adjoining the primary shopping area (i.e. in edge-of-centre locations). Further work will therefore be required to support the Allocations DPD on the need for and capacity of Rotherham Town Centre to accommodate further development of main town centre uses, including the appropriateness of the existing town centre boundary.
**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
The Submission Core Strategy should highlight Rotherham Renaissance and how it will be supported through Core Strategy policies.

Detailed consideration of Rotherham Town Centre will be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work.
Respondent I.D.  5253

Name: Miss Beverley Smith

Organisation: GVA Grimley (for Evans Regeneration Investments Ltd)

Representation Number: 601

Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Summary of Representation:
Greater emphasis should be given to the importance of promoting the renaissance of Rotherham town centre, and should be done so as a separate heading under Greenbelt
Suggested wording:
2. Rotherham Town Centre
Promoting the comprehensive regeneration of the Town Centre and strategic sites on the edge of the town centre to foster economic and, social development and to create a vital and viable town centre.

Councils Response:
Support for Rotherham Renaissance is in line with the sustainable communities approach and is a cross cutting theme inherent across the Core Strategy Preferred Option document. PD1 identifies Rotherham town centre as a key focus for change; reflected in housing, employment and retail and main town centre uses policy directions. Whilst it is considered appropriate that the Core Strategy Submission document should highlight Rotherham Renaissance and how it will be supported through Core Strategy policies, it is not considered necessary to introduce a separate policy which repeats provision made in other policies.

Paragraph 2.16 of PPS6 also sets out the broad requirements for local planning authorities in planning for town centres, including assessing the need for new floorspace for retail, leisure and other main town centre uses, identifying deficiencies in provision, and assessing the capacity of existing centres to accommodate new development, including, where appropriate, the scope for extending the primary shopping area and/or town centre. Paragraph 2.6 notes that in such cases, local planning authorities should seek to identify, designate and assemble larger sites adjoining the primary shopping area (ie. in edge-of-centre locations). Further work will therefore be required to support the Allocations DPD on the need for and capacity of Rotherham Town Centre to accommodate further development of main town centre uses, including the appropriateness of the existing town centre boundary.
**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
The Submission Core Strategy should highlight Rotherham Renaissance and how it will be supported through Core Strategy policies.

Detailed consideration of Rotherham Town Centre will be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 650
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5254
Name: Mr Richard Frudd
Organisation: Indigo Planning Ltd (for National Grid Property Holdings)

Representation Number: 650
Policy: PD1 \ Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: Settlement hierarchy
Summary of Representation:
Welcome the recognition of Wath as a settlement with high potential for change

Councils Response:
Support for the identification of Wath as a settlement with high potential for change is noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for the identification of Wath as a settlement with high potential for change will be taken into account in preparing Sustainable Communities policies and finalising the settlement hierarchy in the Core Strategy Submission Document.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 652
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5254
Name: Mr Richard Frudd
Organisation: Indigo Planning Ltd (for National Grid Property Holdings)

Representation Number: 652
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Developer contributions

Summary of Representation:
Recommend that further clarification be provided to confirm that developers will only be required to make contributions where these are in line with the advice and tests set out in Circular 05/05

Councils Response:
Section 4 of Policy Direction 1 has been drawn up in line with the advice in Circular 05/05 (Planning Obligations). Paragraph 2.12 of Planning Policy Statement 12 (local Development Frameworks) indicates that the core strategy should contain clear and concise policies for delivering the strategy. PPS12 also makes clear that LDF policies should not repeat national or regional guidance.

The Core Strategy Preferred Options document identifies that Supplementary Planning Documents yet to be programmed include guidance on planning obligations. Circular 05/05 will remain a material consideration in determining planning applications. In light of the guidance available in Circular 05/05, advice in PPS12 and the intention to provide future SPD on planning obligations it is not considered appropriate to repeat the detailed requirements of Circular 05/05 in the Core Strategy Submission Document.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 671
PD1 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 5256
Name: Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation: JVH Town Planning (for Ivanhoe Properties and Mr David James)

Representation Number: 671
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: Settlement hierarchy

Summary of Representation:
Mixed character areas around Rotherham centre have an opportunity to be redeveloped for homes, retail, community and leisure uses and these types of sites should be allowed to come forward to progress urban enhancement.

Councils Response:
Further work will be undertaken including a consideration of the types of development which will be acceptable and/or promoted in differing locations. Detailed consideration of the Rotherham Urban Area including Rotherham Town Centre and its periphery will be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work. Work will also be required on the supporting Development Control Policies DPD in relation to acceptable uses within allocations.

In line with PPS6 further work will also be required to assess the need for new floorspace for retail, leisure and other main town centre uses.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The comments will be taken into account in taking forward the Site Allocations DPD and supporting Policies DPD.

Further work will be required to assess the need for new floorspace for retail, leisure and other main town centre uses across the borough.

..........................................................................................................................
Respondent I.D.  5256
Name:  Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation:  JVH Town Planning (for Ivanhoe Properties and Mr David James)
Representation Number:  670
Policy:  PD1 Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Settlement hierarchy
Summary of Representation:
Supports inclusion of Masbrough as a key focus for change, and identifies opportunities for redevelopment to provide residential, retail and leisure development.

Councils Response:
Support for the Masbrough’s role within the settlement hierarchy is noted. Work on the Site Allocations DPD will consider the potential for sites within Masbrough to accommodate a range of types of development.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for the spatial direction will be taken into account in finalising the settlement hierarchy in the Core Strategy Submission Document.

Further consideration of individual sites will be undertaken in developing the Site Allocations DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 675
PD1 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 5257

Name: Mr Ken Burley

Organisation: Acting as Agent for Redirack

Representation Number: 675

Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: 8.7, maps 7 & 10

Summary of Representation:
Strongly support spatial direction referring to the Dearne and Kilnhurst in particular, and that Swinton/Kilnhurst has high change potential. Note that recent masterplanning work has recognised the Wharf Road sites regeneration potential.

Councils Response:
Note the support for the spatial direction for the Dearne, Kilnhurst and Swinton/Kilnhurst. Sites at Wharf Road have been considered as part of the Employment Land Review.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for the spatial direction will be taken into account in finalising the settlement hierarchy in the Core Strategy Submission Document.

Further consideration of individual sites will be undertaken in developing the Site Allocations DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

**Assessment of Representations**

**Rep No: 372**

**PD1 \ Support**

---

**Respondent I.D.** 5264

**Name:** Mr Graham Sinclair

**Organisation:** Head of Resources and Access. RMBC

**Representation Number:** 372

**Policy:** PD1 **Object/Support:** Support

**Section / Paragraph:** Developer contributions

**Summary of Representation:**
Support safeguarding and providing a range of quality services such as health, childcare, education and leisure. Support Negotiation of S106 Agreements

**Councils Response:**
The Council’s Core Strategy will support provision of a range of quality services. Detailed development control policies will set out criteria to achieve this strategic aim in any new development opportunities. Clarification of the likely content of S106 Agreements will be undertaken at the detailed policies stage and through the preparation of further guidance in a Supplementary Planning Document.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Provide support for the provision of a range of quality services in the Core Strategy and Detailed Policies Document to create and maintain sustainable communities. Ensure that S106 planning agreements and obligations fully reflect all requirements and are included within the detailed policies document.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5266
Name:  Mr D.W. Short
Organisation:  The Emerson Group

Representation Number:  558
Policy:  PD1  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  General

Summary of Representation:
The points set out in PD1 are a logical outcome of the need to cater for adequate
development in sustainable locations. Concern regarding degree to which reliance is
placed on Section 106 agreements and how this accords with Govt. advice and the
impending Planning Gain Supplement.

Councils Response:
The Core Strategy Preferred Options document identifies that Supplementary Planning
Documents yet to be programmed include guidance on planning obligations. Circular
05/05 will remain a material consideration in determining planning applications. In light of
the guidance available in Circular 05/05, advice in PPS12 and the intention to provide
future SPD on planning obligations it is not considered appropriate to repeat the detailed
requirements of Circular 05/05 in the Core Strategy Submission Document.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure submission policy complies with the requirements of Circular 05/05 and is
compatible with planning gain supplement (if introduced).
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 559  
PD1 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 5266  
Name: Mr D.W. Short  
Organisation: The Emerson Group  

Representation Number: 559  
Policy: PD1  
Object/Support: Other  
Section / Paragraph: General

Summary of Representation:  
Site allocation representation (SAS 118) received plus supplementary material for the Land off Rother Crescent and South of Bradshaw Avenue, Treeton. Proposed use is residential development site - allocated for residential development (H45) in the adopted UDP.

Councils Response:  
Sites to be considered as part of Allocations DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD next year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the Submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 562
PD1 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5267
Name: Barbara Turner
Organisation:

Representation Number: 562
Policy: PD1 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Settlement Hierarchy

Summary of Representation:
Dinnington as a 'Key focus for change' is very close to Laughton Common which itself is an area with 'high potential for change'. This is potentially dangerous in such a small area in that it may create overdevelopment with a negative effect on local services. It would be better to spread the development to Maltby and Aston as for instance new swimming pools are planned for these areas.

Councils Response:
The submission Core Strategy will have a clear settlement hierarchy. PD1 used the Babtie Sustainable Settlement Study as the basis for creating a settlement hierarchy. However the Core Strategy will develop the Council's thinking further. The Babtie settlement study was undertaken at a point in time and the methodology behind the study is robust. However the policy directions will be developed into Core Strategy policies and will have a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development within the Borough.

The scope of any future development will be determined by its potential to provide a positive contribution towards improving existing sustainability or to be planned in a way which may give rise to sustainable patterns of development. The general extent and location of this growth will be assessed as part of the Allocations DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Over the next few months, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation later in the year.

This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 571  
PD1 \ Other  

Respondent I.D. 5272  

Name: Margaret Maher  

Organisation:  

Representation Number: 571  

Policy: PD1  
Object/Support: Other  

Section / Paragraph: Local distinctive design  

Summary of Representation:  
The Imperial Buildings are to be demolished - concern that buildings worth keeping are being lost and replaced by expensive trivia such as the Big Screen in All Saints Square.  

Councils Response:  
Whilst it is intended to demolish All Saints Building on Corporation Street, there are no intentions to demolish Imperial Buildings. Imperial Buildings are currently being refurbished to create 19 apartments and retail space on the ground floor. The aspirations of the locally distinctive design subsection of Policy Direction 1 and the historic built environment element of PD7 have been prepared to retain, protect and enhance high quality existing buildings and their surrounding environment. New developments will be expected to enhance and harmonise with their surroundings. High quality design will be sought in negotiations with developers. Any specific proposals that come forward via submission of planning applications will offer opportunity for further comment by the public.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
No amendments necessary.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  958

Name:  Mrs Alice Rodgers

Organisation:  Maltby Environmental Group

Representation Number:  487

Policy:  PD2

Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Urban extensions

Summary of Representation:
Concern at the suggestion that Maltby may be required to see an amendment to its green belt to ensure long term housing supply and continuing sustainability of the settlement. Maltby Colliery site post its closure may be an option in the longer term for locating development.

Councils Response:
The extent and location of greenbelt amendments (please note that Maltby Colliery is also located within the greenbelt) will be assessed as part of the Allocations DPD. This will take full account of the need to ensure the long term continuity of housing and employment land supply and the sustainability of the settlement in question. Additionally it will be explored as to where amendments may be justified as exceptional circumstances or a need to reconcile minor technical mapping inconsistencies has been identified.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes. Note concern for Green Belt amendments in Maltby. Consider possible opportunities for the Maltby Colliery site post its closure.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 512
PD2 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  1018
Name:  Cllr T. G. Bell
Organisation:  Laughton Common Residents

Representation Number:  512
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Location of housing development

Summary of Representation:
A positive for Laughton Common would be to see homes developed on the left hand side going towards Dinnington on Outgang Lane.

Councils Response:
Comments relating to specific sites are not applicable to the Core Strategy as it is intended to be a more strategic document. The extent and direction of growth will be established as part of the Allocations DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Important to consider potential for residential development within suggested area as part of Allocations DPD site survey assessments.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 510
PD2 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 1018
Name: Cllr T. G. Bell
Organisation: Laughton Common Residents

Representation Number: 510
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: Housing choice

Summary of Representation:
Disabled one bed homes would be more desirable than too many apartments particularly around Station Way.

Councils Response:
The Strategic Housing Market Assessment will identify the type of housing required to create mixed, balanced communities. Provision will be made for special needs housing to meet any identified requirements along with other factors including the availability and viability of suitable sites established through the Allocations DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Identified provision for special needs housing in the Allocations DPD will be guided by the Housing Market Assessment findings.
Summary of Representation:
PD2 states that housing sites will be provided to meet the RSS requirements of 15,000 new dwellings (although this figure may change when the final RSS is issued) to 2021 (with 65% brownfield). It is understood that the Site Allocations DPD will identify more specifically the housing sites for the area.
The concerns of the HA within the housing direction is based on the location of future sites. While specific developments are not in discussion at the moment, it is anticipated that some sites will be targeted for high levels of growth in housing and this could cause potential problems with regards to peak hour traffic flows on and off the SHN.
The Agency is concerned with greater development at Rotherham City Centre as this may increase the level of commuting via the key transport corridors. These cross the SHN at crucial junctions on the M1 and M18 which include:
- J35 on the M1
- J34 on the M1 (NORTH AND SOUTH)
- J33 on the M1, and
- J1 on the M18.
A new mixed use development at Waverley would also have an impact on the current SHN, which would require further study and assessment as and when more detail can be provided. The transport corridor between this new settlement and Rotherham would use Junction 33 on the M1.
Each of these junctions currently suffers from congestion (especially during the peak hours) so any further development that would cause increased flows on these junctions should be referred to the Agency at as early stage as possible. The Agency would also be concerned with the greater level of air emissions that could occur at these junctions, especially with regards to the recent Air Quality Directive (96/62).
Dinnington, South East of Rotherham is identified as a key focus for change. The key transport corridor for this settlement has been identified between J1 or the M18 and J32 of the M1.
Councils Response: The concerns of the Highways Agency regarding potential adverse impact on the strategic road network caused by new housing development are noted. In keeping with Circular 02/07 and the Air Quality Directive, the Council has already
undertaken to fully involve the Agency in its preliminary settlement and sites appraisal work which will be undertaken to inform the submission Core Strategy and the initial options stage of the supporting Allocations DPD. This will provide sufficient opportunity to assess potential traffic and air quality impacts and to inform preferred site allocations in due course.

Councills Response:
The concerns of the Highways Agency regarding potential adverse impact on the strategic road network caused by new housing development are noted. In keeping with Circular 02/07 and the Air Quality Directive, the Council has already undertaken to fully involve the Agency in its preliminary settlement and sites appraisal work which will be undertaken to inform the submission Core Strategy and the initial options stage of the supporting Allocations DPD. This will provide sufficient opportunity to assess potential traffic and air quality impacts and to inform preferred site allocations in due course.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Continue to closely involve the Highways Agency in preliminary settlement and site appraisal work and the eventual selection of preferred site allocations.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 104
PD2 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  1561
Name:  Mr Peter White
Organisation:  Derbyshire County Council

Representation Number:  104
Policy:  PD2 Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  PD2.5

Summary of Representation:
Derbyshire CC support PD2 in general as it seeks to satisfy RSS requirements. The proposal to develop Waverley for housing is supported and is preferred to any alternative greenfield or Green Belt development. The proposed overall distribution of housing is unlikely to have any adverse effect upon housing distribution in Derbyshire.

Councils Response:
Derbyshire CC preference for development of Waverley, as a brownfield site, is noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 627
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1565

Name: Mr Brian Davies

Organisation: Natural England

Representation Number: 627

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
In line with the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal, the Policy Direction should identify the importance and need for giving residential developments access to gardens etc., as part of an overall requirement for high quality sustainable design.

Councils Response:
The principle of securing residential developments with access to gardens, greenspaces, allotments and good quality public realm as part of an overall requirement for high quality sustainable design is accepted. However, it is felt more appropriate this be included in the successor to the overarching Policy Direction 1 alternatively consideration will be given as to whether a new stand alone policy is required. It is not likely that this issue will be considered in the successor to Policy Direction 2.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include reference to the importance and need for giving residential developments access to gardens, allotments, greenspace and good quality public realm as part of an overall requirement for high quality sustainable design within a new policy or within an amended Policy Direction.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 81  PD2 \ Comment  

Respondent I.D.  1682  
Name: Mr Anthony Barber-Lomax FRICS  
Organisation: Fitzwilliam (Wentworth) Estates  

Representation Number: 81  
Policy: PD2  Object/Support: Comment  
Section / Paragraph: Para's. 1/2/5  

Summary of Representation:  
Para.1: A high brownfield target may result in development of otherwise undesirable sites, some of which might be better left to green space or future industrial use.  
Para.2: Housing design must be attractive now and into the future. Traditional style has longevity whilst modern compact and cheap alternatives can become tomorrow's ghettos. High density is not desirable from an occupier's perspective.  
Para.5: Developing Waverley for housing will not create a sustainable community nor help Rotherham Town Centre. Industrial use would be more appropriate.  

Councils Response:  
Comments noted. It is acknowledged that not all brownfield sites will be suitable or viable for housing and that brownfield targets need to be related to local circumstances and periodically reviewed in the light of monitoring.  
It is agreed that housing design needs to be attractive but is not accepted that all modern design will not endure and that it should be rejected in favour of nostalgic pastiche. Design, like density, needs to stem from and be sympathetic to its local context. Potential development of the large scale site at Waverley presents a possible opportunity for mixed use development, supporting community infrastructure and enhanced public transport systems. This, rather than allocating the entire site for industrial use would provide a higher degree of self containment helping to reduce commuting and further congestion in the Parkway/M1 corridors. Any housing development at Waverley would need to be of an appropriate scale and type and phased over the longer term in order not to prejudice other regeneration initiatives. The Council will be considering the need for urban extensions, like Waverley, with sustainable development and housing delivery requirements in mind when finalising the submission core strategy.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
Comments be noted.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 381
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  1702
Name:  Ms Georgina Bourne
Organisation:  The Home Builders Federation

Representation Number:  381
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Section 2

Summary of Representation:
While it is supported that housing choice should be informed by an up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment, HBF would object to a policy that would dictate the provision of a mix of dwelling types in new developments in all cases. It will not be appropriate for the Council to dictate this in all circumstances. This matter must be approached sensibly. Achieving mixed communities does not mean that all areas have to have the same mix of dwelling types. All areas are different, all housing markets are different and this needs to be considered on a sub-regional scale. Different areas perform different functions and this is often largely as a result of the housing mix in the area. The SHMA needs to consider the issue of complementarity between areas.

Councils Response:
PPS3 promotes sustainability through the creation of mixed communities and paragraph 24 states:

In planning at site level, Local Planning Authorities should ensure that the proposed mix of housing on large strategic sites reflects the proportions of households that require market or affordable housing and achieves a mix of households as well as a mix of tenure and price. For smaller sites, the mix of housing should contribute to the creation of mixed communities having regard to the proportions of households that require market or affordable housing and the existing mix of housing in the locality.

PPS3 states, therefore, that all developments should contribute to creating the right mix of housing. This does not mean that all areas will be the same, but differences between the mix of houses in an area and what is needed will be identified in the Strategic housing Market Assessment and it is this difference that will need to be addressed.

It is acknowledged that different areas have different functions, but an area having a particular function can create problems. For example large areas of similar house types,
catering for particular socio – economic groups has, in some cases, created a concentration of problems.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Consider comments as part of Policies DPD and supporting evidence.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  1702
Name:  Ms Georgina Bourne
Organisation:  The Home Builders Federation

Representation Number:  379
Policy:  PD2  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Section 1

Summary of Representation:
It should be accepted that the precise housing requirement is not yet known as the final version of the RSS has not been published. There should be some flexibility in assumptions now about future housing requirements for the long term, in order to allow the strategy to deal with changing circumstances (PPS12 test of soundness ix at paragraph 4.24)

Councils Response:
The document attempted to cover the most likely scenarios in this respect, and the submission Core Strategy will of course be based on the most up to date RSS requirement. Since the document was produced the RSS Examination in Public Panel Report has been published, providing more certainty as to the likely future requirement. However, the level of requirement stated in the Panel Report may still be subject to change and flexibility will have to be built in to deal with any possible changing circumstances.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
If RSS requirement is not finalised, allow for flexibility in the RSS requirement assumptions within submission draft Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 380
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1702

Name: Ms Georgina Bourne

Organisation: The Home Builders Federation

Representation Number: 380

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Section 1

Summary of Representation:
Section 1 includes reference to the re-invigoration of housing within HMR pathfinder areas. The approach to housing growth, with development focusing on regeneration areas is a high risk approach, and it may not be possible to deliver should a downturn in the flat market occur. We consider that a more sophisticated housing strategy is required based on evidence of what and where the housing markets are within Rotherham, and the type of housing required.

Councils Response:
The support of the HMR pathfinder programme through the LDF is considered to be an essential element of the housing strategy for Rotherham, and is a requirement in the emerging RSS. HMR pathfinder is not reliant on the flat market. A more sophisticated approach to the housing market is required by PPS3 and the production of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, currently being produced, is key to this. However, any more sophisticated approach will still need to inform and support the HMR pathfinder programme.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Review the feasibility of the PD2 (Babtie) settlement hierarchy to deliver HMR and RSS requirements from the current settlement appraisal/site options work. Establish the broad housing distribution strategy. Ensure the role of settlements and the related broad distribution of the housing supply in the Core Strategy aligns with final RSS requirements before submission.
Summary of Representation:
The Council should ensure that a proper HMA is undertaken with the full involvement of the property industry in order to help underpin the evidence base for any policies and requirements. PPS3 (Annex C) gives the requirements of the outputs from HMA and states assessments should be prepared collaboratively with stakeholders, suggesting that the involvement of the industry is a key part of the methodology.

Councils Response:
The involvement of the house building industry is essential in the production of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, PPS3 outlines the outputs required and this has been further developed by DCLG’s “Strategic Housing Market Assessment – Practice Guidance” published in April. This guidance details what is required for the SHMA to be considered "robust and credible".

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the SHMA is “robust and credible” and capable of supporting the policy requirements for the LDF.
Summary of Representation:
There will be a need for both greenfield and brownfield development. It’s likely that the RSS requirement will increase compared to the past. The focus must be on meeting housing requirements, rather than arbitrarily prioritising brownfield land at the expense of greenfield. The public at large is concerned at the erosion in quality of life caused by focusing of development in town centres. It is becoming, politically, more difficult to deliver and demand for has now tailed off. The Council should identify the nature of the market that exists in the local authority area through the preparation of comprehensive SHMAs, carried out in accordance with Government Guidance and with full consultation with stakeholder, particularly local house builders, landowners and their agents.

Councils Response:
PPS3 does emphasise the need to meet housing requirements but it also requires that in meeting the requirement, that previously developed land (PDL) is prioritised. Paragraph 36 of PPS3 states:
“The priority for development should be previously developed land, in particular vacant and derelict sites and buildings.”
PPS3 also requires that Local Planning Authorities produce PDL trajectories to monitor progress in this respect. However, PPS3 requires that all sites in the rolling five year supply of housing land are “deliverable”, as defined by PPS3, and that the sites for the later periods of the plan are “developable”. Therefore in prioritising PDL these requirements must be met, this would mean that greenfield sites would have to be released if there were not enough PDL sites available to meet the rolling five year supply. The prioritisation of PDL would not, therefore, be “arbitrary”. Focusing on PDL sites is not the same as focusing of development in town centres and, in any event, it is not accepted that development in town centres means erosion in quality of life. Meeting needs identified in the SHMA is not dependent on whether the sites involved are PDL or not, as this issue does not determine the type or mix of dwellings on the site.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Retain the need to prioritise previously developed land, having regard to the other requirements of PPS3.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 384
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  1702
Name: Ms Georgina Bourne
Organisation: The Home Builders Federation

Representation Number: 384
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Section 4

Summary of Representation:
PPS 3 states “allowance for windfalls should not be included in the first ten years of land supply unless LPA’s can provide sufficient evidence of genuine local circumstances that prevent specific site being identified”. The core strategy needs to be in accordance with the PPS3 in this respect.

Councils Response:
This point is accepted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Take into account paragraph 59 of PPS3 when determining if a windfall allowance should be included in the land supply and review action required under SHLAA when available.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  1702
Name:  Ms Georgina Bourne
Organisation:  The Home Builders Federation

Representation Number:  385
Policy:  PD2 Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Section 5

Summary of Representation:
With reference to Waverley as a new mixed use settlement. It is important to ensure that, in accordance with PPS3, LPA’s only identify sites to deliver housing in the first five years that are deliverable. To be considered deliverable, sites should be available, suitable and achievable. It is noted at paragraph 7.49 that reference is made to acknowledge that there is a possibility not all land will prove to be available in the plan period, it is important to ensure that such strategic sites should not be included in the submission draft Core Strategy if decisions have not been made about its ‘deliverability’

Councils Response:
Sites that have been shown to be deliverable, as defined by paragraph 54 of PPS3, will be included in the first five years supply and the subsequent rolling five year supply as indicated in paragraph 55 of PPS3.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that sites in the first five years supply (and the subsequent rolling five year supply) are deliverable, as defined by paragraph 54 of PPS3.

****************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 576
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  1800
Name:  Mr Paul Bedwell
Organisation:  Spawforths (for Woodford Group)

Representation Number:  576
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The policy is too long and unclear and should be more concise. Objection is made to the inclusion of windfall allowance in future supply calculations, and that no definition is provided of “other sources” of land supply, both contrary to advice in PPS3.

The core strategy should only look at strategic locations for development and not identify specific sites. The policy should be redrafted to identify a 15 year supply of housing in line with PPS3.

Councils Response:
The Core Strategy Preferred Options document puts forward nine ‘policy directions’ which will be developed into final policies in the Submission Document. In line with the advice in PPS12 clear and concise policies will be prepared for the Core Strategy Submission Document. These policies will avoid repetition of regional and national guidance.

In preparing the Submission Core Strategy regard will be had to the requirements of PPS3, including advice regarding the components of future housing supply. As with the Preferred Options document, the Submission Core Strategy will not identify specific sites, however will set out strategic locations for new housing including the potential for urban extensions.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
In line with the advice in PPS12 clear and concise policies will be prepared for the Core Strategy Submission Document.

Further consideration of the requirements and implications of PPS3 will be required when preparing the Submission Core Strategy. The Submission Core Strategy should provide sources and/or definitions where relevant for any data provided.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 522
PD2 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  2121
Name:  Mr & Mrs Peter & Sue Hubbard
Organisation:  Ulley Parish Plan Steering Committee

Representation Number:  522
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Urban extensions

Summary of Representation:
Proposal for Waverley supported in principle but there are two major concerns (covered in this Representation and 2121/523) that the document needs to incorporate. The traffic impacts of the full Waverley proposal goes much further than the Parkway and the M1 J33 in terms of traffic impacts. Any proposals for Waverley must therefore include control over the impacts of the potential traffic increase on other road networks and the wording of PD2 should be strengthened to reflect this need.

Councils Response:
Support for Waverley is noted. However the principle of development of a new community at Waverley has yet to be justified in comparison with other potential urban extensions that may be required to achieve the Borough’s requirement for future housing and employment provision as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy.

In the light of the above the scale, mix and phasing of any major development at Waverley will be set out in the submission Core Strategy and supporting Allocations and Policies DPDs.

There is also a need to check the implications of the Regional Transport Strategy strategic transportation investment programme and to consider further the potential implications of proposals such as Waverley on the strategic road network. In keeping with Circular 02/2007, the Council is currently working with the Highways Agency concerning the assessment of the potential impact of possible site allocation options.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments noted.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 523
PD2 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 2121

Name: Mr & Mrs Peter & Sue Hubbard

Organisation: Ulley Parish Plan Steering Committee

Representation Number: 523

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Urban extensions

Summary of Representation:
Proposal for Waverley supported in principle but there are two major concerns (covered in this Representation and 2121/522) that the document needs to incorporate. The proposal is effectively for a new town and it is seen as essential that the necessary support infrastructure (e.g. sewage disposal, road and public transport networks) needs to be designed on this basis. To allow the development to be piecemeal and incremental is seen as unsustainable and the wording in PD2 should be strengthened to reflect this need.

Councils Response:
Support for Waverley is noted and it is agreed that piecemeal development would be undesirable. However the principle of development of a new community at Waverley has yet to be justified in comparison with other potential urban extensions that may be required to achieve the Borough’s requirement for future housing and employment provision as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy.

In the light of the above the scale, mix and phasing of any major development at Waverley will be set out in the submission Core Strategy and supporting Allocations and Policies DPDs.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments noted.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 204
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 2203

Name: Mr Robert Fletcher

Organisation: Ian Baseley Associates

Representation Number: 204

Policy: PD2  Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: 7.54 and table 6

Summary of Representation:
It is considered that the policy criteria need to be amended in order to recognise that the extension of smaller urban areas in sustainable locations would also be appropriate, particularly where they occur within principle transport corridors. This suggestion is reinforced by the Arup sustainability appraisal which points out inherent weaknesses by;
A) not recognising the importance of sustainable design to deliver good quality residential developments;
B) not reflecting the importance of giving residential development access to gardens, green spaces, allotments and good quality public roads to create desirable and useable housing; and
C) not highlighting the importance of ensuring there is a mix of housing type to meet lifelong housing needs in the Borough.

Councils Response:
The above are only part of the sustainability equation, accessibility to shops, services, health provision, schools etc are also important factors that have contributed to the sustainable settlements hierarchy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to the to the policy criteria with regards to the sustainable settlements hierarchy. Arup's comments will be given due consideration in the drafting of the plan for submission to the Secretary of State.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 272
PD2 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 2243
Name: Mr Michael Long
Organisation: South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTA)

Representation Number: 272
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: 2.3/4

Summary of Representation:
General support for approach of housing locations concentrated within main centres and
core public transport networks in line with the settlement hierarchy.

Windfalls should be prioritised to reflect the accessibility considerations supporting the
sustainable communities policy.

Housing numbers are not particularly a public transport issue and will be addressed in the
Site Allocations DPD.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed and comments noted. The housing strategy will be developed further in
the submission Core Strategy with broad housing apportionments distributed in line with
RSS primary centres and the Borough's sustainable settlements hierarchy. This will be
underpinned by detailed settlement capacity and site assessments being prepared for the
Regulation 25 stage of the Allocations DPD. Windfall capacity will be determined by the
requirements of PPS3.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Take account of the above in developing the housing strategy in the submission Core
Strategy.
Summary of Representation:
The detailed housing land and market assessment has not been completed yet for Rotherham so the figures provided should be treated with caution.

Councils Response:
Paragraph 7.43 states existing commitments are from planning permissions not yet completed and the remaining residential allocations in the existing Unitary Development Plan (June 1999). Other sources (para 7.44) come from the Urban Potential Study that provided an estimate of land potentially available for residential development in urban areas up to 2016. This document is publicly available. Table 6 makes clear that the figures for individual settlements includes dwellings that have already got planning permission (at June 2006) the remainder includes some large sites allocated in the Unitary Development Plan but not yet developed. There will also be an element (of the housing numbers) that was included as part of the Urban Potential Study but these may be small windfall sites or sites that could potentially be identified in a future Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD). The explanatory text (para.7.50) makes clear that some brownfield sites assumed to come forward (identified in the UPS and / or already granted planning permission) may not become available.

It is important to recognise that at this stage the figures provided in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document, are indicative only. During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation later in the year.

It only after consideration of all potential development sites that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken. Table 6 and Map 7 of the draft Core Strategy sought to provide an indication of the current position using information from the existing UDP and the Urban Potential Study.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved. Supporting evidence justifying the release of Waverley will need to be provided.
(See also response to HLS_2413_PD1_a).(Representation no.316)
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 2413

Name: Mr John Dunshea

Organisation: Atisreal UK

Representation Number: 321

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
PD2 does not highlight the importance of ensuring there is a mix of housing type to meet lifelong needs in the Borough.

Councils Response:
Agree. The sustainability appraisal by Arup’s also highlighted this point. Support for the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken by independent consultants - Arup, into the Core Strategy Preferred Options is welcomed. The Core Strategy considers a number of housing related issues and whilst this is a principle that could be developed as a detailed development control policy it is appropriate that the principle is included at this stage of the Core Strategy.

The principles for creating a sustainable settlement including ensuring there is a mix of homes to meet lifelong needs will be an essential principle when considering and taking forward all future development opportunities in Rotherham.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for the CSPO Sustainability Appraisal is welcome.

Ensure that the Core Strategy and any subsequent detailed policy DPD’s include sufficient and appropriate references to the inclusion of lifetime homes. Consideration will need to be given to preparing an evidence base from which to negotiate a percentage of homes to be built to lifetime homes standards.

Consideration may need to be given to preparing supplementary planning guidance in the future to ensure that this issue is appropriately dealt with.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 320
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 2413
Name: Mr John Dunshea
Organisation: Atisreal UK

Representation Number: 320
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The policy direction PD2 does not reflect the importance of giving residential development access to gardens, green spaces, allotments and good quality public realm.

Councils Response:
Agree. The sustainability appraisal by Arup’s also highlighted this point. Support for the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken by independent consultants - Arup, into the Core Strategy Preferred Options is welcomed.

The principles for creating a sustainable settlement using sustainable design principles and good design practice including provision of and access to gardens, green spaces, allotments and good quality public realm will be an essential principle when considering and taking forward all future development opportunities in Rotherham.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Agree. The sustainability appraisal by Arup’s also highlighted this point. Support for the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken by independent consultants - Arup, into the Core Strategy Preferred Options is welcomed.

The principles for creating a sustainable settlement using sustainable design principles and good design practice including provision of and access to gardens, green spaces, allotments and good quality public realm will be essential principles when considering and taking forward all future development opportunities in Rotherham. Future LDF Local Development Documents including Area Action Plans and Supplementary Planning Documents will develop these principles further.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 2413

Name: Mr John Dunshea

Organisation: Atisreal UK

Representation Number: 319

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Agree with the Sustainability Appraisal that identifies that PD2 does not recognise the importance of sustainable design in the creation of sustainable communities.

Councils Response:
Agree. The sustainability appraisal by Arup’s also highlighted this point. Support for the Sustainability Appraisal undertaken by independent consultants – Arup, into the Core Strategy Preferred Options is welcomed.

The principles for creating a sustainable settlement using sustainable design principles should be an essential part in appraising and taking forward all future development opportunities in Rotherham particularly urban extensions and other major development opportunities that may be required to achieve the Borough’s requirement for future housing and employment provision as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. The principle of Waverley has not yet been accepted and further work needs to be done to justify the release of Waverley to meet Rotherham’s future housing need.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for the CSPO Sustainability Appraisal is welcome. Further work needs to be undertaken to support the release of Waverley as a sustainable new settlement.

Ensure that the Core Strategy and any subsequent detailed policy DPD’s include sufficient and appropriate references to the inclusion of sustainable design in new development schemes. Consideration may need to be given to preparing supplementary planning guidance in the future to ensure that this issue is appropriately dealt with.

.................................................................
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations  
Rep No:  318

Respondent I.D.  2413  
Name:  Mr John Dunshea  
Organisation:  Atisreal UK  

Representation Number:  318

Policy:  PD2  
Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Brownfield land at Waverley is considered more appropriate for development than greenfield sites elsewhere in Rotherham.

Councils Response:
At this stage Waverley’s brownfield position needs to be confirmed with DCLG due to the omission of green/ brownfield definitions in PPS3. The principle of Waverley has not yet been accepted and further work needs to be done to justify the release of Waverley to meet Rotherham’s future housing need.

More work needs to be done on urban extensions/ new communities to justify its development in the context of national and regional policy and supported by Sustainability Appraisal. Waverley is a significant site with potential for a new sustainable mixed use community. Other urban extensions will be identified during the settlement appraisal and site options work. Justification of suitable urban extensions will be dependent on the final RSS requirements, Sustainability Appraisal and performance under other policy and spatial objectives including the housing trajectory, Housing Market Renewal objectives and sustainable transport considerations.(See also 2635/296).

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the “spatial development strategy” for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.

Further work needs to be undertaken to support the release of Waverley as a sustainable new settlement. Identify and appraise all urban extensions options including Waverley and take forward with appropriate justification into the submission document. Confirm
Waverley’s brownfield position with DCLG due to the omission of green/ brownfield definitions in PPS3.

Discuss with Highways Agency/RMBC Transportation Unit the need for evidence, regarding mitigation of potential impacts on the strategic road network and Air Quality Management Areas, in support of further development in the Lower Don Valley - to include Waverley and other possibilities that might be identified in the current settlement appraisal/site options work.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  2413
Name:  Mr John Dunshea
Organisation:  Atisreal UK

Representation Number:  324
Policy:  PD2 Object

Summary of Representation:
Concern at the phasing of residential development on Waverley. Timing of new residential to tie in with industrial and commercial.

Councils Response:
It is important to recognise that at this stage the figures provided in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document, are indicative only. During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation later in the year.

It only after consideration of all potential development sites that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken and the phasing of all potential future development thoroughly considered.

It is accepted that more work needs to be done on urban extensions/ new communities that will need to be justified in the context of national and regional policy and supported by Sustainability Appraisal. Waverley is a significant site with potential for a new sustainable mixed use community. Other urban extensions will be identified during the settlement appraisal and site options work. Justification of suitable urban extensions will be dependent on the final RSS requirements, Sustainability Appraisal and performance under other policy and spatial objectives including the housing trajectory, Housing Market Renewal objectives and sustainable transport considerations.

The recent planning permission granted for Highfield Commercial raised serious concerns with the Forward Planning team about timing of potential mixed use development in this locality. However the landowners were anxious to pursue the planning application out of synch with any potential future residential development of the new Waverley community. Concern has also been raised about timing of the future Waverley mixed use community by Sheffield City Council and Transform South Yorkshire as immediate short term
development at Waverley could jeopardise development in the Lower Don Valley and within the Rotherham West Pathfinder area.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved. Supporting evidence justifying the release of Waverley will need to be provided and consideration will be given to phasing of future development on this site.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  322  
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  2413
Name:  Mr John Dunshea
Organisation:  Atisreal UK

Representation Number:  322
Policy:  PD2 Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Support the distribution of housing in accord with the settlement hierarchy in PD1. The estimate of housing land in PD2 may not all come forward for development in the plan period. Considered that housing land at Waverley could be required in the medium term and be preferable to the release of greenfield sites. Waverley should be allocated above G/F land (even within sustainable communities).

Councils Response:
Paragraph 7.43 states existing commitments are from planning permissions not yet completed and the remaining residential allocations in the existing Unitary Development Plan (June 1999). Other sources (para 7.44) come from the Urban Potential Study that provided an estimate of land potentially available for residential development in urban areas up to 2016. This document is publicly available. Table 6 makes clear that the figures for individual settlements includes dwellings that have already got planning permission (at June 2006) the remainder includes some large sites allocated in the Unitary Development Plan but not yet developed. There will also be an element (of the housing numbers) that was included as part of the Urban Potential Study but these may be small windfall sites or sites that could potentially be identified in a future Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).

The explanatory text supporting policy direction 2, also considers the brownfield / Greenfield status of potential sites. It is clear that some of the sites being considered for future development will be greenfield. Even without the development of Waverley up to 2021 this authority could still meet its brownfield target but only if all known brownfield sites identified in the UPS and / or already granted planning permission do come forward.

It is important to recognise that at this stage the figures provided in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document, are indicative only. Over the next few months, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be
undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation next year.

It only after consideration of all potential development sites that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken. Table 6 and Map 7 of the draft Core Strategy sought to provide an indication of the current position using information from the existing UDP and the Urban Potential Study. It is at this stage that the issue of the brownfield / Greenfield status of the sites surveyed will also be considered.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved. Supporting evidence justifying the release of Waverley will need to be provided.
(See also response to HLS_2413_PD1_a).(Representation no.316)
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 284
PD2 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 284

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: 2.1 - Para 7.60

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)

The Core Strategy should detail mechanisms for how land supply should be managed (PPG3, paras 52 to 57) to guide the phasing of sites in the Site Allocations DPD.

This is a strategic matter and should not be fully delegated to the Policies DPD.

Councils Response:
The comments are accepted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include a strategic policy in the submission document covering the broad management of housing land supply linked to the housing trajectory. (see how this issue was handled in the Ryedale Core Strategy)
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  2635
Name:  Ms Rachel Wigginton
Organisation:  Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number:  283
Policy:  PD2 Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  2.1

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)
There should be sufficient locational detail in the submission document to guide the allocation of sites for at least 10 years and broad locations identified on the key diagram for years 11 to 15 where it will not be possible to allocate sites.

Councils Response:
The need for sufficient locational detail in the Core Strategy to guide the allocation of sites to provide for at least 10 years housing supply together with identifying broad locations for a further 5 years supply is acknowledged. Preliminary housing allocation are being considered for the options stage of the supporting Allocations DPD. This work will inform the appropriate approach to broad housing distribution in the submission Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider a suitable approach for the submission Core Strategy to guide housing supply - either broad percentages of the total RSS quantum by SPZ or the distribution of specific number housing by settlement. Look at an appropriate end date (2024/26) and the implications of Sheffield’s requirement not being achieved. Consider the implications of the South Shields Core Strategy Inspector's Report concerning these matters.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 287
PD2 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635
Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton
Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 287
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: 2.2

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)

Circular 01/2006, para 31 requires core strategies to set out criteria for the location of
gypsy and traveller sites to guide the allocation of sites in the Site Allocations DPD.

The supporting text should refer to Council participation and timescale of the South
Yorkshire Needs Assessment. Policy wording should indicate how any additional sites are
to be incorporated into the Site Allocations DPD with timescales.

Councils Response:
Comments noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include locational criteria in core strategy policy and search for sites in preliminary work on
Allocations DPD options. Need also to cater for requirements of travelling showmen.
Check availability of new guidance on locational criteria with GOYH. (Look at how the
issue has be dealt with by Wakefield, Sheffield, Kirklees and Hambleton (Policies DPD) -
also discuss with Rob Murfin at YHA).
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations  
Rep No:  303
PD2 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  2635
Name:  Ms Rachel Wigginton
Organisation:  Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number:  303
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  PD2&3

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 7 (Justification of Alternative Options)

Housing distribution in the sub areas should be balanced with employment development and take account of infrastructure capacity and other constraints.

SA needs to have assessed the environmental and sustainability implications of the proposed distribution of land and apportionment will need to be supported by the evidence base.

Councils Response:
Comments accepted. The balance of housing and employment within sub areas will be addressed before submission taking into account constraints.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
See also 2635/280,282,293,297,300, 302 and 305 in addressing this matter. Decide the basis for sub areas - individual settlements or spatial planning zones?
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  
Rep No:  301  
PD2 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  2635

Name:  Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation:  Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number:  301

Policy:  PD2  
Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:  Paras 7.49 to 7.53 (including Waverley)

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 7 (Justification of Alternative Options)

The strategy for housing needs further development.

There is uncertainty over the preferred option and it is essential that strategic decisions are not devolved to lower level DPDs.

Paras 7.49 - 7.53 discusses the implications of including/not including Waverley but fails to conclude.

Waverley should only be taken forward after all viable alternatives have been thoroughly investigated and national and regional policy taken into account.

Paras 7.50 and 7.51 make reference to the possible need for greenfield land but fail to develop the issue in terms of where the most sustainable broad locations might be.

Councils Response:
It is accepted that the housing strategy requires further development before submission. This will include considering the future role of Waverley justified in the context of other alternatives together with national and regional policy. The future need for greenfield housing will be dependent on the extent of brownfield opportunities in sustainable locations (to be quantified in the current site options work) and the final RSS requirement.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
In developing the housing strategy for submission see also 2635/280,283,284,285,286,290,291,296,300,301,303.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 296
PD2 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 296

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: 2.5

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 7 (Justification of Alternative Options)

More clarity is needed about urban extensions.

If Waverley and other urban extensions are to be included they should be fully supported by the settlement study and fully justified in the context of national and regional guidance and in terms of sustainability, particularly accessibility.

It should also be made clear that full consideration has been given both to alternative new settlement options, such as a greenfield urban extension, and to other alternatives to Waverley.

Map 4 shows two other "new mixed use communities" - Aldwarke and Manvers- but these are not referred to in paragraph 5.11 and their potential status should be clarified.

At submission there should be a clear selection of a deliverable direction, supported by the evidence base and SA with contingencies built in if necessary.

Councils Response:
It is accepted that more work needs to be done on urban extensions/ new communities which will need to be justified in the context of national and regional policy and supported by SA. Waverley is a significant brownfield site with potential for a new sustainable mixed use community. On Map 4 the Manvers reference is the Lakeside Development with extant planning permission and Aldwarke is the only other UDP Regeneration Area with scope for further development although opportunities for housing are likely to be curtailed by the areas industrialised nature. Other urban extensions will be identified during the settlement appraisal and site options work. Justification of suitable urban extensions will be dependent on the final RSS requirements, SA and performance under other policy and
spatial objectives including the housing trajectory, HMR objectives and sustainable transport considerations.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Identify and appraise all urban extensions options including Waverley and take forward with appropriate justification into the submission document. Confirm Waverleys brownfield position with DCLG due to the omission of green/brownfield definitions in PPS3.
Representations Report.doc

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 285
PD2 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 285

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Para 7.47

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)

The windfall assumption needs to be justified in the context of PPS3, para 59 and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).

Councils Response:
The requirements of PPS3 are noted but there are concerns about the delay in publishing further guidance on SHLAA.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Take on the requirements of PPS3 regarding windfall assumptions and review action required under SHLAA when available. (Consider the approach to the issue with Sheffield in the context of a joint SHLAA).
Representations Report.doc

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 291
PD2 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  2635
Name:  Ms Rachel Wigginton
Organisation:  Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number:  291
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Table 6

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)

There should be a higher proportion of housing in Rotherham Urban Area and a resultant smaller proportion in the other settlements than is currently indicated in Table 6.

The proportions of housing in settlement hierarchy should be strategy rather than site led.

The scale and pattern of housing needs to support the HMR Pathfinder strategy as indicated in draft RSS policy.

Councils Response:
Comments noted. Table 6 was only intended to set out levels of currently know capacity (principally the Urban Potential Study and unimplemented UDP allocations) related to the status of individual settlements in the (Babtie) hierarchy. The current settlement appraisal/site options work is being undertaken to identify further housing capacity to support the HMR strategy and RSS requirements for Allocations DPD options prior to Core Strategy submission. This detailed site assessment work will also establish the feasibility of the settlement hierarchy and confirm the spatial strategy and the broad distribution of the RSS housing requirement for the submission document.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Review the feasibility of the (Babtie) settlement hierarchy to deliver HMR and RSS requirements from the current settlement appraisal/site options work. Establish the broad housing distribution strategy. Ensure the role of settlements and the related broad distribution of the housing supply in the Core Strategy aligns with final RSS requirements before submission. (See also 2635/283,284,290.)
Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)

The Core Strategy needs to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes, including the possibility of higher housing figures for the Sheffield/Rotherham Market Area, in the final RSS.

Councils Response:
Noted. The current settlement appraisal/site options work will establish the degree of flexibility available to accommodate any increase in the final RSS housing requirement.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
From the current settlement appraisal/site options work and in conjunction with Sheffield City Council establish the margins of flexibility to deliver increased RSS housing supply in the Sheffield/Rotherham Market Area. Discuss joint SHLAA with Sheffield and lobby for early publication of guidance (see also 2635/283)
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 286
PD2 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 286

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: 2.2

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)

The Core Strategy should set a plan wide target for affordable housing and the circumstances justifying a variation of approach (eg lower thresholds in different sub-areas) (see PPS3, paras 27 to 30).

This is a strategic matter and should not be delegated to the Policies DPD.

Councils Response:
Comment noted. The issue should be informed by the Rotherham Housing Market Assessment.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider whether the HMA addresses the matter sufficiently well to set both Borough wide and sub-area targets (if required) in the Core Strategy. Complete comparison of HMA with requirements of PPS3 and HMA guidance and identify the need for further work/evidence in support of this important issue well in advance of submission.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 213
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3165
Name:  Mr & Mrs J & S Dixon
Organisation:

Representation Number:  213
Policy:  PD2     Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Housing Choice

Summary of Representation:
Support for the ARUP assessment that the plan has a weakness in not stressing the importance of residents having easy access to gardens, greenspace and allotments.

Councils Response:
Arup’s comments will be given due consideration in the submission draft Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Stress the need for easy access to gardens, greenspace and allotments in the submission draft Core Strategy.
Respondent I.D.  3165
Name:  Mr & Mrs J & S Dixon
Organisation:

Representation Number:  212
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Housing Choice

Summary of Representation:
The plan concentrates on the need for affordable and special needs housing, but there is also a need for more expensive housing to broaden the population mix and increase spending power in the town.

Councils Response:
The plan seeks to meet the housing needs of all sections of society, so will also identify sites suitable for the upper end of the housing spectrum. The Council considers that the text of Policy Direction PD2 section 2 adequately addresses the issue of housing mix. However, in the interests of clarity, we will assess whether housing mix should receive more emphasis in the Submission Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the need for greater emphasis on housing mix in the Submission Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 403
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3207

Name:  Ms Janet Hodson

Organisation:  JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number:  403

Policy:  PD2  Object  Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The approach seems to relate more to PPG3 than PPS3 and relies on the outdated UPS not SHLAA and the HMA has not yet been completed.

Councils Response:
PPS3 reflects the Government's concern to improve housing delivery and includes requirements to ensure a rolling 5 year available supply of housing related to Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAA) and the requirements of RSS and an up to date Housing Market Assessment (HMA).

The scale of Rotherham's housing requirement is likely to increase in RSS when published in March 2008 and the Housing Market Assessment will in due course form an important part of the evidence base in identifying specific housing needs.

LDFs need to take account of cross boundary housing market issues (to comply with Soundness Test 6). Studies have indicated a close affinity between the Sheffield and Rotherham housing markets and officers of the Council and Sheffield City Council, encouraged by GOYH, have recently commenced a Joint Rotherham/Sheffield SHLAA taking account of recently published supplementary guidance to PPS3, advising on the approach and methodology to be adopted. This will demonstrate the deliverability of an available and viable supply of housing and the work will be undertaken in conjunction with landowners, agents and representatives of the house building industry.

In addition to examining the deliverability of housing sites to be included in the Allocations DPD, the Joint SHLAA will also need to look at when existing housing commitments with planning permission are likely to be implemented.

The scale of recent housing permissions fulfil existing RSS requirements and the Greenfield Moratorium has helped to maintain brownfield performance. However, under PPS 3 there is now a requirement for a rolling five year supply of available housing land. As of April this year, if a five year supply cannot be maintained because existing...
commitments are not being implemented, planning authorities are required to provide strong justification to refuse housing applications. Closer examination of the likely deliverability of existing housing commitments, in conjunction with the developers and landowners involved, may lead to the lifting of the Greenfield Moratorium.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
The Core Strategy and subsequent DPD’s will meet the requirements of PPS3. The SHLAA will engage with landowners, agents and representatives of the housebuilding industry.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 3207

Name: Ms Janet Hodson

Organisation: JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number: 402

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Summary of Representation:
Clearly this will follow the principles in the hierarchy (see previous comments in Representation 3207/400). It is considered that Bramley/Wickersley should be added to the list of settlements where urban extensions may be appropriate and that Laughton Common be included within the Dinnington growth location. Potential at Wath, Swinton/Kilnhurst and Brampton should take priority over growth in Waverley. The Waverley concept relies on the creation of new infrastructure whereas additional development in the settlements named above can support and regenerate existing settlements and support the retention of social and other infrastructure.

Councils Response:
Comments noted. Current settlement appraisal/site options work is being undertaken to identify further housing capacity to support the HMR strategy and RSS requirements for Allocations DPD options prior to Core Strategy submission. This detailed site assessment work will also establish the feasibility of the settlement hierarchy and confirm the spatial strategy and the broad distribution of the RSS housing requirement for the submission document.

It is accepted that more work needs to be done on urban extensions/new communities which will need to be justified in the context of national and regional policy and supported by SA. Waverley is a significant site with potential for a new sustainable mixed use community, however, other urban extensions will be identified during the settlement appraisal and site options work. Justification of suitable urban extensions will be dependent on the final RSS requirements, SA and performance under other policy and spatial objectives including the housing trajectory, HMR objectives and sustainable transport considerations.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Review the feasibility of the settlement hierarchy to deliver HMR and RSS requirements from the current settlement appraisal/site options work. Establish the broad housing distribution strategy. Ensure the role of settlements and the related broad distribution of the housing supply in the Core Strategy aligns with final RSS requirements before submission.

Identify and appraise all urban extensions options including Waverley and take forward with appropriate justification into the submission document.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 422
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3239

Name: Mr Greg Smith

Organisation: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number: 422

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Section 4

Summary of Representation:
Reliance on windfall is contrary to guidance in PPS3. We would suggest that there should be no reliance on windfall. In any case, in assessing windfall sites local planning authorities should compare the actual performance with the expected performance as indicated in the local planning authority’s housing trajectory and previously developed land trajectory. If the Council choose to follow such an approach, it will need to ensure that any under performance in terms of windfall does not cause them not to meet their overall housing trajectory or jeopardise overall delivery. This will mean the identification of ‘reserve’ sites or a similar policy requiring unallocated sites to be brought forward for housing.

In line with the guidance in PPS3 we would therefore advocate a policy that puts in place such a mechanism and sets the percentage level of under performance that triggers such a policy or the reassessment of need and demand across the Housing Market Area and review of the RSS to update the local level of housing provision.

Councils Response:
Reference to windfalls in the Preferred Options document was intended to assist the debate about prospects for the delivery of the likely regional requirement and apportionment between settlements based on current sources of capacity pending consideration of the extent of further provision needed in the supporting Allocations DPD. The Council's position on windfalls in the submission Core Strategy will need to take account of PPS3, now advising against a windfall allowance in the first 10 years supply unless demonstrated by robust evidence.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that windfalls are only included in the housing supply if they can be justified according to paragraph 59 of PPS3, that is advising against a windfall allowance in the first ten years' supply unless demonstrated by robust evidence. Consider the approach to this
issue in the context of the joint SHLAA. Review action required under the SHLAA when available. The Council will monitor planning permissions and completions for housing in its Annual Monitoring Report, and take appropriate management action in accord with paragraph 65 of PPS3, if necessary.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations 

Rep No: 423  
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3239

Name: Mr Greg Smith

Organisation: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number: 423

Policy: PD2  
Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Section 5

Summary of Representation:
As already stated in Section 2 above we object to the approach advocating only localised amendments to the Green Belt. In line with national guidance in PPG2, it is considered that if there is a need to alter the green belt boundary in order to ensure the long term continuity of both housing supply and employment land, then a full scale review should be undertaken.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction PD1 outlines the Council’s commitment to maintaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS.

Paragraph 2.6 of PPG2 states:

“Once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. If such an alteration is proposed the Secretary of State will wish to be satisfied that the authority has considered opportunities for development within the urban areas contained by and beyond the Green Belt.”

Alteration of the Green Belt should only take place in exceptional circumstances, failure to find sufficient suitable land for housing and other uses, on sites that are not in the Green Belt, may constitute exceptional circumstances. The scale of the review of the Green Belt boundary, in these circumstances, would depend on the size of the shortfall. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will determine the amount of suitable housing land available, this will need to be compared to the RSS housing requirement.

Paragraph 2.1 of PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence, if the Green Belt boundary needs to be altered this alteration should, therefore be kept to a minimum. There is no evidence to support the requirement for a comprehensive review of the Green Belt.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.
Summary of Representation:
Reference to Waverley must also be carefully considered as this site is significant in the sub-region and regional context and not just the housing market of Sheffield and Rotherham. Waverley was not identified in the draft RSS as a residential location but as an economic development opportunity through the development of the site as part of the Waverley/Orgreave Advanced Manufacturing Park. As such suggesting that it can now come forward as a housing site would appear contrary to the draft RSS. The Council did not object to this designation at the RSS so there would appear little likelihood of this changing.
It is important that there is conformity within the Development Plan and as such if the revised RSS emerges without scope for a new community in this location then the suitability of including this within the LDF for development within the lifetime of that plan would appear unsound. Waverley should not therefore be relied on as a source of housing land.

In any event this is a large and complex site which requires to be developed in a manner with the appropriate infrastructure to ensure its sustainability. Our experience of such sites is that this will take a long lead in time prior to development commencing and that there will be limit as to the rate that housing can be delivered. These are important considerations in terms of the drafting of the housing trajectory. Unless there are signed delivery agreements with the developers suggesting otherwise it would be unsound to consider any of this site to make a contribution to the Council’s housing requirement prior to 2016.

Councils Response:
The LDF needs to be in general conformity with the RSS. However this does not preclude some variations from the RSS when evidence supports this, for example, if evidence not considered in producing the RSS becomes available. It is accepted that more work needs to be carried out to determine if Waverley is required and whether it can be justified. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) will determine exactly what land
is available where, and when it is likely to come forward. The results of the SHLAA when compared to the RSS housing requirement will determine whether housing land needs to be released beyond the existing urban envelope. The comparative sustainability of the options available and alignment with wider policy objectives will need to be assessed to decide if, and if so, when Waverley is allocated for housing.

The issue of when housing land is likely to come forward is given a great deal of prominence in PPS3. If a large housing land is allocated at Waverley, the developability/deliverability of the site must be established.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
The need/justification for Waverley will need to be examined in light of strategic objectives, including RSS, and the results of the SHLAA.

Developability/deliverability must be established in accordance with PPS3.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3239
Name:  Mr Greg Smith
Organisation:  Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number:  420
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Section 1

Summary of Representation:
In addition the policy requires that only specific sites for the first 5 years supply of housing land be identified. We object to this as it is contrary to the guidance set out in PPS3 – Housing which states in paragraph 54 and 55 that: (Quoted Para. 54 and first point of 55).

The Policy as drafted fails as it only requires the first 5 years of housing supply to be identified whereas it should specify that these sites are both identified and available. PPS3 therefore makes it very clear that at least 10 years of specific sites are developable and we therefore suggest that this element of the policy is altered accordingly to reflect this and that this filters through to the methodology underpinning the Site Allocations DPD. We consider, in the case of Rotherham, there is no reason why the full 15 years supply should not be identified.

Lichfield District Council’s Core Strategy failed the test of soundness as the Inspector’s report argued that it did not provide for at least 10 years potential supply of housing. The Strategy therefore failed test 5 of Section 20 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act as does Rotherham’s approach set out herein.

Councils Response:
PPS3 requires that a five year supply of deliverable sites is identified in the relevant LDF development plan document, and that a rolling five year supply will be maintained thereafter. The requirements of PPS3, in relation to housing supply, will obviously have to be met.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that sites in the first five years supply and the subsequent rolling five year supply are deliverable, as defined by paragraph 54 of PPS3.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 3239
Name: Mr Greg Smith
Organisation: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number: 421
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Section 3

Summary of Representation:
We object to the sequential search for housing land as advocated within this policy. There is no provision within PPS3 to undertake a sequential search as previously advocated under paragraph 30 of PPG3. In the assessment of sites for specific allocation within DPD documents such sites should be deliverable and it is against this criterion that local planning authorities should ensure that they have a continuous five year supply of sites that meets the housing trajectory. It is therefore considered that this part of the policy should be revised to take account of this guidance.

Councils Response:
PPS3 does not require a sequential approach in the same way that PPG3 did, this approach will need to be re-examined in light of this. However in determining whether sites are suitable PPS3 among other things requires the following:

Paragraph 10 states that the planning system should deliver housing developments in suitable locations, which offer a good range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure.

Paragraph 28 expands on this and states that Local Planning Authorities should set out the criteria to be used for identifying broad locations and specific sites taking into account, among these are:

- The spatial vision for the local area (having regard to relevant documents such as the Sustainable Community Strategy) and objectives set out in the relevant Regional Spatial Strategy.
- The contribution to be made to cutting carbon emissions from focusing new development in locations with good public transport accessibility and/or by means other than the private car and where it can readily and viably draw its energy supply from decentralised energy supply systems based on renewable and low-carbon forms of energy supply, or where there is clear potential for this to be realised.
Accessibility of proposed development to existing local community facilities, infrastructure and services, including public transport. The location of housing should facilitate the creation of communities of sufficient size and mix to justify the development of, and sustain, community facilities, infrastructure and services.

It is clear that a strategic framework is needed when determining where new development should be located and this requires that the types of locations that development will need to be directed to will need to be defined. At the strategic level, if we want to direct development to locations that are accessible to public transport and a range of facilities and services, the easiest way to do this is to direct it to the main urban centres.

PPS3 also requires that priority be given to the release of previously developed land (paragraph 36). The sequential approach is still, therefore, a useful one if we want to locate land according to the requirements of PPS3.

PPS3 also requires that any sites allocated in the first five years of the plan is deliverable and that any supply identified for subsequent years is developable, this will also be an important factor in deciding where new development will go.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Ensure that policies outlining where residential developments should be located take into account paragraph 28 of PPS3 and the need for sites to be deliverable/developable, in accordance with paragraphs 54 to 57 of PPS3.
Respondent I.D.  3239
Name:  Mr Greg Smith
Organisation:  Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number:  419
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Section 1

Summary of Representation:
Question the basis of the assumed RSS requirement:

This Policy states that in order to meet the RSS requirement around 15,000 new dwellings will be needed to 2021 and up to 19,500 to 2026. 3.2 The housing requirement as set out in this policy is unsound. The figures in the Draft RSS set the net housing requirement for Rotherham for the period 2004-2021 at 13,750 and projected forward to 2026 the requirement equates to 17,795 or an average annual net requirement of 809.

At the time of writing, the Panel have yet to issue their report following the examination and as such there has been no response to the outcome of these projections from the Secretary of State. It is considered that until the Panel Report is published, which is now overdue, the direction of future housing requirements is best illuminated by the scenarios set out above as requested by the Panel and that the DCLG figure of 15,521 must be regarded as a minimum.

These figures are based on the most up to date information available at the time and as such are considered suitably robust in the interim prior to publication of the Panel Report and clear guidance on the level of housing provision throughout the Yorkshire and the Humber.

In addition at the time of writing the Department for Communities and Local Government published (March 16th 2007), new updated household projections based on the ONS 2004 based population projections. These figures show that in particular there is a higher annual average household growth particularly in Yorkshire and the Humber and for Rotherham the figure is 1003 dwellings per annum which would support the higher figures set out in paragraph 3.5 above.

Councils Response:
The document attempted to cover the most likely scenarios in this respect, and the submission Core Strategy will of course be based on the most up to date RSS
requirement. Since the document was produced the RSS Examination in Public Panel Report has been published, providing more certainty as to the likely future requirement. However, the level of requirement stated in the Panel Report may still be subject to change and flexibility will have to be built in to deal with any possible changing circumstances.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
If RSS requirement is not finalised, allow for flexibility in the RSS requirement assumptions. Review the feasibility of the PD2 (Babtie) settlement hierarchy to deliver HMR and RSS requirements from the current settlement appraisal/site options work. Establish the broad housing distribution strategy. Ensure the role of settlements and the related broad distribution of the housing supply in the Core Strategy aligns with final RSS requirements before submission.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 112
PD2 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3328

Name:  Ms Lucy Mitchell

Organisation:  Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number:  112

Policy:  PD2            Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  PD2.1

Summary of Representation:
The proposals outlined in the Core Strategy to meet the Draft RSS housing requirement
and the phased and managed release of housing land to support the HMR Pathfinder are
supported.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3328
Name:  Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation:  Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number:  113
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  PD2.2

Summary of Representation:
The commitment in the Core Strategy to provide decent homes in terms of type, tenure and affordability is supported. Regular monitoring of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) will be vital to ensure the right balance of housing mix.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action apart from monitoring and updating the SHMA as required.
Summary of Representation:
The proposals to locate housing in accordance with the settlement hierarchy, specifically ranking the redevelopment of brownfield sites as the top priority, is supported. This complements the RES and Policy H1 of the RHS to deliver 65% of new housing on previously developed land.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 114
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3328

Name:  Ms Lucy Mitchell

Organisation:  Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number:  114

Policy:  PD2               Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  PD2.2

Summary of Representation:
The Core Strategy should make a commitment to ensure that all new housing
development meets “lifetime homes” standards and achieves sustainability standards,
such as BREEAM or EcoHomes “very good” or “excellent” standards.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction PD8 promotes the sustainable design and construction of new buildings
and includes reference to the Code for Sustainable Homes. Further detail on appropriate
construction standards for new housing development may be contained in a supporting
DPD and/or SPD. As standards are likely to change frequently, the Council considers this
approach more appropriate for the longevity of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include appropriate construction standards in the Policies DPD and/or SPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 150
PD2 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 3418
Name: Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation: Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number: 150
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
While we welcome the proposal to address affordable housing provision in a future DPD, we feel it is important that some indication is provided in the Core Strategy as to the possible level of need in the District. In the absence of an up to date Local Housing Needs Assessment, reference could be made to policy H4 of the draft RSS, which suggests that Rotherham District should provide up to 29% of housing as affordable.

Councils Response:
The Rotherham Housing Needs Assessment is currently in final draft stage and will be available to inform drafting of the Submission Core Strategy. The results of the Assessment will inform targets in the LDF.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Submission Core Strategy will include a strategic target for affordable housing provision in Rotherham. Further detailed policy and thresholds will be included in the Polices DPD and supporting SPD as appropriate.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 151
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3418

Name: Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation: Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number: 151

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
We feel that Policy PD2 lacks sufficient reference to the importance of housing mix, which will no doubt be addressed in a future DPD. It would be helpful if the issue were also raised in the Core Strategy. It is of particular importance when considering the potential impact of housing development on the Pathfinder areas in South Yorkshire.

Councils Response:
The Council considers that the text of Policy Direction PD2 section 2 adequately addresses the issue of housing mix. However, in the interests of clarity, we will assess whether housing mix should receive more emphasis in the Submission Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the need for greater emphasis on housing mix in the Submission Core Strategy.
**Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council**

**CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS**

**Assessment of Representations**

**Rep No: 149**

PD2 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3418

Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  149

Policy:  PD2  

Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

**Summary of Representation:**

We welcome the inclusion of the draft RSS brownfield target in the policy.

**Councils Response:**

Support noted.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**

No further action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 152
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3418
Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  152
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
We reiterate our comments made on Policy PD1 with regard to localised Green Belt reviews.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction PD1 outlines the Council’s commitment to maintaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS. Policy Direction PD2 section 5 gives examples of where localised reviews may be necessary. Any such changes to the Green Belt would have to be justified by exceptional circumstances. Work underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD will help determine the need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long-term sustainable development of the Borough’s settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 51
PD2 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 3424
Name: Mr Henryk Peterson
Organisation: Sport England

Representation Number: 51
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Sport England supports the principle of mixed use development as outlined in PD2 Policy Direction for Housing. The example of the Waverley Scheme with potential use of master planning is seen as a mechanism to help achieve sustainable development. Any future allocation of land to support this strategic direction should protect and enhance playing field interests and ensure an adequate level of outdoor and indoor sport and recreational facilities are provided, to an accredited standard, and with resources for future maintenance.

Councils Response:
Support for sustainable mixed use communities including Waverley is noted. The provision and maintenance of adequate standards of indoor and outdoor sport and recreation facilities within such mixed use communities is acknowledged.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Note comments in developing the submission version of PD2 and in appropriate justification for a possible sustainable mixed use community at Waverley.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 223
PD2 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 3463
Name: Mr C. J. Harper
Organisation:

Representation Number: 223
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: Housing choice, location of housing

Summary of Representation:
Agree with using previously used areas but must build where people want to live. There is also a need for a mix of affordable housing for single occupancy.

Councils Response:
The allocation of sites for residential development will by informed by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment to ensure that identified needs are met in terms of housing type, tenure and location.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change required regarding the method of identifying sites for new housing.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 580
PD2 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3727

Name:  Mr Ian Gilder

Organisation:  Environmental Resources Management (for UPM Kymmene)

Representation Number:  580

Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Support this policy direction, particularly in relation to the former timber mill site put forward for housing as part of the site allocations DPD.

Councils Response:
Support for Policy Direction 2 is noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for the Policy Direction 2 will be taken into account in preparing Housing policies in the Core Strategy Submission Document.

Further consideration of individual sites will be undertaken in developing the Site Allocations DPD.
Respondent I.D. 4183

Name: Mr G Blunn

Organisation:

Representation Number: 179

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Housing requirement and managing supply

Summary of Representation:
Why is the policy contained in the Policies DPD not stated in detail here?

Councils Response:
The Policies DPD has not yet been drafted, but is planned to be available for public consultation in 2008.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure Mr Blunn is informed when the Policies DPD is ready for consultation.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 180
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183
Name: Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number: 180
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Housing Choice

Summary of Representation:
The “Strategic Housing Assessment” should be the definitive document that establishes where dwellings are to be built; it should not be deviated from.

Councils Response:
PPS3 reflects the Government's concern to improve housing delivery and includes requirements to ensure a rolling 5 year available supply of housing related to Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAA) and the requirements of RSS and an up to date Housing Market Assessment (HMA).

The scale of Rotherham's housing requirement is likely to increase in RSS when published in 2008 and the recently completed Housing Market Assessment will form an important part of the evidence base in identifying specific housing needs.

LDFs need to take account of cross boundary housing market issues and studies have indicated a close affinity between the Sheffield and Rotherham housing markets and officers of the Council and Sheffield City Council, encouraged by GOYH, have recently commenced a Joint Rotherham/Sheffield SHLAA taking account of recently published supplementary guidance to PPS3, advising on the approach and methodology to be adopted. This will be demonstrating the deliverability of an available and viable supply of housing in conjunction with landowners, agents and representatives of the house building industry. In addition to examining the deliverability of housing sites to be included in the Allocations DPD, the Joint SHLAA will also need to look at when existing housing commitments with planning permission are likely to be implemented.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Take on the requirements of PPS3 and review action required under HMA and SHLAA (when available).
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 181
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  4183
Name: Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number: 181
Policy: PD2   Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Location of housing development

Summary of Representation:
Disagree with the search sequence (1 – 5) for the location of new housing. The following sequence is suggested:
1 A site with adequate public transport and/ or non-car mode link to employment and services whether Greenfield or brownfield.
2 To conserve and/ or enhance a local village character.
3 Extensions to main urban areas that are accessible to jobs and services.
4 Use of previously developed land and the conversion of appropriate buildings within urban areas.
5 Other infill within urban areas.

Councils Response:
This search sequence has been drawn up reflecting central and regional government guidance. Development of brownfield land is high on the Government’s agenda and councils have to meet specific targets for the number of houses built on brownfield sites (68% in Rotherham’s case identified within Regional Planning Guidance).

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 182
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  4183
Name:  Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number:  182
Policy:  PD2                     Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Windfalls

Summary of Representation:
Windfalls and housing do not complement one another, this paragraph should be deleted.

Councils Response:
“Windfalls” are sites which come forward for housing development but were not identified as such in an adopted development plan. Such sites make a significant contribution to the overall housing supply within the Borough.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
Summary of Representation:
The housing supply figures given in Table 6 do not clearly differentiate between sites within/outside the Pathfinder as the figure for the Urban Area (3,087), obviously includes both. It is essential that the housing supply/demand figures for the Borough as a whole are related to the targets identified through the HMR masterplanning process. This will provide the confidence check that will be required to be able to endorse the Core Strategy, and will provide the base for the Borough’s land release policies.

Councils Response:
Paragraph 7.43 states existing commitments are from planning permissions not yet completed and the remaining residential allocations in the existing Unitary Development Plan (June 1999). Other sources (para 7.44) come from the Urban Potential Study that provided an estimate of land potentially available for residential development in urban areas up to 2016. This document is publicly available. Table 6 makes clear that the figures for individual settlements includes dwellings that have already got planning permission (at June 2006) the remainder includes some large sites allocated in the Unitary Development Plan but not yet developed. There will also be an element (of the housing numbers) that was included as part of the Urban Potential Study but these may be small windfall sites or sites that could potentially be identified in a future Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).

The explanatory text supporting policy direction 2, also considers the brownfield / Greenfield status of potential sites.

It is important to recognise that at this stage the figures provided in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document, are indicative only. Over the next few months, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation next year.
It only after consideration of all potential development sites that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken. Table 6 and Map 7 of the draft Core Strategy sought to provide an indication of the current position using information from the existing UDP and the Urban Potential Study. It is at this stage that the issue of sites within the HMR Pathfinder Initiative could be considered.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Consider which of the housing sites identified lie in the pathfinder area in determining the housing land release strategy.
**Summary of Representation:**

It is difficult to follow the logic of the housing supply figures being presented with/without Waverley, without there first being a strategic consideration of the benefits of a major mixed-use development there in the first place. Justifying it on the basis that it conveniently fills a hole (sorry!) in the housing supply figures isn't a very robust approach. There is no evidence presented to show that the apparent shortfall in housing land could not be remedied by the further development of settlements in the Pathfinder (including in Doncaster or Barnsley MBC’s in the Dearne Valley), which may well be a more sustainable approach. Alternatively, or better still additionally, we would look to for a clear statement of the benefits that the Waverley development could bring to the sub-region as a whole, and the risks that could potentially arise to the Pathfinder's strategy.

**Councils Response:**

Waverley was included in the possible scenarios discussed in the housing section as, given the scale of the site, its inclusion or exclusion has a significant effect on the overall picture. The CSPO does not attempt to justify its allocation, “to fill a hole” or otherwise, but attempts to examine what the implications might be if it were justified and subsequently allocated. It was not intended that dealing with Waverley as a possible strategic housing development in this document, that the inclusion of Waverley as an allocation in subsequent DPDs should be seen as a foregone conclusion.

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment SHLAA will determine exactly what land is available where, and when it is likely to come forward. The results of the SHLAA when compared to the RSS housing requirement will enable us to decide which housing land needs to be released beyond the existing urban envelope. The comparative sustainability of the options available and alignment with wider policy objectives, including the need to support Pathfinder objectives, will need to be assessed to decide if and when Waverley is allocated for housing.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Over the next few months, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation early next year. This baseline information will be used to produce the “spatial development strategy” for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.

The need/justification for Waverley will need to be examined in light of strategic objectives, including RSS, and the results of the SHLAA. Further work needs to be undertaken to support the release of Waverley as a sustainable new settlement. Identify and appraise all urban extensions options including Waverley and take forward with appropriate justification into the Issues and Options (Regulation 25) Consultation on Site Allocations prior to possible future inclusion in the Submission Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 438
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  4965
Name:  Mr Peter O’Brien
Organisation:  Transform South Yorkshire

Representation Number: 438
Policy: PD2  Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
There should be a statement on affordable housing strategy, based at this stage on the projected need/demand across the Borough.

Councils Response:
This point is accepted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The affordable housing strategy needs to be dealt with in more detail in the submission Core Strategy, in light of up to date evidence.
Summary of Representation:
The draft RSS refers to required housing completions in the Pathfinder. This should also be referenced in the Core Strategy, to provide a delivery/monitoring benchmark.

Councils Response:
The RSS including the requirements in relation to Pathfinder will need to be taken into account.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the RSS requirements in relation to the Pathfinder are taken into account in the submission Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 439
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4965
Name: Mr Peter O’Brien
Organisation: Transform South Yorkshire

Representation Number: 439
Policy: PD2
Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
I would suggest that the role of density in achieving the rational use of land and in supporting balanced, well-designed communities, should be highlighted. This again draws on the draft RSS, and helps ensure that the evidenced need for a more subtle approach to densities in parts of the Pathfinder is not overlooked.

Councils Response:
The Council considers that Policy Directions PD8 and PD2 section 3 adequately set out a minimum density and a search sequence for the development and location of new housing. Further detail on a range of densities appropriate to different locations will be contained in the Policies DPD.

The Policies DPD will also set out measures to support urban renaissance and the HMR Pathfinder in relation to housing size, tenure and design.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Incorporate detailed policy on the density, size, tenure and design of new housing development in the Policies DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 433
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4965
Name: Mr Peter O'Brien
Organisation: Transform South Yorkshire

Representation Number: 433
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The draft RSS requires that LPA's make provision for the management of land release so as to support the HMR Pathfinders. The Core Strategy should therefore follow this through, with a specific commitment, such as "priority will be given to the release of land where it will support the delivery of strategies for the housing market renewal area. ... outside of the HMR area, land will be released provided that it does not prejudice targets for the Pathfinder". The precise nature of the land release policies, and the targets, should be set out in the Borough Policies and Borough Sites documents.

Councils Response:
The exact wording relating to the support given the HMR Pathfinder needs to be carefully considered in light of the RSS EiP Panel Report. Any such wording also needs to take account of the fact that many of the problems in the Pathfinder area exist in other parts of the Borough. All policies in the LDF will need to be founded on a robust evidence base including those supporting HMR Pathfinder. Care needs to be taken to ensure that policies favouring the Pathfinder area do not exacerbate or create problems elsewhere.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Policies in subsequent documents need to be formulated in light of the above comments, RSS policy and the available evidence base.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 432

PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4965

Name: Mr Peter O'Brien

Organisation: Transform South Yorkshire

Representation Number: 432

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
In Section 7 (Housing) there is too much focus on the "existing" RSS, given that it is very shortly to be replaced.

Councils Response:
As the process of production of the emerging draft replacement RSS proceeds, the replacement document will need to be given increased prominence in the production of the submission Core Strategy. The extent to which it has prominence over the existing RSS will be considered in light of the stage it has reached. The draft RSS Examination in Public Panel Report has now been published, and the contents of this report will need to be given considerable weight in the production of the submission Core Strategy. However, the level of requirement stated in the Panel Report may still be subject to change and flexibility will have to be built in to deal with any possible changing circumstances.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Contents of the draft RSS Examination in Public Panel Report to be given considerable weight in the production of the submission Core Strategy recognising that it may still be subject to change and as such flexibility will have to be built in to deal with any possible changing circumstances.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 437
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4965
Name: Mr Peter O'Brien
Organisation: Transform South Yorkshire

Representation Number: 437
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
PD2: I have already referred (para 5) to the need for the Core Strategy to explicitly support housing development in the Pathfinder through land release policies. The same point applies to Housing Choice, where (in line with draft RSS policies) we would look for a policy commitment to design quality, mix and sustainability in the Pathfinder. Clearly the monitoring indicators need to differentiate between the pathfinder/non-Pathfinder sites, and pick up the mix/tenure etc issue.

Councils Response:
The problems experienced in the Pathfinder also exist in other parts of the Borough and PPS3 requires that issues of quality, mix and sustainability are addressed in all new housing developments. PD1 also includes an emphasis on locally distinctive design. Pathfinder areas should not, therefore be favoured in this respect, as this may detrimentally affect other parts of the Borough. All sites within the HMR programme will be considered in the future work on the Allocations DPD. Policies to guide all new development will be included in future appropriate DPD's and the issues of quality design, housing mix and tenure will all be considered. Consideration will be given to differentiating between Pathfinder/non-Pathfinder monitoring indicators.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Issues will be considered in future appropriate DPD’s. Consider be given to differentiating between Pathfinder/non-Pathfinder monitoring indicators.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 231  
PD2 \ Support  

Respondent I.D. 4969  
Name: Mr Ian Rowe  
Organisation: Signet Planning (for Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estates)  

Representation Number: 231  
Policy: PD2  
Object/Support: Support  
Section / Paragraph: Housing requirement and managing supply  

Summary of Representation:  
Support for the strategic approach of providing houses of various scales and distribution to meet RSS and brownfield targets. It must be remembered that some Greenfield sites may be more sustainable than some brownfield sites.  

Councils Response:  
Accepted. Rotherham has a target of 68% of all new housing development on brownfield land, so will still need to identify Greenfield sites to meet it's housing needs. All sites or the methodology to assess sites will be subject to a sustainability appraisal.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
As part of the Allocations DPD work all potential sites or the methodology to assess sites will be subjected to a sustainability appraisal. Advice is being sought as to the best approach.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 342
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5024

Name: Ms Nicola Sewell

Organisation: Indigo Planning

Representation Number: 342

Policy: PD2  Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
There is an undersupply of housing land identified in Rotherham. As currently worded PD2 is inappropriate in relation to urban extensions. Specific reference to settlements in sections 3 and 5 should be deleted. (Indigo suggest that land at Whitehall Road Catcliffe should be allocated as an urban extension. UGS on the current UDP).

Councils Response:
The housing and employment figures provided in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document are indicative only. During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation later in the year.

At this stage the figures for new house building and employment land supply (provided in the Core Strategy Preferred Options) are indicative only.

Consideration will be given to the creation of a new urban extension at Waverley (proposed as a sustainable new community) and urban extensions throughout the Borough.

The relative sustainability of all settlement expansion will need to be assessed. It is only when the survey work to assess potential new development needs in a settlement has been completed, that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken and the impact of and need for Waverley, and extensions of settlements into Green Belt (including at Maltby and Dinnington as identified in section 5 of PD2), can be fully assessed.

The policy directions in the Core strategy Preferred Options document are meant to guide future policy development, but are not the policies themselves. Settlement sustainability will be a key factor in any decision-making and the merits of releasing land for a new
community at Waverley and extensions into the Green Belt will be assessed as part of the survey work to be undertaken over the next few months.

The submission Core Strategy will have a clear settlement hierarchy. PD 1 used the Babtie Sustainable Settlement Study as the basis for creating a settlement hierarchy. However the Core Strategy will develop the Council’s thinking further. The policy directions will be developed into Core Strategy policies and the document will have a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development within the Borough.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5024
Name:  Ms Nicola Sewell
Organisation:  Indigo Planning

Representation Number:  341
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Development in Maltby and Dinnington would require amendments to Green Belt to extend the urban area. There are other suitable urban extensions not in the Green Belt.

Councils Response:
The housing and employment figures provided in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document are indicative only. During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation later in the year.

At this stage the figures for new house building and employment land supply (provided in the Core Strategy Preferred Options) are indicative only. Consideration will be given to the creation of a new urban extension at Waverley (proposed as a sustainable new community) and urban extensions throughout the Borough. The relative sustainability of all settlement expansion will need to be assessed. It is only when the survey work to assess potential new development needs in a settlement has been completed, that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken and the impact of and need for Waverley, and extensions of settlements into Green Belt (particularly at Maltby and Dinnington), can be fully assessed. Settlement sustainability will be a key factor in any decision-making and the merits of releasing land for a new community at Waverley and extensions into the Green Belt will be assessed.

The submission Core Strategy will have a clear settlement hierarchy. PD 1 used the Babtie Sustainable Settlement Study as the basis for creating a settlement hierarchy. However the Core Strategy will develop the Council's thinking further. The policy directions will be developed into Core Strategy policies and the document will have a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development within the Borough.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 314
Policy: PD2
Object/SUPPORT: Object

Respondent I.D. 5024
Name: Ms Nicola Sewell
Organisation: Indigo Planning

Representation Number: 314

Summary of Representation:
Search sequence criteria, includes urban extension but only identifies 4 broad locations: Rotherham, Maltby, Dinnington and Wath. It does not include the settlements set out in PD1.

Councils Response:
The submission Core Strategy will have a clear settlement hierarchy. PD 1 used the Babbie Sustainable Settlement Study as the basis for creating a settlement hierarchy. However the Core Strategy will develop the Council’s thinking further. The Babbie settlement study was undertaken at a point in time and the methodology behind the study is robust. The policy directions will be developed into Core Strategy policies and the document will have a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development within the Borough.

The housing and employment figures provided in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document are indicative only. During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation later in the year.

At this stage the figures for new house building and employment land supply (provided in the Core Strategy) are indicative only. Consideration will be given to the creation of a new urban extension at Waverley (a sustainable new community). It is only when the survey work to assess potential new development needs in a settlement has been completed, that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken and the impact of and need for Waverley can be fully assessed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 54
PD2 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 5025

Name: Ms Rachael Pierce

Organisation: Sanderson Weatherall

Representation Number: 54

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
My Client (Royal Mail Group Property) supports the policy relating to the location of new housing. The development of previously developed land with a focus on main urban areas is supported in accordance with national and regional planning policy.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for PD2.2, particularly use of previously developed sites and the focus on main urban areas for the location of new housing, be noted.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 452
PD2 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5147

Name:  Mr John King

Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  452

Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Part 5

Summary of Representation:
Support policy approach for Waverley

Councils Response:
Support for the inclusion of Waverley in the housing calculations is noted, although Waverley was included only as a possible proposal. It has yet to be fully justified in comparison with other potential urban extensions that may be required to achieve the Borough's requirement for future housing (and employment) provision as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Identify and appraise all urban extensions options including Waverley and take forward with appropriate justification into the submission document.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 448
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5147

Name: Mr John King

Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 448

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Part 1

Summary of Representation:
Must address issues of density and set out broad figures for different locations as required by PPS3. Densities are not considered within the core strategy. This should be addressed as the Council must have a figure for densities to create its housing land requirement.

Councils Response:
The Council considers that Policy Directions PD8 and PD2 section 3 adequately set out a minimum density and a search sequence for the development and location of new housing. Further detail on a range of densities appropriate to different locations will be contained in the Policies DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Incorporate detailed policy on the density of new housing development in the Policies DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 449
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  449
Policy:  PD2  
Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Part 2

Summary of Representation:
Policy must include strong wording on environmental sustainability, including demands on reducing the use of natural resources and action on climate change, not just sustainable communities. Agree with the SA that the policy does not recognise the importance of sustainable design and the importance of access to green space. Also the need of quality public realm.

Councils Response:
Sustainability and Climate Change are major themes running throughout the Core Strategy, but probably need more emphasis in the preamble to the Submission Core Strategy. It would be too repetitive to include references to sustainable design in all PDs, given the requirement for brevity in Core Strategies, but the links between the PDs need to be made. Efficient use of natural resources and the links to sustainability and Climate change are dealt with under Policy Direction 8 but the contribution this makes to sustainable communities needs to be spelt out.

The principle of securing residential developments with access to gardens, greenspaces, allotments and good quality public realm as part of an overall requirement for high quality sustainable design is accepted. However, it is felt more appropriate this be included in the successor to the overarching Policy Direction 1 alternatively consideration will be given as to whether a new stand alone policy is required. It is not likely that this issue will be considered in the successor to Policy Direction 2.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Clarify that sustainability and climate change issues permeate the whole plan. Improve the cross-referencing between PDs for those subjects and topics that fit into more than one PD category.
Include reference to the importance and need for giving residential developments access to gardens, allotments, greenspace and good quality public realm as part of an overall requirement for high quality sustainable design within a new policy or within an amended Policy Direction.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  451
Policy:  PD2        Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Part 5

Summary of Representation:
Any expansion into the Green Belt must be accompanied by commensurate, and where possible additional or enhanced, gains elsewhere. Consultation on the Issues and Options paper shows that the public values Green Belt.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction PD1 outlines the Council’s commitment to maintaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS. The only “gains” in the Green Belt would by definition only be possible by re-allocating land from another use. As loss of Green Belt would generally only happen after all other opportunities for meeting land use requirements have been explored, i.e. there is no more land available in areas other than the Green Belt. It is difficult to see where “commensurate gains” would come from and, therefore, how this could be applied as a general principle. It is, however acknowledged that, where land next to the Green Belt is surplus to requirements for it’s current allocation, re-allocation for Green Belt should be considered among the possible uses for the land.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long-term sustainable development of the Borough’s settlements. That re-allocation of land as Green Belt is considered, where appropriate.
Further discussions with CPRE may be necessary to examine further the issue raised.

........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 450
PD2 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  450
Policy:  PD2                Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Part 3

Summary of Representation:
Support sequential approach, but concern that if housing is permitted to support local services, this could be abused by developers.

Councils Response:
Support is welcomed. The LDF process will determine which settlements require further housing to support local services, how much is required in each case and where it will be located. While the principle would be laid out in the Core Strategy, the relevant allocations and development control policies, established via the Allocations and Policies DPDs, will control where any such development would be allowed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments should be noted in the production of the submission draft Core Strategy and the Allocations and Policies DPDs.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 5200
Name: Claire Whittaker
Organisation: Fairhurst Consultants (for Lafarge Aggregates Ltd)

Representation Number: 270
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: 2.3

Summary of Representation:
There is no policy direction for executive homes in the Core Strategy.

The policy objectives in PPS7, para 11 - Sustainable development in rural areas would support provision of several architecturally designed dwellings in a high quality landscape setting to improve market choice.

It is suggested there is scope for such high quality development at Lindrick Dale adjacent to existing properties of a similar standard.

Whilst the site is within Green Belt and AHLV, the company is willing to revoke the IDO consent on the dormant limestone quarry to offset limited housing development at Lindrick Dale
Alternatively, the company would consider re-opening the dormant quarry and removing the extracted material via a spur off the nearby railway.

Additional policy direction wording suggested:-

• In rural locations suitable for high quality, architecturally designed housing where exceptionally, the benefits of the proposal outweigh the policy objections.

(See also Site Allocations representation- both housing and quarrying aspects)

Councils Response:
PD2.3 is driven by PPS3 and RSS as the principal determinants of locating new housing development. The PPS7 objective that is cited above will also need to be considered alongside the LDF objectives mentioned in the response to Rep.5200/269. In this context the additional wording suggested for developing the policy would not be favoured as this would imply exceptional circumstances are prevalent throughout the Borough. This is not considered to be the case although the Council would be prepared to consider the
propositions arising from the particular circumstances that exist at Lindrick Dale on their individual merits.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Consider provision for executive housing as recommended under Rep.5200/269 but decline the suggested policy wording. Hold separate discussions with the respondent concerning the respective merits of the housing and quarrying propositions arising from the particular circumstances that exist at Lindrick Dale.
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**Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council**

**CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS**

**Assessment of Representations**

Rep No: 172

PD2 \ Comment

**Respondent I.D. 5204**

**Name:** Mr Andrew Pritchard

**Organisation:** East Midlands Regional Assembly

**Representation Number:** 172

**Policy:** PD2

**Object/Support:** Comment

**Section / Paragraph:** PD2.3

**Summary of Representation:**
The East Midlands “Northern HMA” borders Rotherham Borough and is part of the wider Sheffield/Rotherham HMA. For information, the average annual housing provision rates for the Northern HMA are:

- Bolsover 350
- Chesterfield 360
- North East Derbyshire 330
- Bassetlaw 330

The Regional Assembly note the content of the Core Strategy Preferred Options document and look forward to further consultation.

**Councils Response:**
The information on housing figures for the East Midlands Northern Housing Market Area is noted.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
The Council will have regard to the East Midlands Northern HMA figures as part of any Sheffield and Rotherham Joint Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment undertaken and any update to the Rotherham Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 59
PD2 \ Comment

Respondent I.D. 5205
Name: Mr Sam Kipling
Organisation: Environment Agency

Representation Number: 59
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Comment

Section / Paragraph: Page 84, para "Evidence base"

Summary of Representation:
Page 84 - Evidence Base
Your Strategic Flood Risk Assessment should be used to inform section 3 of Policy PD2. It will help to highlight areas at risk from flooding. Development should be avoided in those areas by carrying out the Sequential Test. Your SFRA and PPS25 should be fully considered and included as part of your evidence base.

Councils Response:
Comment accepted but dependent on the final scope and formatting of submission strategic policies reference to the Rotherham SFRA may be more appropriate under PD9.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Depending on the final scope and formatting of submission strategic policies, either include reference to the Rotherham Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as part of the evidence base supporting PD2.3 or cross reference to PD9.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  60  
PD2 \ Comment

Respondent I.D.  5205

Name:  Mr Sam Kipling

Organisation:  Environment Agency

Representation Number:  60

Policy:  PD2  
Object/Support:  Comment

Section / Paragraph:  Page 84, para "Conformity"

Summary of Representation:
Page 84 - Conformity
PPS25 should also be included in this section.

Councils Response:
Comment noted. Reference to PPS25  will be made under PD2 subject to no change in the format of the submission document.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Refer to PPS25 under PD2 Conformity assuming no change to the policy format on submission.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 58
PD2 \ Comment

Respondent I.D. 5205
Name: Mr Sam Kipling
Organisation: Environment Agency

Representation Number: 58
Policy: PD2  Object/Support: Comment
Section / Paragraph: Number 3. Location of housing development

Summary of Representation:
Number 3: Location of Housing Development – This section sets out the criteria upon which potential allocation and windfall sites are judged. Flooding should be included as a criterion for making decisions on the spatial location of new housing development in accordance with the recently published PPS25: Development and Flood Risk. The following wording is suggested:-

“Sites in Flood Zone 1 will be preferred to sites in Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3.”

Councils Response:
Comment and suggestion noted but dependent on the final scope and formatting of submission strategic policies reference to the flood risk sequential test may be more appropriate under PD9.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Depending on the final scope and formatting of submission strategic policies consider whether broad or detailed flood risk sequential testing criteria would be most appropriately covered in PD2 and/or PD9. The issue of flood risk will also be considered as part of the Allocations DPD site selection criteria.

........................................................................................................................................
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 40
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5225

Name: Mr S. Staines

Organisation: Friends, Families & Travellers

Representation Number: 40

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Paragraph 7.60

Summary of Representation:
FFT is pleased that the core strategy indicates a commitment to make provision for Gypsies and Travellers in the Site Allocations DPD. However, para 31 of Circular 1/2006 indicates that "the Core Strategy shoud set out criteria for the location of gypsy and traveller sites which will be used to guide the allocation of sites in the relevant DPD. These criteria will also be used to meet unexpected demand." Hence as it stands the Core Strategy does not conform with national guidance. The strategy should be revised to meet national guidance.

Councils Response:
It is accepted that the Core Strategy should include criteria for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Criteria for the location of Gypsy and Traveller sites be included in the submission version of PD2.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5241
Name:  Mr Peter Ludlam
Organisation:

Representation Number:  348
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Table 6

Summary of Representation:
Concern that table 6 promotes development of greenfield housing sites in Thurcroft much greater than that proposed for Maltby and contrary to the Jacobs Babtie study recommendations.

Councils Response:
Paragraph 7.43 states existing commitments are from planning permissions not yet completed and the remaining residential allocations in the existing Unitary Development Plan (June 1999). Other sources (para 7.44) come from the Urban Potential Study that provided an estimate of land potentially available for residential development in urban areas up to 2016. This document is publicly available. Table 6 makes clear that the figures for individual settlements includes dwellings that have already got planning permission (at June 2006) the remainder includes some large sites allocated in the Unitary Development Plan but not yet developed. There will also be an element (of the housing numbers) that was included as part of the Urban Potential Study but these may be small windfall sites or sites that could potentially be identified in a future Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).

However at this stage the figures provided in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document are indicative only. Over the next few months site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation in 2008.

It is only after consideration of all potential development sites that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken. Table 6 and Map 7 of the draft Core Strategy sought to provide an indication of the current position using information from the existing UDP and the Urban Potential Study.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD later in the year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 351
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5241
Name: Mr Peter Ludlam

Organisation:

Representation Number:  351

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:  Table 6, Map 7

Summary of Representation:
Confusion between settlements and Parishes particularly with respect to Laughton Common.

Councils Response:
Agreed - table 6 refers to some settlements (not all) and not parishes. Map 7 however refers to Laughton Common (as a settlement) and, it is presumed, additional housing numbers have been included within the the Dinnington Anston figures to reflect the potential house building at Laughton Common but this is not clear from the preferred options document. The figures as presented do not appear to tie into a single source at this stage and these anomalies in the data/information presentation will need to be resolved.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Anomalies in the data / information presentation will need to be resolved in the submission Core Strategy document and a consistent and coherent approach to the Borough’s spatial strategy presented.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 370
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5245
Name:  Mr Sam Thistlethwaite
Organisation:  Banks Development

Representation Number:  370
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Map 7

Summary of Representation:
Object to limited growth at Thurcroft. A higher growth allocation would take advantage of the settlement's sustainable location in respect of proximity to both M1 and M18.

Councils Response:
The submission Core Strategy will have a clear settlement hierarchy. PD 1 used the Babtie Sustainable Settlement Study as the basis for creating a settlement hierarchy. However the Core Strategy will develop the Council's thinking further. The Babtie settlement study was undertaken at a point in time and the methodology behind the study is robust. However the policy directions will be developed into Core Strategy policies that will have a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development within the Borough.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD later in the year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 504
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5248
Name:  Mr R.D. Butters
Organisation:  Hallam Land Management Ltd

Representation Number:  504
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The historic housing requirements of the current RSS, the requirements of the submission draft RSS and the requirements put forward at the examination in public of the RSS are considered in paragraphs 7.27 to 7.41. The RSS Panel’s Report has not been released but it is widely believed that the RSS plan period is very likely to be extended to 2026 (in order to conform with the national policy requirements set out in PPS3 for LDFs to demonstrate a 15 year supply of housing land) and based on the latest ONS population projections the annual requirement is also likely to be increased. PD2 leaves this matter open in terms of offering two alternatives and is not consistent with the text in paragraph 1.3 of CS-PO which states that the Core Strategy will set out the overall vision objectives and spatial strategy for Rotherham over the next 14 years to 2021. Neither the approach in para 1.3 nor PD2” are appropriate and clearly have a significant effect on the development requirements for the district and the impact on the supply side proposed in the CS-PO. The identification of a preferred Policy direction for the requirements of the district for future housing should therefore be considered when the requirements are known and not prematurely.

Councils Response:
The submission Core Strategy will obviously need to take account of the most up to date version of the Regional Spatial Strategy and, given that the RSS Examination in Public panel report has now been published, this will need to be given considerable weight. This relates both to the level of the requirement and the timescale to be dealt with.

It is the Council’s intention that Regulation 25 consultations on the allocations DPD will take place before finalising the Core Strategy for submission, allowing further comments to be made in relation to allocations and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, in light of more detailed information on site availability.

Settlement/sites surveys will have been carried out to inform the Regulation 25 consultations on the Allocations DPD.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 513
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5248

Name: Mr R.D. Butters

Organisation: Hallam Land Management Ltd

Representation Number: 513

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
CS-PO PD2 – Refers to windfalls and the need to safeguard existing uses. On the basis that these windfall sites have not been identified in the Urban Potential Study many are likely to result in the unacceptable loss of existing employment sites thereby undermining them as a potential source of future housing land supply. The Urban Potential Study has identified many of the sites that would previously, have come forward as windfall sites and in any event the reliance on an unidentified source of 100 dwellings/year is contrary to national policy PPS3 paragraph 59 ‘windfalls should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply’. Therefore CS-PO Table 5 significantly overstates the potential housing supply. This overstatement of the housing land supply will have the serious and adverse knock on result of falsely assuming that it is not necessary to review other historic restraint policies which may in fact need to be reviewed and changed to provide certainty of supply of housing land in accordance with national policy.

Councils Response:
The inclusion of 100 windfall dwellings per year in addition to those identified in the UPS reflect the fact that since the production of the UPS a significant amount of windfall land has come forward that was not identified in the study. The figure also reflects the fact that ambitions to promote town centre living were not reflected in the UPS. Compared to the rate at which windfalls have been granted planning permission in the last few years, 100 is a conservative figure.

However, PPS3 has changed government policy in relation to the inclusion of an assumed rate of windfalls in the housing supply and this will need to be taken into account. The Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment will determine what land is available for housing on a site by site basis. Any housing supply shown in future documents must accord with the requirements of PPS3 and will be based on a detailed assessment of the housing land available.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the requirements of PPS3 are met in relation to demonstrating the supply of housing land in the submission draft Core Strategy.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 509
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5248
Name:  Mr R.D. Butters
Organisation:  Hallam Land Management Ltd

Representation Number:  509
Policy:  PD2          Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The housing land supply is supplemented in CS-PO Table 5 by the addition of 3,500 dwellings from the Waverley site which are identified as a brownfield supply. The Waverley site however does not conform with the definition of previously developed land and does not therefore represent a source of brownfield housing land. Additionally the Waverley site cannot be relied upon to deliver 3,500 dwellings. CS-PO PD6 Transportation contains a reference to a programmed ‘Waverley link road’ but no provisions for improvements to the Sheffield Parkway or J33 of the M1 Motorway and Section 8 at paragraph 8.7 CS-PO confirms that Waverley is a ‘longer term possibility’ and ‘would be dependent on finding suitable transport solutions to growing problems of congestion on the Parkway and M1’. Therefore in terms of soundness of the proposed core strategy it cannot be relied upon to supply 3500 dwellings as it is a site which is only a possibility and its delivery depends on finding solutions to significant infrastructure problems that have not yet been solved.

Councils Response:
Previous advice issued by the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber, relating to former minerals sites, stated that where the land was reclaimed with the intention to re-develop it (rather than restored to a green state), then it should be treated as previously developed.

Although this advice related to the definition in PPG3, the definition has not changed in relation to former minerals sites has not changed. Confirmation of whether the site should be regarded as previously developed land has been sought from GOYH.

Further work is required to establish the viability of the Waverley proposal in terms of adequate transport links, before it can be included in the housing land supply in subsequent documents.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The status of the site as “previously developed land” or otherwise should be confirmed.

The principle of development of a new community at Waverley has yet to be justified in comparison with other potential urban extensions that may be required to achieve the Borough’s requirement for future housing and employment provision as set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy.

In the light of the above the scale, mix and phasing of any major development at Waverley will be set out in the submission Core Strategy and supporting Allocations and Policies DPDs.

There is a need to check the implications of the Regional Transport Strategy strategic transportation investment programme and to consider further the potential implications of proposals such as Waverley on the strategic road network. In keeping with Circular 02/2007, the Council is currently working with the Highways Agency concerning the assessment of the potential impact of possible site allocation options.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 511

PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5248

Name: Mr R.D. Butters

Organisation: Hallam Land Management Ltd

Representation Number: 511

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The supply indicated in CS-PO Table 5 ‘other sources’ are described as ‘some of these sites could be included in the Allocations DPD’. Clearly the converse of this is also true suggesting that not all of these sites will be identified (and many if developed for housing would result in the loss of existing employment land). Therefore the inclusion of 4714 dwellings from other sources undermines the soundness of the CS-PO and is not a reliable source of supply.

Councils Response:
Some sites may be of sufficient size and suitability for housing developments for them to be allocated in the Allocations DPD, other, smaller sites may not be allocated, but could still come forward as windfalls and form part of the housing supply. Since the publication of the CSPO, PPS3 has changed government policy in relation to the inclusion of an assumed rate of windfalls in the housing supply. The Strategic Housing Land Availability assessment will determine what land is available for housing on a site by site basis. The Council will also monitor planning permissions and completions for housing in its Annual Monitoring Report, and take appropriate management action in accord with paragraph 65 of PPS3, if necessary.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that windfalls are only included in the housing supply if they can be justified according to paragraph 59 of PPS3, that is advising against a windfall allowance in the first ten years’ supply unless demonstrated by robust evidence. Consider the approach to this issue in the context of the joint SHLAA. Review action required under the SHLAA when available. The Council will monitor planning permissions and completions for housing in its Annual Monitoring Report, and take appropriate management action in accord with paragraph 65 of PPS3, if necessary.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  506
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5248
Name:  Mr R.D. Butters
Organisation:  Hallam Land Management Ltd

Representation Number:  506
Policy:  PD2       Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The consideration of housing land supply as proposed in the Core Strategy – Preferred Options (CS-PO) document depends upon an element of the supply coming from ‘other sources’ (derived from the Urban Potential Study) and from windfalls with these totalling 4,714 and 1700 dwellings respectively CS-PO (Table 4). This approach is not in accordance with national policy laid down in PPS3 (para 55) that requires the 10 year supply (and where possible the 15 year supply) of housing land is to be from identified, specific, developable sites. The suggestion in PD2 that the Local Development Documents only need to identify land for the first 5 years is also ill founded. The national policy approach is that there should be a rolling 5 year supply of identified deliverable housing land throughout the plan period – (PPS3 para 57).

Councils Response:
The need for sufficient locational detail in the Core Strategy to guide the allocation of sites to provide for at least 10 years housing supply together with identifying broad locations for a further 5 years supply is acknowledged. Preliminary housing allocation are being considered for the options stage of the supporting Allocations DPD. This work will inform the appropriate approach to broad housing distribution in the submission Core Strategy.

The submission Core Strategy will need to take into account the requirements of PPS3, in terms of the period dealt with, and what is included in the housing supply.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider a suitable approach for the submission Core Strategy to guide housing supply - either broad percentages of the total RSS quantum by SPZ or the distribution of specific number housing by settlement. Look at an appropriate end date (2024/26) and the implications of Sheffield's requirement not being achieved.
Take on the requirements of PPS3 regarding windfall assumptions and review action required under SHLAA when available.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations
Rep No: 543
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5249
Name: Mr Neil Rainsforth
Organisation:

Representation Number: 543
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Urban Extensions

Summary of Representation:
Any amendments to the Green Belt should not blur the distinction between Maltby and Hellaby.

Councils Response:
The extent and location of greenbelt amendments will be assessed as part of the Allocations DPD. This will take full account of the need to ensure the long term continuity of housing and employment land supply and the sustainability of the settlement in question. Additionally it will be explored as to where amendments may be justified as exceptional circumstances or a need to reconcile minor technical mapping inconsistencies has been identified.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes. Note concern for Green Belt amendments between Maltby and Hellaby.
Summary of Representation:
Clarity should be provided to confirm the circumstances in which residential development may be appropriate on sites previously in use or allocated for non-residential purposes, including the facilitation of wider brownfield objectives.

Councills Response:
This is an issue more appropriately addressed in the supporting Policies DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The comments will be taken into account in preparing the Policies DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 653
PD2 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 5254
Name: Mr Richard Frudd
Organisation: Indigo Planning Ltd (for National Grid Property Holdings)

Representation Number: 653
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: Location of housing development

Summary of Representation:
Strongly support the approach set out in section 3 of PD2.

Councils Response:
Support for the approach set out in section 3 of Policy Direction 2 is noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for the approach set out in section 3 of Policy Direction 2 will be taken into account in preparing Housing policies as part of the Core Strategy Submission Document.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 672
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5256

Name: Ms Janet Hodson

Organisation: JVH Town Planning (for Ivanhoe Properties and Mr David James)

Representation Number: 672

Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Location of housing development

Summary of Representation:
Opportunities to meet housing requirements should be fully explored within the Rotherham urban area (which has existing infrastructure) prior to Waverley where new infrastructure will be required.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction 2 identifies the potential for significant brownfield residential development at Waverley as part of an exemplar mixed use community to meet long term housing supply requirements. Work to assist preparation of the Site Allocations DPD will consider the potential for settlements (including the Rotherham urban area) to meet housing, employment and other requirements.

It is accepted that opportunities within Rotherham urban area should be fully explored prior to Waverley and that further work needs to be done on urban extensions/new communities which will need to be justified in the context of national and regional policy (including final RSS requirements) and supported by SA.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The comments will be taken into account in undertaking the Site Allocations DPD work, and further work needs to be done to appraise Waverley and other urban extensions and to take forward with appropriate justification in the submission document.
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Assessment of Representations  

Respondent I.D.  5259  
Name:  Mr Philip Abbott  
Organisation:  Shefffield City Council  

Representation Number:  371  
Policy:  PD2  
Object/Support:  Other  
Section / Paragraph:  Para. 7.48  

Summary of Representation:  
Assurance sought re: proposed Waverley development that:  
a) Timing: to commence after 2016;  
b) Transport: analyse fully the potential traffic impact and agree a transport strategy;  
c) School places: current provision involves a complex set of cross-boundary movements of students, school capacities will need to be reviewed jointly and appropriate contributions negotiated.

Councils Response:  
In preparing the Submission Core Strategy the Council will consider the inclusion of Waverley as a sustainable new community within the Borough.

The submission Core Strategy will have a clear settlement hierarchy, PD 1 used the Babtie Sustainable Settlement Study as the basis for creating a settlement hierarchy. The policy directions of the Core Strategy Preferred Options document will be developed into Core Strategy policies in the Submission document and will have a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development within the Borough.

However it is only if the principle of developing Waverley as a sustainable new community is accepted for inclusion within the submission Core Strategy that the issues raised above can be fully considered. It is understandable that there is some concern regarding the future development of Waverley. This Council is anxious to ensure that the development of a sustainable new community at Waverley is dealt with through the appropriate planning processes and will seek to manage the release of any housing land in the future in accord with the joint Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (being undertaken in partnership with Sheffield City Council and the north Derbyshire authorities). It will seek reassurance that all the appropriate studies to enable the development to happen have been undertaken including analysing fully the potential traffic impact. A transport strategy will also need to be prepared to the satisfaction of all the local authorities concerned. Issues regarding school places and and other social and community infrastructure will also need to be resolved.
However should early consideration of a new community at Waverley be required necessitated by the early submission of planning applications, the issues raised by the respondent will be fully considered and full consultation with adjoining local authorities be undertaken.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD next year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 259
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5260
Name: Jane Hanson
Organisation: Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number: 259
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: location of housing developments

Summary of Representation:
The Council should adopt measures to encourage conversion of existing properties rather than demolition and rebuilding on a larger footprint.

Councils Response:
The Council work to residential densities prescribed by Central Government, currently between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare. Any attempt by the Council to incorporate policies within the Local Development Framework that are contrary to government guidance will probably lead to the plan failing to receive government approval.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Development Control policies will prevent overdevelopment of sites.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 260
PD2 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 5260
Name: Jane Hanson
Organisation: Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number: 260
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: windfalls

Summary of Representation:
The promotion of more stringent guidelines in terms of handling windfall sites is supported, but these should be extended to include consultation between the developer and the community.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of this policy direction.
The Government is encouraging pre-application discussion between developers and the local community (further details of which are contained within the Statement of Community Involvement), but this is likely to be linked to the size of the proposed development so small schemes may not be included in such initiatives. The Council will be seeking to strengthen its Development Control policies to give more control over the development of residential garden land to prevent over-development and to safeguard the biodiversity of the area.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Strengthen the policy guidance for the development of residential gardens/curtilages as part of the Policies DPD.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 5266
Name: Mr D.W. Short
Organisation: The Emerson Group

Representation Number: 560
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: General

Summary of Representation:
The content of paragraph 7.59 and of PD2 is supported. The distribution in accordance with the settlement hierarchy is logical and backed up by the evidence base.

Councils Response:
Support is welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support will be taken into account in preparing the submission draft Core Strategy.
Representations Report.doc

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 563
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5267
Name: Barbara Turner
Organisation:

Representation Number: 563
Policy: PD2 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Urban Extensions

Summary of Representation:
Concern that green belt will be altered to allow for significant development in Dinnington and Laughton Common.

Councils Response:
The extent and location of greenbelt amendments will be assessed as part of the Allocations DPD. This will take full account of the need to ensure the long term continuity of housing and employment land supply and the sustainability of the settlement in question. Additionally it will be explored as to where amendments may be justified as exceptional circumstances or a need to reconcile minor technical mapping inconsistencies has been identified.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes. Note concern for Green Belt amendments in Dinnington and Laughton Common.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 564
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5269
Name:  Mrs Debbie Broad
Organisation:

Representation Number:  564
Policy:  PD2 Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Urban extensions

Summary of Representation:
Object to the proposals for an extension to the urban area in Dinnington (encroachment on the Green Belt).

Councils Response:
The extent and location of greenbelt amendments will be assessed as part of the Allocations DPD. This will take full account of the need to ensure the long term continuity of housing and employment land supply and the sustainability of the settlement in question. Additionally it will be explored as to where amendments may be justified as exceptional circumstances or a need to reconcile minor technical mapping inconsistencies has been identified.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes. Note concern for Green Belt amendments in Dinnington.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5270

Name:  Mr Keith Ellis

Organisation:

Representation Number:  566

Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Location of housing development

Summary of Representation:
Building on brownfield sites is far better than encroaching onto green belt areas.

Councils Response:
The search sequence which forms part of the criteria for assessing new housing sites indicates the priority for building on previously developed land within sustainable settlements and locations (a point reinforced within Policy Direction PD8). Furthermore Policy Direction PD1 outlines the Council’s commitment to maintaining the general extent of the Green Belt in line with national policy and RSS. Policy Direction PD2 section 5 gives examples of where localised reviews may be necessary. Any such changes to the Green Belt would have to be justified by exceptional circumstances. Work underway to support the emerging Allocations DPD will help determine the need or otherwise for any localised Green Belt changes to support the overall long-term sustainable development of the Borough’s settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the evidence emerging from the Allocations DPD survey work, the housing and employment land targets in emerging RSS and any other relevant studies to determine the need for localised Green Belt changes.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 374
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5271
Name:  Mr Eric Stowe
Organisation:  RMBC Access Officer

Representation Number:  374
Policy:  PD2  Object/Support:  Object

Summary of Representation:
There is no mention of lifetime homes. Should be a guaranteed % (10% bare min.) to enable fully adaptable inclusive housing provided (at little extra cost) - when built.

Councils Response:
Agree. The Core Strategy considers a number of housing related issues and whilst this is a principle that could be developed as a detailed development control policy it is appropriate that the principle is included at this stage of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the Core Strategy and any subsequent detailed policy DPD's include sufficient and appropriate references to the inclusion of lifetime homes. Consideration will need to be given to preparing an evidence base from which to negotiate a percentage of homes to be built to lifetime homes standards.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 375
PD2 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5271
Name:  Mr Eric Stowe
Organisation:  RMBC Access Officer

Representation Number:  375
Policy:  PD2 Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Not enough information / commitment to sustainable design to enable sustainable communities.

Councils Response:
Agree. The sustainability appraisal by Arup’s also highlighted this point.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the Core Strategy and any subsequent detailed policy DPD’s include sufficient and appropriate references to the inclusion of sustainable design in new development schemes. Consideration may need to be given to preparing supplementary planning guidance in the future to ensure that this issue is appropriately dealt with.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 488
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  958
Name: Mrs Alice Rodgers
Organisation: Maltby Environmental Group

Representation Number: 488
Policy: PD3  Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Strategic employment sites

Summary of Representation:
The potential need for adjustment to Maltby's green belt to accommodate an increase in employment land is identified on the grounds that it will make Maltby more sustainable - transport corridor improvements are suggested to link Bramley/Wickersley to employment land in Maltby - if Maltby is to be more sustainable will it need to import labour from Wickersley?

Councils Response:
The Policy Direction for Industry and Commerce (PD3) sets out a strategy which supports the settlement hierarchy identified in part 2 of Policy Direction 1 (Sustainable Communities). This identifies town centres and strategic employment sites across the borough as the primary locations for new employment. It also sets out a strategy for distribution centres, local businesses, tourism and the rural economy.

The Council has undertaken an Employment Land Review which has identified employment land requirements to 2021, considered the suitability for employment use of a number of sites across the borough, and the distribution of land favoured to retain for employment use by settlement. Surveys undertaken as part of the Employment Land Review considered sites against a range of strategic, sustainability and market attractiveness criteria. Further work will be required for the Core Strategy Submission Document to clarify employment land requirements at a settlement level, taking account of the settlement hierarchy and the findings of the employment land review.

This will inform work on the Site Allocations DPD, which in allocating land for a range of uses will have regard to the suitability, attractiveness and deliverability of sites for a range of uses, including employment. This may include de-allocation of existing sites and new allocations of employment land where appropriate. It will also have regard to the broader strategy set out in the Core Strategy including, for example, the creation of new local businesses and safeguarding local employment facilities where these contribute towards the continuing sustainability of communities.
**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Further work for the Core Strategy Submission Document will be required to clarify employment land requirements at a settlement level having regard to the identified employment land requirements of the borough to 2021.

It should be ensured that market attractiveness and the suitability of sites for meeting modern employment requirements are taken into consideration as part of the Site Allocations DPD work.
Respondent I.D. 1561
Name: Mr Peter White
Organisation: Derbyshire County Council

Representation Number: 105
Policy: PD3
Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Paras 7.63 to 7.69

Summary of Representation:
There appears to be some discrepancy in the industrial land availability figures in paras 7.63 to 7.69. Para 7.64 states that 337.41ha are available yet para 7.69 gives a figure of 237ha. Para 7.68 gives a requirement of 230ha by 2016 with 13ha per year between 2016-21. However, the total requirement given is 328ha rather than 295ha. The Council should clarify these figures.

Councils Response:
Need for further clarification of employment land figures noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Email response by Ryan Shepherd providing further clarification sent 9/3/07. Submission Core Strategy to incorporate this clarification, reflect emerging RSS guidance on employment land and incorporate any further development of the Rotherham Employment Land Study and projections.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 628
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1565
Name: Mr Brian Davies
Organisation: Natural England

Representation Number: 628
Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Point 6

Summary of Representation:
Concerns regarding the development of Rother Valley Country Park for hotel use.

Should site locations of this nature be in the core strategy?

Councils Response:
The YES! Project has already been granted planning permission (RB2005/0237 - for proposed leisure / tourism use classes D2 and C1) as an exceptional case, because of the employment and regeneration benefits of this one off proposal. The proposal was referred to the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber, and GOYH decided not to call it in.

Clarify PD3 part 6 to make clear whether expansion of the YES! Project beyond the current planning application boundaries would be acceptable in the future - adjacent to the YES! Project/ Rother Valley Country Park.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The concerns are noted - clarify PD3 or its successor.

..............................................................................................................
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 630
PD3 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  1565
Name:  Mr Brian Davies
Organisation:  Natural England

Representation Number:  630
Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Point 9

Summary of Representation:
Natural England is pleased to see the importance of tourism and rural economy reflected in Point 9.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action required.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 629
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1565
Name: Mr Brian Davies
Organisation: Natural England

Representation Number: 629
Policy: PD3
Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Point 9

Summary of Representation:
Point 9 (Rural Economy) should include the opportunity for environmentally focused business related to rural areas. Natural England is concerned that buildings in rural areas have to be redundant for reuse for other economic purposes.

Councils Response:
The list of suggested types of economic development is not intended to be exhaustive under this policy direction. It is accepted appropriate opportunities for environmentally focused business related to rural areas should be encouraged and this should be included in a future draft of the policy or its successor. Similarly the example given that buildings in rural areas have to be redundant for reuse for other economic purposes requires clarification that appropriate development in non-redundant buildings is also capable of being acceptable.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend Policy Direction or its successor to refer to opportunity for environmentally focused business related to rural areas and to clarify that buildings in rural areas do not have to be redundant for reuse for other economic purposes.

.................................................................
Summary of Representation:
Para.3: There is no mention of the appropriate greenfield/brownfield ratio for employment land. Presumably they should be no different than is considered appropriate for housing.

Councils Response:
Government guidance intends the brownfield target to specifically apply to housing development. The Council also considers that it is sustainable to also promote the use of reclaimed land for industrial and commercial development as seen in Templeborough, Manvers and Dinnington. This policy will have continuing emphasis in the LDF.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comment be noted - no action required.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  1800

Name:  Mr Paul Bedwell

Organisation:  Spawforths (for Woodford Group)

Representation Number:  577

Policy:  PD3  Object

Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The policy is too long and unclear and should be more concise.

A policy should be included in the core strategy that permits the re-use of identified employment sites for alternative uses (ie sites identified in the employment land review).

Councils Response:
The Core Strategy Preferred Options document puts forward nine ‘policy directions’ which will be developed into final policies in the Submission Document. In line with the advice in PPS12 clear and concise policies will be prepared for the Core Strategy Submission Document. These policies will avoid repetition of regional and national guidance.

Options for those sites not favoured for retention for employment use in the Employment Land Review will be considered as part of the Allocations DPD work. In terms of policies broadly relating to re-use of employment sites, this is an issue more appropriately addressed in the supporting Policies DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
In line with the advice in PPS12 clear and concise policies will be prepared for the Core Strategy Submission Document.

The comments will be taken into account in preparing the Policies DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 274
PD3 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 2243

Name: Mr Michael Long

Organisation: South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE)

Representation Number: 274

Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: 3.2/3

Summary of Representation:
Support to centralised employment (other than distribution centres) supporting public transport patterns.

Councils Response:
Support noted. Agree with comment but some concern that views about distribution centres should not be the appropriate principal locational determinant.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Note comment.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 683
PD3 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 2243

Name: Mr Michael Long

Organisation: South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE)

Representation Number: 683

Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Page 89, para 7.74

Summary of Representation:
Support for the need to align employment opportunities with public transport links.

Councils Response:
Attempts will generally be made to locate employment opportunities within local communities to reduce the need to travel. Where this is not possible, good public transport links will need to be developed and maintained to assist access to job opportunities further afield in main centres and strategic employment areas.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Take the above into account in developing the spatial apportionment of housing and employment land in the Submission Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 273
PD3 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 2243

Name: Mr Michael Long

Organisation: South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE)

Representation Number: 273

Policy: PD3  Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: 3.4

Summary of Representation:
Support to distribution centres on the urban periphery and primary road network.

Generally traffic generated by this sector is greater than employee access and it is recommended these developments are located away from the core public transport network.

Councils Response:
Support noted. However, there is a need to generally promote public transport access to all employment opportunities and an alternative approach for distribution centres is considered unlikely. Furthermore, locating this type of development adjacent to the primary road network means that it will nearly always be well served by public transport services.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Note SYPTE considers access to the core public transport network is less crucial in determining locational criteria for distribution centres.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 325
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  2413
Name:  Mr John Dunshea
Organisation:  Atisreal UK

Representation Number:  325
Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
PD3 does not refer specifically to innovative working practices such as the proposed mixed use community at Waverley. The benefits of this would include the attraction of a wider variety of business sectors throughout the Borough.

Councils Response:
The Council is reluctant to emphasise the role a mixed use community at Waverley will play in the borough’s economy - through the attraction of a wider variety of business sectors throughout the Borough – as yet the principle of a new mixed community at Waverley has not been established. Sufficient supporting evidence needs to be provided to justify the creation of a new mixed use community at Waverley and the “knock-on” effects of its development. How will these “knock-on” effects be measured? The benefit outlined above is an aspiration but its impact cannot be monitored at this stage.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the “spatial development strategy” for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved. Supporting evidence justifying the release of Waverley with potential benefits arising from its development will need to be provided. (See also response to HLS_2413_PD1_a). (Representation no.316)
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 326
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  2413
Name:  Mr John Dunshea
Organisation:  Atisreal UK

Representation Number:  326
Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The benefits of sustainable employment developments such as Waverley are not promoted through PD3.

Councils Response:
The Council is reluctant to emphasise the role a mixed use community at Waverley will play in the borough’s economy - as yet the principle of a new mixed community at Waverley has not been established. Sufficient supporting evidence needs to be provided to justify the creation of a new mixed use community at Waverley and the benefit of sustainable employment development will need to be evidenced and measured.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Supporting evidence justifying the release of Waverley with potential benefits arising from its development will need to be provided by both parties.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 293
PD3 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 293

Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)

Both current and draft RSS support the availability of sufficient land in sustainable locations to meet the needs of a modern economy with cities and urban areas as key drivers. Much employment growth will be in office-base uses and public services rather than general industry.

RSS emphasises the need to steer office, retail and leisure uses to town centres and this needs to be reflected in the Core Strategy in terms of policies for the location of particular uses and in providing more locational guidance for employment allocations.

Councils Response:
Comments noted. The current settlement appraisal/site options work will be looking to provide sufficient land in sustainable locations to meet the needs of a modern economy bearing in mind the Employment Land Review and forecasts for future employment needs.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Establish most appropriate up to date economic forecasts as a basis for quantifying future employment needs including office provision - commission further evidence if required. Ensure sufficient employment capacity is provided in site allocation options. Set out the broad distribution of employment land as part of the spatial strategy for the submission document.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 302  
PD3 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  2635

Name:  Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation:  Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number:  302

Policy:  PD3  
Object/Support:  Other

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 7 (Justification of Alternative Options)

The balance of industrial and commercial development between and within settlements should be developed and clarified to provide a strategic steer for the Site Allocations DPD.

Councils Response:
Comment accepted. It is intended to address this matter, to be informed by the outcome of settlement appraisal and site options work, before submission.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Address the balance of employment land between and within settlements to guide the Allocations DPD. Consider the need for additional evidence in support of apportionments between and within settlements. (See also 2635/293 and 300)
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 407
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3207
Name: Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation: JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number: 407
Policy: PD3  Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Employment Land review not yet finalised.

Councills Response:
See comments ref: Representation 3207/389.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 406
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3207
Name:  Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation:  JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number:  406
Policy:  PD3 Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
It is unclear if the monitoring indicators include an assessment of existing employment land in order to assess relative changes to other uses as a percentage of the whole supply

Councils Response:
The Rotherham LDF Annual Monitoring Report 2006 notes that “employment land lost to residential development” was formerly a Regional Spatial Strategy core indicator (1f) and is now no longer measured. It is noted that in the 2005 AMR this indicator showed no losses of employment land to residential use and also that no target has been set.

Further work will be required to refine the performance indicators including identifying appropriate targets. Consideration will be given to the appropriateness of this indicator and how it is measured as part of this work.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further work will be required to refine the performance indicators including identifying appropriate targets. Consideration will be given to the appropriateness of this indicator and how it is measured as part of this work.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 405  
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3207
Name: Ms Janet Hodson
Organisation: JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number: 405
Policy: PD3  
Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:  
This section should make it clear that there are circumstances where employment uses need to relocate and the land can be more effectively utilised for an alternative use. Providing land in locations suitable and attractive for business should be the key aim. This section will need to updated with the approved RSS and the finalised ELS.

Councils Response:  
This is an issue more appropriately addressed in the Allocations and supporting Policies DPDs. However it is also acknowledged that further work will be required to refine future employment land requirements and spatial distribution of employment land to inform the submission Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
Further work will be required to refine future employment land requirements and spatial distribution of employment land. The comments will be taken into account in undertaking this work and in preparing the Allocations and supporting Policies DPDs.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 404  
PD3 \ Object  

Respondent I.D. 3207  
Name: Ms Janet Hodson  
Organisation: JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)  

Representation Number: 404  
Policy: PD3  
Object/Support: Object  
Section / Paragraph: Section 1  

Summary of Representation:  
It is unclear where the 330 hectares of employment land comes from in PD3. Para 7.80 says that the DPD is to set the amount.  

Councils Response:  
Paragraph 7.80 indicates that the Core Strategy will set the quantum of employment land together with broad distributional principles. Paragraphs 7.65 to 7.68 set out a consideration of future employment land requirements, which are derived from the Employment Land Review.  

It is acknowledged however that further refinement of future projections and spatial distribution of employment land is required and therefore further work will be required to address this.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
Further work will be required to refine future employment land requirements and spatial distribution of employment land prior to submission of the Core Strategy.  

*******************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 425
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3239

Name: Mr Greg Smith

Organisation: Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number: 425

Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: 7.69

Summary of Representation:
It is suggested that in settlements such as Dinnington which are identified as settlements as a key focus for change and which are well provided for in the short term, there are potentially opportunities for some employment sites which no longer serve an economic function to be brought forward to meet the housing requirements of the Borough and would also contribute towards the previously developed land targets. It is therefore suggested that careful consideration is given to the release of the most suitable employment sites, taking account of location, proximity to facilities, opportunities for enhancement to the environment and relationships to the surrounding land uses.
In Dinnington the Green Belt is tightly drawn and there should be consideration given to the balance between employment and housing land to ensure that there is not an oversupply of employment land vis a vis housing land which may require the relaxation of the Green Belt boundary in this location.

Councils Response:
These matters will be considered in light of the settlement/sites assessment work, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and RSS requirements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the release of some employment land in Dinnington for housing purposes, as an alternative to the release of Green Belt.

Further work will be required to refine future employment land requirements and spatial distribution of employment land. The comments will be taken into account in undertaking this work and in preparing the Allocations and supporting Policies DPDs.
Respondent I.D.  3239
Name:  Mr Greg Smith
Organisation:  Development Land & Planning Consultants Ltd.

Representation Number:  426
Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Support

Summary of Representation:
In settlements such as Maltby which is identified as a settlement with High Potential for Change, there is a severe lack of land available for development with only 2.08ha of land available for development in the longer term. It is therefore crucial that in such settlements, existing allocations of employment land are retained in the interests of the economic vitality of the community. We therefore agree with one of the key conclusions of this section of the Core Strategy that further employment land is likely to be required in Maltby which will enable the community to have readily accessible sustainable employment opportunities without the need for commuting to other parts of the Borough.

Councils Response:
Support welcome

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 119

Respondent I.D.  3328
Name:  Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation:  Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number:  119
Policy:  PD3  
Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  PD3.5

Summary of Representation:
The Core Strategy should make a commitment towards providing incubator units as well as live/work units to support business start-ups across the Borough. This would complement RES objectives.

Councils Response:
The Council accepts the potential of incubator units to promote local business growth.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include reference to incubator units in the Submission Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 120
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3328
Name:  Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation:  Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number:  120
Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  PD3.3

Summary of Representation:
The Core Strategy should make reference to the Advanced Manufacturing Park (AMP) at Waverley and the significant contribution this development will provide in terms of developing the Region’s advanced engineering and metals cluster.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction PD3 section 3 refers to Waverley in the context of advanced manufacturing and metals. However, the Council accepts that the contribution of the Waverley AMP to the region’s advanced engineering and metals cluster could be highlighted, given its flagship status.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include reference to the Waverley AMP in the Submission Core Strategy to highlight its contribution to the region’s advanced engineering and metals cluster.
Summary of Representation:
The Core Strategy’s recognition of the role that knowledge based regional clusters will play in the emerging industrial and business developments within Rotherham is welcomed.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 117
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3328
Name:  Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation:  Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number:  117

Policy:  PD3
Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  PD3.1

Summary of Representation:
Planned employment provision levels within Rotherham Main Urban Area should reflect the settlement’s role within the Borough. The Core Strategy should also ensure that B1 office uses are directed principally towards Rotherham Urban Area in areas accessible via public transport. Employment land allocations in less sustainable areas should generally be limited to B2 and B8 uses, or for start-up units meeting local needs.

Councils Response:
The Council considers that the emphasis given to the town centre in Policy Direction PD3 section 2 is sufficient. However, the further clarity that would be gained by specifying the most appropriate location of certain types of development is accepted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider further detail on the types of use class development appropriate to particular locations in the Submission Core Strategy and/or the Policies DPD as appropriate.
Summary of Representation:
The Core Strategy’s approach to ensuring that sufficient land is available to accommodate infrastructure and buildings to meet the future employment needs of Rotherham is supported, as is the focus on Rotherham Town Centre for retail, office and business services.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 154
PD3 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 3418
Name: Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation: Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number: 154
Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
It is pleasing to see that the Core Strategy has been informed by an up to date Employment Land Review. The Assembly provided comments on Rotherham’s latest review earlier this year.

We are unclear, however, whether a revised employment land review has been prepared in light of the comments received and how this has consequently been reflected in this Preferred Options document.

Councils Response:
The Assembly's comments have been taken into account in the final version of the Employment Land Review of May 2007 (i.e. published later than the Core Strategy Preferred Options) and it is envisaged that this will inform the Submission Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Submission Core Strategy will be informed by the Rotherham Employment Land Review, updated if necessary, alongside any other relevant evidence.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 155
PD3 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3418
Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  155
Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The justification of the level of a rolling 5-year supply of land, including 230 ha to 2016 is based on the Sheffield CRDP(2) forecasts. While this represents a higher level than the indicative figure set out in draft RSS, its use is supported by (draft) Policy E3 that allows for local econometric studies to supplement the regional analysis.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Submission Core Strategy will be informed by the emerging RSS, the Sheffield and Rotherham Joint Economic Study and any other up-to-date evidence relating to the requirements for employment land available at time of drafting.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 157
PD3 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3418
Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  157
Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
We welcome the focus on Rotherham town centre for high trip generating uses and employment, retail, culture and education facilities.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Summary of Representation:
While the “Key Conclusions” following Para 7.74 are supported as a general approach, deallocation and the quality issues discussed in paragraph 7.78 need to be fully addressed. Specifically, the first section of policy PD3 (Industry and Commerce) should be amended to read:

1. Employment Requirements
The development of a suitably skilled workforce, land and infrastructure to meet the needs of Rotherham’s changing economy are supported.

Specific provision is made for the allocation of up to 330 hectares of employment land to 2021, within a range of sites to accommodate buildings and infrastructure to meet the future forecasted employment needs of the Borough in line with requirements of existing and new businesses in a modern, sustainable, innovative and competitive economy. Historic Employment sites not supportive of these aims will be put to other uses to support the overall Core Strategy.

Councils Response:
The Council is amenable to the suggested wording changes.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consideration be made to incorporating the suggested changes to the wording of Policy Direction PD3 in the Submission Core Strategy.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 3418
Name: Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation: Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number: 156
Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Support

Summary of Representation:
As recognised in the document, extending econometric forecast beyond a 10-year horizon is notoriously problematic. However, the approach taken by the document is supported as a means of looking at demand to 2021.

What is less clear, however, is the difference between gross and net requirements for employment land and how this has been considered in the calculation of land required.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Submission Core Strategy will incorporate a clarification of the difference between gross and net requirements for employment land.

(See Ryan Shepherd's email response to Derbyshire CC of 9/3/07 - referred to in Rep.1561/105)
Summary of Representation:
Strategic policy direction PD3 Industry proposes a substantial amount of industrial land allocation (330ha to 2021) based on a job need approach. Sport England would recommend were such a level of land allocation taken forward, the principles of: recycling of previously developed land; mixed use development; aspiring to increasing job densities; and safeguarding wherever possible the interests of existing sport and recreation facilities, catering where necessary for the sport and recreational needs of the workforce should be advanced.

Councils Response:
Comments noted. The principles of the recycling of brownfield land, promotion of mixed use and higher job densities are implicit in the Council's approach to PD3. The safeguarding of sport and recreation interests and providing for the sport and recreation needs of employees is probably better developed further in future detailed policies for sport and recreation.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Make the principles of the recycling of brownfield land, promotion of mixed use and higher job densities more explicit in developing the submission version of PD3. The safeguarding of sport and recreation interests and provision of facilities for employees should be included within the scope of detailed policy development in a future Policies DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 187  
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183  
Name: Mr G Blunn  
Organisation:  

Representation Number: 187  
Policy: PD3  
Object/Support: Object  
Section / Paragraph: Distribution centres

Summary of Representation:
The statement “availability of road access to both rail and canal” is unrealistic. Access into the BWB depot on Rotherham Road needs improvement, and canal access from Aldwarke Road suffers from height restrictions. Is there a need for a distribution “Centre”?  

Councils Response:
We recognise that while opportunities to locate distribution centres adjacent to the rail network and navigable waterways are desirable, restricting all new distribution centres to such locations is not practical. Otherwise sustainable and commercially viable sites will not always be adjacent to rail or canal and proximity to the networks does not guarantee that access is possible. In addition, rail and canal networks are not practical for all types of goods.

With regard to your second point, canal access from both Rotherham Road and Aldwarke Road is not ideal but workable. South Yorkshire is currently experiencing strong interest from distribution companies which are looking to take advantage of its central location and good transportation links. This is best exemplified by the ongoing creation of the 102,000 sq.m warehouse/distribution units for NEXT at Brookfields Park, Manvers due to open in early 2008.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 188
PD3 \ Comment

Respondent I.D. 4183
Name: Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number: 188
Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Comment

Section / Paragraph: Local Businesses

Summary of Representation:
Local businesses need support from the local authority to survive. Start-up facilities and rate rebates are needed, together with financial assistance.

Councils Response:
PD3 makes clear that creating and maintaining small scale businesses and local employment facilities is important so not as to prejudice the continuing sustainability of communities. The influence of the planning system in terms of providing support to local businesses is to some degree limited however and can only be seen in the context of the wider services available within the Local Authority in addressing this issue. For instance, Rotherham Investment and Development Office actively fosters the growth of start-up and small businesses by providing Business Incubators, business support facilities and managed office/workspace in the Rotherham area. RiDO currently operate three Business Centres which offer full business support and incubation services for pre-start, new start and small businesses at easy-in/easy-out terms.

RiDO also works in close collaboration with a number of partner organisations who are also involved in providing business support of various kinds. It does this under the auspices of the Rotherham Enterprise Network, which exists to encourage and develop a culture of entrepreneurship in the Rotherham area, and to streamline support to start-up and small businesses.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 186
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  4183
Name:  Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number:  186
Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Strategic employment

Summary of Representation:
The statement “Primary strategic locations for new industrial and business developments are being considered” does not provide the dynamic drive the unemployed need. Where are these locations? What target is set?

Councils Response:
Within the strategic employment sites subsection of PD3 reference is made to primary strategic locations for new industrial and business development being found within the Rotherham urban area, Wath(Manvers), Dinnington, Maltby/Hellaby and Waverley. Such areas are likely to be important from a commercial viewpoint but also in addressing the employment requirements of an enterprising, dynamic economy. As it is not appropriate for the Core Strategy to identify specific sites; these will be considered within the Allocations DPD. In terms of establishing targets the Core Strategy Preferred Options sets in place a set of provisional monitoring indicators which are drawn from existing sources although there may be a need to substitute more pertinent local indicators, via the Annual Monitoring Report, related to more detailed policies and site allocations in the supporting DPD's.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 184
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183
Name: Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number: 184
Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Town Centre employment

Summary of Representation:
Town centre employment is totally dependant of companies willing to remain within the Town Centre. Assurances must be given that the Renaissance proposals will be implemented.

Councils Response:
The Council is committed to driving the Renaissance initiative forward in order to revitalise the Town Centre. This commitment is reflected within the ongoing work to update the Strategic Development Framework for Rotherham town centre (funded through the Yorkshire Forward Renaissance Towns Initiative). The intention is to include the land use allocations from this refreshed document in the Allocations DPD and this will provide a further opportunity for the community and wider stakeholders to engage in this process and comment on the proposals put forward.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary
Representations Report.doc

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 183
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183

Name: Mr G Blunn

Organisation:

Representation Number: 183

Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Employment requirements

Summary of Representation:
330 hectares of available employment land will not reassure the unemployed, what are the advantages for firms to locate in Rotherham? What interest is being shown in the area?

Councils Response:
It is essential as part of the LDF process to identify sufficient land, in a variety of locations, for future industrial development. Once allocated, it is the role of the Rotherham Investment and Development Office (RIDO) to “sell” Rotherham as an ideal location for doing business. Details of RIDO’s activities can be found on the Council’s website – www.rotherham.gov.uk – under the business tab.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary
Summary of Representation:
Would be good to increase provision of local employment through parallel development of light industry at the Waleswood site to offset ‘dormitory village’ character.

Councils Response:
The Policy Direction for Industry and Commerce (PD3) sets out a strategy which supports the settlement hierarchy identified in part 2 of Policy Direction 1 (Sustainable Communities). This identifies town centres and strategic employment sites across the borough as the primary locations for new employment. It also sets out a strategy for distribution centres, local businesses, tourism and the rural economy.

The Council has undertaken an Employment Land Review which has identified employment land requirements to 2021, considered the suitability for employment use of a number of sites across the borough, and the distribution of land favoured to retain for employment use by settlement. Surveys undertaken as part of the Employment Land Review considered sites against a range of strategic, sustainability and market attractiveness criteria. Further work will be required for the Core Strategy Submission Document to clarify employment land requirements at a settlement level, taking account of the settlement hierarchy and the findings of the employment land review.

This will inform work on the Site Allocations DPD, which in allocating land for a range of uses will have regard to the suitability, attractiveness and deliverability of sites for a range of uses, including employment. This may include de-allocation of existing sites and new allocations of employment land where appropriate. It will also have regard to the broader strategy set out in the Core Strategy including, for example, the creation of new local businesses and safeguarding local employment facilities where these contribute towards the continuing sustainability of communities.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further work for the Core Strategy Submission Document will be required to clarify employment land requirements at a settlement level having regard to the identified employment land requirements of the borough to 2021.

It should be ensured that market attractiveness and the suitability of sites for meeting modern employment requirements are taken into consideration as part of the Site Allocations DPD work.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 232
PD3 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  4969

Name:  Mr Ian Rowe

Organisation:  Signet Planning (for Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estates)

Representation Number:  232

Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Strategic employment sites

Summary of Representation:
Whilst Manvers can be considered a primary strategic location for new industry and business careful consideration needs to be given to whether land identified for employment uses could be more suitably developed for other uses.

Councils Response:
Such considerations will form part of our deliberations into industrial land supply/ need as we prepare the Allocations and supporting Policies DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further work will be required to refine future employment land requirements and spatial distribution of employment land. The comments will be taken into account in undertaking this work and in preparing the Allocations and supporting Policies DPDs.
Summary of Representation:
The scope of this policy does not discuss the need for localised greenbelt adjustments; an important omission when such reference is made in relation to PD1. This is not acknowledged in the key diagram either.

Councils Response:
Section 1 of PD1 identifies that localised greenbelt boundary reviews may be necessary to meet employment and housing requirements. This is also addressed in PD2 (section 5) for housing and it is acknowledged that for consistency a similar approach should be adopted for employment in PD3. The Submission Core Strategy should identify broad strategic locations where localised greenbelt amendments may be necessary to meet identified employment land requirements in support of sustainable communities.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Industry and commerce policies prepared for the Submission Core Strategy should identify broad strategic locations where localised greenbelt amendments may be necessary to meet identified employment land requirements in support of sustainable communities.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5012
Name: Miss Julie Deptford
Organisation: GVA Grimley (Sheffield Business Park Ltd)

Representation Number:  680
Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Strategic employment sites

Summary of Representation:
Object to the lack of recognition of the role of non-central business parks and the failure to identify Sheffield Business Park as a strategic employment site in PD 3 or the key diagram.

Councils Response:
PD3 has been prepared with regard to the settlement hierarchy set out in PD1 and the responses to the alternative options consultation. Section 3 (Strategic Employment Sites) of PD3 identifies the primary strategic locations for new development within Rotherham. It is not appropriate for the Core Strategy to identify specific sites; these will be considered in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD. It is noted however that the majority of Sheffield Business Park is within Sheffield and will therefore be subject to allocations and policies within Sheffield’s Local Development Framework. That part of Sheffield Business Park within Rotherham will be subject to allocation and policies to be determined through the Site Allocations and Policies DPDs.

It is appropriate to acknowledge cross boundary relationships and the economic role of Sheffield Business Park is acknowledged in the recent Employment Land Review. Reference to Sheffield Business Park therefore may be appropriate in the Core Strategy Submission Document supporting text.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Supporting text of the Core Strategy Submission Document should have regard to cross boundary relationships by acknowledging strategically important industrial and commercial locations outside Rotherham’s administrative boundaries, including Sheffield Business Park.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5012
Name:  Miss Julie Deptford
Organisation:  GVA Grimley (Sheffield Business Park Ltd)

Representation Number:  682
Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Advertisements

Summary of Representation:
It is important that advertisement consent applications are supported to assist business and commerce

Councils Response:
Note the support for part 7 of Policy Direction 3.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for part 7 of Policy Direction 3 will be taken into account in preparing industry and commerce policies in the Core Strategy Submission Document.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 344  
PD3 \ Object  

Respondent I.D. 5024  
Name: Ms Nicola Sewell  
Organisation: Indigo Planning  

Representation Number: 344  
Policy: PD3  
Object/Support: Object  

Section / Paragraph:  

Summary of Representation:  
Suggest amendments to enable land at J33 to be included for other activities. Section 6 of PD3 should be amended to include the land at Junction 33 Parkway. The residual land on this site would be suitable for business and leisure based tourism.  

Councils Response:  
During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation later in the year.  

At this stage the figures for new house building and employment land supply (provided in the Core Strategy Preferred Options) are indicative only, although all potential employment sites have been reviewed in the recent Employment Land Review (published May 2007) and available on the Forward Planning web page. No assessment has yet been made of potential sites for community and leisure facilities including hotel development.  

The submission Core Strategy will have a clear spatial strategy for future development throughout the Borough. The policy directions will be developed into Core Strategy policies and the document will have a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development within the Borough.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved. Consideration will be given to both the need for and suitable locations of new hotel developments within the Borough.
**Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council**  
**CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS**

**Assessment of Representations**

**Rep No: 343**

PD3 \ Object

**Respondent I.D.**  5024  
**Name:**  Ms Nicola Sewell  
**Organisation:**  Indigo Planning

**Representation Number:**  343

**Policy:**  PD3  
**Object/Support:**  Object

**Section / Paragraph:**

**Summary of Representation:**  
Policy PD3 does not include suitable individual sites that represent development opportunities for commercial development. Individual sites should be included within PD3 that make efficient use of land e.g. sites which already benefit in part from planning permission. These residual sites will enable comprehensive development of sites and thereby contribute to a more sustainable pattern of development. In addition, sites situated in gateway locations with excellent motorway connections and which are located on a key transport corridor, will assist in enhancing the image of the area. This will assist in meeting the identified shortfall of employment land and provide a range of site sizes and quality.

**Councils Response:**  
The housing and employment figures provided in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document are indicative only. During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation later in the year.

At this stage the figures for new house building and employment land supply (provided in the Core Strategy Preferred Options) are indicative only, although all potential employment sites have been reviewed in the recent Employment Land Review (published May 2007) and available on the Forward Planning web page.

The submission Core Strategy will have a clear spatial strategy for future development throughout the Borough. The policy directions will be developed into Core Strategy policies and the document will have a coherent and consistent spatial strategy for growth and development within the Borough.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 5147
Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 459
Policy: PD3  Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Part 6

Summary of Representation:
Object to the identification of a need for ‘roadside services’ this will inevitably lead to development cluttering the roadside.

Councils Response:
The identification of land for roadside services would be in response to the identification of the need to provide a legitimate service to visitors. Policies should ensure that road side clutter is minimised.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Subsequent policies developed as part of the Policies DPD should ensure that road side clutter is minimised.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 455
PD3 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  455
Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Part 3

Summary of Representation:
Support PD3 part 5 – Creation of local businesses

Councils Response:
Welcome Support

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 456

PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5147

Name: Mr John King

Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 456

Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Part 4

Summary of Representation:
Access to rail and navigation channel must be given greater priority. Alternative transport of freight is a necessity. All new distribution centres must be located next to either the rail network/navigable water ways. If planners continue to view access to the road as the main consideration for such centres the current congestion problems will never be solved.

Councils Response:
While opportunities to locate distribution centres adjacent to the rail network and navigable waterways are desirable, restricting all new distribution centres to such locations is not practical. Otherwise sustainable and commercially viable sites will not always be adjacent to rail or canal and proximity to the networks does not guarantee that access is possible. In addition, rail and canal networks are not practical for all types of goods.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Strengthening the emphasis on the rail and canal networks will be considered in production of the submission draft Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 453
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5147

Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 453
Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Part 1

Summary of Representation:
Object strongly to the provision of 330 Hectares of employment land to 2021. There seems some uncertainty that this is required as the chosen forecast (Sheffield City Region) only goes up to 2016 and sets a figure of 230. Inappropriate to assume that 13 ha per year take up will continue up to 2021. We feel that this figure could lead to excessive allocations of employment land.

Councils Response:
In the absence of econometric modelling beyond 2016 (after which it is acknowledged that forecasting has significant limitations reducing usefulness) and in light of the need to plan for the end of the LDF period (2021) it is considered appropriate to project likely take up figures forward to give a broad indication of requirements. No objection to this approach was received as part of consultation on the Employment Land Review and the CPRE have provided no evidence as to why an assumption of 13ha/year take up beyond 2016 is inappropriate.

It is acknowledged however that further refinement of future projections and spatial distribution of employment land is required and therefore further work will be required to address this.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further work will be required to refine future employment land requirements and spatial distribution of employment land prior to submission of the Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 458
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5147
Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 458
Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Part 6

Summary of Representation:
Further development of Rother Valley Country Park must not occur. Businesses and hotels are not compatible with the Country Park which provides quiet recreation for residents of South Yorkshire and North East Derbyshire. Further growth of leisure activities would not comply with part 2 of this policy, which we support. Is the Yes! Project a special case? As stated by the CPRE during consultation on Yes! Project - planning application, such uses must be located within town centres where they will aid regeneration (this is compliant with PD3 part 2). This view is supported by ARUP in the SA comments.

Councils Response:
See comments under 5147/463 re. the YES! Project. The YES! Project has already been granted planning permission (RB2005/0237 - for proposed leisure / tourism use classes D2 and C1) as an exceptional case, because of the employment and regeneration benefits of this one off proposal. The proposal was referred to the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber, and GOYH decided not to call it in.

Clarify PD3 part 6 to make clear whether expansion of the YES! Project beyond the current planning application boundaries would be acceptable in the future - adjacent to the YES! Project/ Rother Valley Country Park.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The concerns are noted - clarify PD3 or its successor.

..........................................................................................................................
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 457
PD3 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5147

Name: Mr John King

Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 457

Policy: PD3   Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Part 5

Summary of Representation:
Support (supporting small scale local business)

Councils Response:
Support welcome

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None

............................................................................................................
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 461  
PD3 \ Object  

Respondent I.D. 5147  

Name: Mr John King  
Organisation: CPRE  

Representation Number: 461  
Policy: PD3  
Object/Support: Object  
Section / Paragraph: Part 8  

Summary of Representation:  
Need to differentiate between IT and telecommunications. Support is given for IT developments which are essential to business, but fear that new telecommunications infrastructure will have a greater impact on the landscape than the benefits they bring. Needs reference to less intrusive forms of infrastructure e.g. mast sharing and roaming. Technology will change faster than this DPD; less intrusive methods may become available in future.  

Councils Response:  
This part of PD7 does not refer to specific types of infrastructure and should, therefore be flexible enough to deal with changes in technology. The policy direction refers to controlling proliferation and visual amenity impacts.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
None
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 462
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5147
Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 462
Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Part 9

Summary of Representation:
Policies regarding the rural economy should include references to opportunities for live work units to reduce congestion and sustain rural services during daytime when many villages are deserted.

Councils Response:
Live work units could contribute to reducing the need to travel in all types of locations and may have increased benefits in rural areas where there are often fewer opportunities for the use of public transport.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments should be noted in the production of the submission draft and the Allocations and Policies DPDs.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 463
PD3 \ Comment

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  463
Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Comment
Section / Paragraph:  Sustainability Appraisal

Summary of Representation:
Support the conclusion of ARUP – but how does the YES! Project and its expansion comply with the view that the policy “directs development towards the town centres and the policy enhances the function and vibrancy of town and district centres”.

Policy must include the requirement that commercial developments contribute to tackling climate change and the reduction in use of natural resources. Business and industry are the largest emitters of climate change gases.

Employment development should also contribute to the sustainability of communities by contributing to wider social objectives and improvements to local services through section 106 and planning conditions.

Councils Response:
The YES! Project has already been granted planning permission (RB2005/0237 - for proposed leisure / tourism use classes D2 and C1) as an exceptional case, because of the employment and regeneration benefits of this one off proposal. The proposal was referred to the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber, and GOYH decided not to call it in.

Paragraph 7.81 suggests that future SPD's (yet to be programmed in the Local Development Scheme) could include updated design guidance for employment sites and buildings (including mitigation and adaptation to climate change). In addition Policy Direction 8 promotes water efficiency, the sustainable design and construction of new buildings, improved energy efficiency in new developments and to increase installed renewable energy capacity

PD1 addresses the need for developers to make contributions towards community infrastructure.
Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The concerns are noted.
Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  460
Policy:  PD3 Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Part 7

Summary of Representation:
Support appropriate advertisement, subject to the avoidance of adverse visual impact.

Councils Response:
Support welcome

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5241
Name:  Mr Peter Ludlam
Organisation:

Representation Number:  349
Policy:  PD3 Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Map 8

Summary of Representation:
Difficult to comment on the amount of employment land needed without seeing the individual sites. Map fails to specify whether the land is greenfield or brownfield.

Councils Response:
The Council has undertaken an Employment Land Review for the Borough; part one takes stock of the existing situation and sets out a review of Rotherham's local economy at present. Part two of the review identifies future requirements. Finally, a qualitative review of employment land is presented and this will assist in establishing a portfolio of employment land to meet Rotherham's future requirements and market needs.

The Employment Land Review (June 2007) is now available on the Forward Planning web page as a background document. This Review identifies all Greenfield and Brownfield sites. Consultation into the review of the borough’s employment land was undertaken with key stakeholders in January / February 2007, the results of which were also made available on the Council’s web site. The Employment Land Review will feed into the Allocations document that will be consulted on in 2008.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.

There will also be further opportunities to comment on site allocations at a later preferred options stage in 2008.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 589
PD3 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 5247

Name: Mr Edward Uwechue

Organisation: The Development Planning Partnership

Representation Number: 589

Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Town centre employment

Summary of Representation:
Welcome the focus of employment for retail uses in town centres across Rotherham.

Councils Response:
Support for the focus of employment for retail uses in town centres across Rotherham is noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for the focus of employment for retail uses in town centres across Rotherham will be taken into account in preparing Industry and Commerce policies in the Core Strategy Submission Document.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Representative Number: 590

Policy: PD3

Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Town centre employment

Summary of Representation:
Sites on the town centre periphery should be allocated for retail and office uses to aid implementation of the Rotherham Renaissance programme

Councils Response:
Paragraph 2.16 of PPS6 sets out the broad requirements for local planning authorities in planning for town centres, including assessing the need for new floorspace for retail, leisure and other main town centre uses (including offices), identifying deficiencies in provision, and assessing the capacity of existing centres to accommodate new development, including, where appropriate, the scope for extending the primary shopping area and/or town centre. Further work will therefore be required to support the Allocations DPD on the need for and capacity of Rotherham Town Centre to accommodate further development of main town centre uses, including the appropriateness of the existing town centre boundary.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Detailed consideration of the Rotherham Urban Area including Rotherham Town Centre and its periphery will be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work. Dependant upon the outcome of further work the Submission Core Strategy may promote the expansion of Rotherham Town Centre if this is considered appropriate.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 599  
PD3 \ Object  

Respondent I.D. 5252  

Name: Miss Beverley Smith  

Organisation: GVA Grimley (for Express Park Developments Ltd)  

Representation Number: 599  

Policy: PD3  
Object/Support: Object  

Section / Paragraph: Town centre employment  

Summary of Representation:  
Potential should be included for mixed use development in edge-of-centre locations within close proximity of the town centre. Significant investment opportunities in such locations should be facilitated where they would lead to comprehensive regeneration of the town centre. Amended wording suggested:  
Town centre employment  
“The principal focus for employment in retail, offices, public/business services, culture and entertainment, sport, health and high education facilities and other high public movement generators continues to be within Rotherham Town Centre, major development sites in edge of town centre locations in Rotherham and other outlying town centres defined in the Retail/Leisure Policy creating opportunities for accessible mixed use.”  

Councils Response:  
No indication of the type of mixed use envisaged has been provided, however in terms of employment section 3 of PD3 identifies the Rotherham urban area, including the Town Centre periphery, as a primary strategic location for new industrial and business development.  

Further work will be undertaken including a consideration of the types of development which will be acceptable and/or promoted in differing locations. Detailed consideration of the Rotherham Urban Area including Rotherham Town Centre and its periphery will be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work. Work will also be required on the supporting Development Control Policies DPD in relation to acceptable uses within allocations.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
The comments will be taken into account in the detailed consideration of Rotherham Town Centre and its periphery to be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work, and in preparing the supporting Development Control Policies DPD. Subject to the outcome of
further work the Submission Core Strategy may promote mixed use development in edge of centre locations where this is considered appropriate.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 602
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5253
Name: Miss Beverley Smith
Organisation: GVA Grimley (for Evans Regeneration Investments Ltd)

Representation Number:  602
Policy: PD3  Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Town centre employment

Summary of Representation:
Potential should be included for employment development in edge-of-centre locations within close proximity of the town centre. Significant investment opportunities in such locations should be facilitated where they would lead to comprehensive regeneration of the town centre. Amended wording suggested in representation.

Councils Response:
Section 3 of PD3 identifies the Rotherham urban area, including the Town Centre periphery, as a primary strategic location for new industrial and business development.

Further work will be undertaken including a consideration of the types of development which will be acceptable and/or promoted in differing locations. Detailed consideration of the Rotherham Urban Area including Rotherham Town Centre and its periphery will be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work. Work will also be required on the supporting Development Control Policies DPD in relation to acceptable uses within allocations.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The comments will be taken into account in the detailed consideration of Rotherham Town Centre and its periphery to be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work, and in preparing the supporting Development Control Policies DPD. Subject to the outcome of further work the Submission Core Strategy may promote employment development in edge of centre locations where this is considered appropriate and does not repeat policy established elsewhere such as national guidance.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 656
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5254

Name: Mr Richard Frudd

Organisation: Indigo Planning Ltd (for National Grid Property Holdings)

Representation Number: 656

Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Argue that over a third of land identified for employment use in Wath (paragraph 7.71) is unlikely to come forward without inclusion of a residential element, and that the allocations document should clarify that the LPA will adopt a flexible and realistic approach to the consideration of planning applications in order to secure the delivery of planning objectives.

Councils Response:
This is a matter for consideration as part of the Allocations and Policies DPDs work.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The comments will be taken into account in undertaking work on the Site Allocations and Policies DPDs.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 668
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5255

Name:  Mr Bill Davidson

Organisation:  Indigo Planning Ltd (for Safety Kleen Ltd)

Representation Number:  668

Policy:  PD3 Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Support PD3 but seek extension of employment allocation at Booker Way, Dinnington to include land currently identified as proposed local nature reserve.

Councils Response:
Support for PD3 is noted.

PD3 identifies Dinnington as a primary strategic location for new industrial and business development, however the allocation of specific sites will be considered in the Site Allocations DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for Policy Direction 3 will be taken into account in preparing Industry and Commerce policies in the Core Strategy Submission Document.

Site suggestion to be considered as part of the Allocations DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  Rep No: 673  
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5256

Name: Ms Janet Hodson

Organisation: JVH Town Planning (for Ivanhoe Properties and Mr David James)

Representation Number: 673

Policy: PD3  
Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Providing land in locations suitable and attractive to business should be the key aim, including the release of outdated sites and potential allocation of new land (if it is required) in more suitable locations.

Councils Response:
The Policy Direction for Industry and Commerce (PD3) sets out a strategy which supports the settlement hierarchy identified in part 2 of Policy Direction 1 (Sustainable Communities). This identifies town centres and strategic employment sites across the borough as the primary locations for new employment. It also sets out a strategy for distribution centres, local businesses, tourism and the rural economy.

The Council has undertaken an Employment Land Review which has identified employment land requirements to 2021, considered the suitability for employment use of a number of sites across the borough, and the distribution of land favoured to retain for employment use by settlement. Surveys undertaken as part of the Employment Land Review considered sites against a range of strategic, sustainability and market attractiveness criteria. Further work will be required for the Core Strategy Submission Document to clarify employment land requirements at a settlement level, taking account of the settlement hierarchy and the findings of the employment land review.

This will inform work on the Site Allocations DPD, which in allocating land for a range of uses will have regard to the suitability, attractiveness and deliverability of sites for a range of uses, including employment. This may include de-allocation of existing sites and new allocations of employment land where appropriate. It will also have regard to the broader strategy set out in the Core Strategy including, for example, the creation of new local businesses and safeguarding local employment facilities where these contribute towards the continuing sustainability of communities.
**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Further work for the Core Strategy Submission Document will be required to clarify employment land requirements at a settlement level having regard to the identified employment land requirements of the borough to 2021.

It should be ensured that market attractiveness and the suitability of sites for meeting modern employment requirements are taken into consideration as part of the Site Allocations DPD work.
**Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council**  
**CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS**

**Assessment of Representations**

Rep No: 674  
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5257

Name: Mr Ken Burley

Organisation: Acting as Agent for Redirack

Representation Number: 674

Policy: PD3  
Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: 7.71

**Summary of Representation:**
Disagree that Swinton/Kilnhurst has a severe lack of employment land because it has good access to the Wath/Manvers area and lack of land is not a critical issue for individual settlements. The core strategy is about the wider picture although the needs of settlements/planning zones must be considered as part of this whole.

**Councils Response:**
The comments will be taken into account and further consideration will be given to the appropriateness of the hierarchy, and the role of settlements within this. The comments will also be taken into account in undertaking work on the Site Allocations DPD, which will include more detailed consideration of settlements and their requirements.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
The comments will be taken into account and further consideration will be given to the appropriateness of the hierarchy, and the role of settlements within this. The comments will also be taken into account in undertaking work on the Site Allocations DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 676
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5261
Name: Mr Steve McBurney
Organisation: GVA Grimley (for Rotherham College of Arts and Technology)

Representation Number: 676
Policy: PD3  Object/SUPPORT: Object
Section / Paragraph: Town centre employment

Summary of Representation:
Agree in principle to paragraph 2 of PD3 and support reference to educational facilities; however expansion of policy required in order to promote the development of key sites on the edge of Rotherham town centre.

Councils Response:
Agreement in principle with section 2 of PD3 and the reference to educational facilities is noted.

Further work will be undertaken including a consideration of the types of development which will be acceptable and/or promoted in differing locations. Detailed consideration of the Rotherham Urban Area including Rotherham Town Centre and its periphery will be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work. Work will also be required on the supporting Development Control Policies DPD in relation to acceptable uses within allocations.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Agreement in principle with section 2 of PD3 and the reference to educational facilities will be taken into account in preparing Industry and Commerce policies in the Core Strategy Submission Document.

The comments will be taken into account in the detailed consideration of Rotherham Town Centre and its periphery to be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work, and in preparing the supporting Development Control Policies DPD. Subject to the outcome of further work the Submission Core Strategy may promote development in edge of centre locations where this is considered appropriate and does not repeat policy established elsewhere such as national guidance.
Representations Report.doc

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 677
PD3 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5262
Name: Julie Deptford
Organisation: GVA Grimley (for Sheffield City Airport and Sheffield Airport Properties Ltd)

Representation Number: 677
Policy: PD3 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Strategic employment sites

Summary of Representation:
Given the proximity of Sheffield City Airport to Rotherham it is essential that cross boundary relationships are acknowledged. No reference is made to the economic role of Sheffield Business Park or the significant economic development and associated benefits that will arise from redevelopment of part of the Airport. These should be recognised as strategic employment sites in PD3

The Core Strategy should reflect the changes taking place at the airport and recognise its strategic location.

Councils Response:
Section 3 (Strategic Employment Sites) of PD3 identifies the primary strategic locations for new development within Rotherham. It is not appropriate for the Core Strategy to identify specific sites; these will be considered in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD. It is noted however that the majority of Sheffield Business Park is within Sheffield and will therefore be subject to allocations and policies within Sheffield’s Local Development Framework. That part of Sheffield Business Park within Rotherham will be subject to allocation and policies to be determined through the Site Allocations and Policies DPDs.

However it is appropriate to acknowledge cross boundary relationships and the economic role of Sheffield Business Park is acknowledged in the recent Employment Land Review. Reference to Sheffield Business Park therefore may be appropriate in the Core Strategy Submission Document supporting text.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Supporting text of the Core Strategy Submission Document should have regard to cross boundary relationships by acknowledging strategically important industrial and commercial
locations outside Rotherham’s administrative boundaries, including Sheffield Business Park.
Representations Report.doc

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 561
PD3 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5266
Name:  Mr D.W. Short
Organisation:  The Emerson Group

Representation Number:  561
Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  General

Summary of Representation:
Paragraph 7.79 and PD3 are supported. The amount and variety of employment opportunities proposed seems to match the general requirements of the Borough.

Councils Response:
Support is welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support will be taken into account in preparing the submission draft Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5268
Name: Miss Beverley Smith
Organisation: GVA Grimley (for Threadneedle Property Investments Ltd)

Representation Number:  679
Policy:  PD3  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  7.63-7.82

Summary of Representation:
Existing employment allocations realistically capable of being implemented should be retained. Support should be given to retention of employment allocations west of Rotherham Town Centre in the Templeborough area and all current allocations should remain.

PD3 should make reference to existing allocations and their retention where appropriate.

Councils Response:
Part 3 of PD3 identifies Rotherham urban area including Templeborough as a primary strategic location for new industrial and business development. The allocation of specific sites will be considered in the Allocations DPD; therefore it is inappropriate for PD3 to make reference to existing allocations. Preparation of the Allocations DPD will take account of the Core Strategy Policy Directions and the findings of the Employment Land Review which has considered the suitability and viability of a range of employment sites, including those UDP development sites which remain undeveloped. It will also take account of a range of factors, including the deliverability of sites for allocation.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further work will be required to refine future employment land requirements and spatial distribution of employment land. The comments will be taken into account in undertaking this work and in preparing the Allocations and supporting Policies DPDs.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations  
Rep No: 90  
PD4 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  72
Name: Mr Malcolm Walker
Organisation: Peacock & Smith (on behalf of Wm Morrisons)

Representation Number: 90
Policy: PD4  
Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:  
Catcliffe Shopping Centre should be defined as a district centre. Justification is because of the proposed new mixed use community at Waverley. See also sites rep. requesting consideration of further retail uses on the adjacent vacant land.

Councils Response:  
Many people have put forward suggestions for sites to be looked at for development in the future. During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough will be undertaken. It is anticipated that the sites will then be put out to consultation later in the year for all stakeholders to consider.

However at this stage the figures for new house building and employment land supply (provided in the Core Strategy) are indicative only, and the principle of the need for a new community at Waverley has not yet been accepted. The retail hierarchy reflects existing retail opportunities in each settlement, not future likely need if the community / settlements in the area were to grow or if Waverley were to be developed as a sustainable new community.

If the development of Waverley as a new sustainable community is accepted for inclusion within the submission Core Strategy, then consideration will be given to the status of Catcliffe as a district shopping centre.

It is only when the survey work to assess potential new development needs in a settlement has been completed, that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken. Table 6 and Map 7 of the draft Core Strategy provide an indication of the current housing potential using information from the existing Unitary Development Plan and the Urban Potential Study. It is the likely ranking of a settlement in the settlement hierarchy (PD1) that will determine its status as a district or local centre.
**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD later in the year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.

*******************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  1561
Name:  Mr Peter White
Organisation:  Derbyshire County Council

Representation Number:  106
Policy:  PD4  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  PD4.2

Summary of Representation:
Derbyshire CC supports the policy approach which seeks to locate new retail development within Rotherham town centre and other centres in the Borough and resist out-of-centre development. This approach should ensure that town centres in north east Derbyshire are not adversely affected by new retail development (in Rotherham).

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 521
PD4 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  1578

Name:  Mr Chris Telford

Organisation:  Bassetlaw District Council

Representation Number:  521

Policy:  PD4  Object/SUPPORT:  Other

Section / Paragraph:  Retail Centre Hierarchy

Summary of Representation:
Although no objection is made to Maltby being classified as a Main Town, it is noted that it is not referred to as such in the Yorkshire and Humber draft RSS policy SY1.

Councils Response:
Agree with comment made. This issue has been subject to debate as part of Rotherham’s representation to the Examination in Public for RSS and the subsequent receipt of the Panel Report. The Panel’s recommendations, along with all of the representations about the draft RSS, are now being considered by GOYH who will then publish “Proposed Changes” for consultation.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Await outcome of proposed changes to RSS for implications upon submission draft Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 520
PD4 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1578
Name: Mr Chris Telford
Organisation: Bassetlaw District Council

Representation Number: 520
Policy: PD4 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Retail Centre Hierarchy

Summary of Representation:
No concerns are expressed at the principal hierarchical approach and the scope for retail and services development beyond Rotherham, but with regard to the specific amount of retail development proposed east of Rotherham. The potential for such significant major retail development in relatively close proximity to this district and the sub-regional centre of Worksop i.e. 10,000-20,000m2 of such development at both Dinnington and Maltby is a matter for objection. It is proposed therefore that the proposed level of retail development in the Main Towns such as Dinnington and Maltby be reduced to no more than 15,000m2 as a maximum in each case.

Councils Response:
The floorspace figures in PD4 indicate the relative scale of the types of centres in the retail hierarchy and are not upper limits on floorspace.

Paragraph 2.42 of PPS6 indicates that local planning authorities should consider setting an indicative upper limit for the scale of developments likely to be permissible in different types of centres, and that developments above these limits should be directed to centres higher up the town centre hierarchy. Further work to inform the Submission Core Strategy document and the Allocations DPD will be required to consider the appropriateness of the retail hierarchy with regard to the typology of centres set out in Annex A of PPS6. In conjunction with this consideration will be given to upper limits for the scale of developments which will be appropriate for centres within the retail hierarchy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further work to inform the Submission Core Strategy document and the Allocations DPD will be required to consider the appropriateness of the retail hierarchy with regard to the typology of centres set out in Annex A of PPS6. In conjunction with this consideration will be given to upper limits for the scale of developments which will be appropriate for centres within the retail hierarchy.
Respondent I.D. 2413

Name: Mr John Dunshea

Organisation: Atisreal UK

Representation Number: 327

Policy: PD4  Object/Support: Object

Summary of Representation:
The retail hierarchy could be further enhanced through the introduction of a further level entitled new neighbourhood facilities.

Councils Response:
The retail hierarchy reflects existing retail opportunities in each settlement, not future likely need if the community / settlements in the area were to grow or if Waverley were to be developed as a sustainable new community.

If the development of Waverley as a new sustainable community is accepted for inclusion within the submission Core Strategy, then consideration will also need to be given to the status of Catcliffe within the settlement hierarchy.

It is only when the survey work to assess potential new development needs in a settlement has been completed, that any comparison with other settlements and sites can be undertaken. Table 6 and Map 7 of the draft Core Strategy provide an indication of the current housing potential using information from the existing Unitary Development Plan and the Urban Potential Study. It is the likely ranking of a settlement in the settlement hierarchy (PD1) that will determine its status as a district or local centre.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD later in the year. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 52
PD4 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 3284
Name: Mr Colin Griffiths
Organisation: Satnam Planning Services Limited

Representation Number: 52
Policy: PD4 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
We support the proposed focus for new leisure and retail floor space within the Borough to be directed towards the Town Centre. There should be strict controls over Out of Town growth on new and existing retail and leisure parks.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for the focus of new retail and leisure floor space being in the Town Centre and the need for strict control of out-of-town facilities in PD4 be noted.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3328
Name:  Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation:  Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number:  121
Policy:  PD4  
Object/Subject:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  PD4.1

Summary of Representation:
Policy PD4 and its commitment towards retaining Rotherham as the Borough’s principal town centre for shopping, commerce, culture and leisure is supported. This complements the renaissance objectives of the RES.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 159
PD4 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3418
Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  159
Policy:  PD4  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
We support the emphasis on Rotherham town centre as the primary focus for retail and leisure development within the district and the general approach to a retail centre hierarchy.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
**Summary of Representation:**
We would hope that a stronger policy approach to discouraging further out of centre retail/leisure development will be adopted within the Core Strategy. This would better support one of the key strategic aims of the South Yorkshire Spatial Vision as agreed by the Leaders of the four Authorities in November 2004.

**Councils Response:**
Policy Direction PD4 sets out the need for retail/leisure development proposals outside designated centres to demonstrate compliance with national policy given in PPS6. We consider this a sufficient policy stance.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Consider the need to expand the policy in the submission Core Strategy to interpret the local interpretation rather than repetition of PPS6 in relation to out of town retail and leisure development.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 3424
Name: Mr Henryk Peterson
Organisation: Sport England

Representation Number: 68
Policy: PD4 Object/Support: Comment

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Strategic policy direction PD4 Retail and Leisure should have regard to Sport England Active Design Guidance to help overcome some of the weaknesses Arup Consultants have identified.

Councils Response:
Comment noted. Taking account of Arup's sustainability commentary, PD4 and particularly the strategic policy (PD1) promoting quality design could be suitably expanded to refer to the design of community facilities and the public realm at the submission stage. Detailed reference to Sport England's Active Design Guidance may be more appropriate in the proposed future Design SPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider expanding PDs 1 and 4 to emphasise quality design of community (sport and recreation) facilities and public realm in line with Sport England's and Arup's sustainability commentary. Review Sport England's Active Design Guidance for inclusion into future Design SPD.

.................................................................
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 192
PD4 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183
Name: Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number: 192
Policy: PD4 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Neighbourhood facilities

Summary of Representation:
The public must use these facilities for them to remain viable, what assistance does the Council offer to these businesses to improve their image?

Council's Response:
The Council recognises the important function that such centres make to local areas and, when finances allow will undertake works to improve their attractiveness and vitality, often responding to requests coming forward from the Area Assembly meetings. The local centre at Doncaster Road, Dalton is the latest such centre to benefit from improvement works.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 191
PD4 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183

Name: Mr G Blunn

Organisation:

Representation Number: 191

Policy: PD4 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Out of Centre developments

Summary of Representation:
The public need to know the rules of compliance with PPS6 to understand what influence they might have.

Councils Response:
All government planning policy guidance notes and planning policy statements are accessible free on www.communities.gov.uk. Free internet access is available from all libraries in Rotherham.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action required

***************************************************************************************
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Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 190
PD4 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183
Name: Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number: 190
Policy: PD4 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Retail centre hierarchy

Summary of Representation:
Retail centres are car orientated rather than pedestrian/ bus friendly, evidence lack of bus facilities in Retail World

Councils Response:
The Core Strategy reflects Government policy to direct retail uses to existing centres, which tend to have existing public transport links. Out-of-town retail uses are the exception and will be expected to provide public transport linkages. The Out-of-town centres developed in the 1970’s - 1980’s did not have the same requirements for public transport links since “the car” and personal mobility were much more in favour at that time. It is not always easy to retro-fit public transport facilities into such centres. Retail world was built under Enterprise Zone regulations which exempted it from many of the planning requirements that would normally be insisted upon. A new road from Beale Way has planning permission and will provide improved public transport access and alleviate congestion on Rotherham Road. However, the means of funding the road and railway overbridge has yet to be agreed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments noted.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 189
PD4 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  4183
Name:  Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number:  189
Policy:  PD4 Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Retail and Leisure

Summary of Representation:
The Statement “viability and vitality….for shopping, commerce, culture and leisure is sustained and enhanced…. ” Is not founded in reality.

Councils Response:
Central Government guidance (PPS6) directs councils to preserve and enhance town centres as hubs of retail, commerce and leisure. Rotherham Council is using the Renaissance Towns Initiative to “turn around” the fortunes of the town centre, and provide a centre that is viable and has vitality and that the residents of Rotherham can be proud of once again.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 535

PD4 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  4906

Name: Miss Rose Freeman

Organisation: The Theatres Trust

Representation Number: 535

Policy: PD4 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Rotherham Town Centre

Summary of Representation:
The essence of the action plans contained in the Cultural Strategy and the Community Strategy should appear in the Core Strategy and should not be mixed in with the provision of shops. Subsection 1 is deemed inadequate for the future of leisure and culture facilities in the Borough. The role of the Core Strategy is to set out the scale of development envisaged, with a subsequent Area Action Plan focusing on how any particular proposal will be delivered. This policy does not reflect the aspirations of the Cultural and Community Strategies.

Councils Response:
Although the importance of the Community Strategy is recognised numerous times throughout the Core Strategy (including within the conformity section of PD4), it is acknowledged that the Core Strategy Preferred Options does not recognise the Cultural Strategy (aside from its mention within Appendix 4: Evidence Base). However it is intended that leisure and culture provision in Rotherham Town Centre will be examined in the Allocations DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Prior to submission amend the vision and Policy Direction 4 to more fully reflect the importance of culture and arts opportunities in the Borough. Include provision for cultural facilities in Rotherham Town Centre within the Allocations DPD.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5025
Name:  Ms Rachael Pierce
Organisation:  Sanderson Weatherall

Representation Number:  55
Policy:  PD4  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The position of new retail, leisure and service facilities in identified town centres is supported by my client (Royal Mail Group Property).

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for PD2.2 be noted.
Respondent I.D.  5135

Name:  Ms Annette Elliott

Organisation:  United Co-operatives Ltd

Representation Number:  585

Policy:  PD4  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Retail centre hierarchy

Summary of Representation:
Prefer to see more local centres clearly defined. It is suggested that the following settlements could be examined further as sustainable local centres and clearly defined accordingly: Brampton, West Melton, Wentworth, Thorpe Hesley, Greasbrough, Kimberworth, Canklow, Brinsworth, Catcliffe, Treeton, Aughton, Todwick, Harthill, South Anston, Thrybergh, Dalton and Woodsetts.

Councils Response:
In preparing the Core Strategy Submission Document further work will be required to refine the retail centre hierarchy. This will have regard to the typologies for centres set out in Annex A of Planning Policy Statement 6 (Planning for Town Centres). The centres suggested above will be considered as part of this work, and allocated accordingly depending upon the characteristics of each centre. It is noted however that Policy Direction 4: Retail and Leisure does identify the need to safeguard and improve smaller neighbourhood shopping parades

Preparation of the Policies DPD will establish a policy regime for each category of the retail hierarchy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The centres suggested will be considered as part of additional work to refine the retail centre hierarchy and allocated accordingly depending upon the characteristics of each centre.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 466
PD4 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5147

Name:  Mr John King

Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  466

Policy:  PD4  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Part 3

Summary of Representation:
Support required compliance with PPS6, which states that it is the Government’s objective of promoting vital and viable town centres and that it should be achieved by focusing development in existing centres.

Councils Response:
Support Welcome

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  465
Policy:  PD4  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Parts 1&2

Summary of Representation:
It is essential that neighbourhood retail and leisure facilities are protected as they often provide a diversity of locally owned shops and services. These shops then support a variety of local producers.

Councils Response:
Agree that neighbourhood retail and leisure facilities should be protected.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments should be noted in the production of the submission draft.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Summary of Representation:
Support for ARUP’s view that design quality should be included within policy PD4. Retail and leisure facilities must contribute to quality public realm which is safe if they are to attract visitors away from out of town shopping centres. They must also be subject to the same energy reduction, efficiency and renewable generation requirements as other forms of development.

Councils Response:
The sustainable design and construction is covered in PD8 and is intended to cover domestic, community service and commercial buildings. The need for locally distinctive design and public realm is included in PD1 to assist in creating sustainable communities. It would be too repetitive to include sustainable design and references in all PDs and would not assist the requirement in guidance for brevity in Core Strategies.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Need to ensure the structure of the submission Core Strategy adequately addresses the recurring reference to sustainable design and construction in the SA commentaries. Consider the implications for the supporting Policies DPDs and Design SPD.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 464
PD4 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 5147
Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 464
Policy: PD4  Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: Parts 1&2

Summary of Representation:
Support concentration of retail and leisure in Rotherham town and other centres. The policy is however retail focused. What about leisure? Leisure uses vary in terms of their impacts and their required locations. As a result many leisure uses which require a rural location would not comply with this policy. We would suggest separating retail from leisure.

Councils Response:
Support welcome. The leisure activities referred to in this policy direction are those that would normally be found in town centres e.g. Cinemas.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
We will consider drafting policy guidance that looks at the needs of leisure use/activities and cultural activities outside of town centres.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5167
Name:  Mr Brian Upstone
Organisation:  RAP Residents Against Pollution

Representation Number:  537
Policy:  PD4  
Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Rotherham Town Centre

Summary of Representation:
Town centre renaissance that incorporates large residential schemes was regarded as driving people and shops out of Rotherham.

Councils Response:
Support for Rotherham Renaissance is in line with the sustainable communities approach and is a cross cutting theme inherent across the Core Strategy Preferred Option document. PD1 identifies Rotherham town centre as a key focus for change; reflected in housing, employment and retail and main town centre uses policy directions.

Paragraph 2.16 of PPS6 also sets out the broad requirements for local planning authorities in planning for town centres, including assessing the need for new floorspace for retail, leisure and other main town centre uses, identifying deficiencies in provision, and assessing the capacity of existing centres to accommodate new development, including, where appropriate, the scope for extending the primary shopping area and/or town centre. Further work will therefore be required to support the Allocations DPD on the need for and capacity of Rotherham Town Centre to accommodate further development of main town centre uses, including the appropriateness of the existing town centre boundary.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Detailed consideration of Rotherham Town Centre and the mix of likely activities and their location will be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 357
PD4 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  5243

Name:  PS Rachel Usher

Organisation:  South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number:  357

Policy:  PD4 Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Transport Interchange problematic for low level crime and anti-social behaviour.

Councils Response:
This is not an issue for spatial planning. This is an issue more appropriately dealt with through the Passenger Transport Executive and police. Is appropriate legislation available elsewhere to protect this area from anti social behaviour? The Council could consider, in partnership with other Agencies, the use of town centre ambassadors to discourage low level crime and anti social behaviour. Is it appropriate that extra policing is provided in this area?

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
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Assessment of Representations  
Rep No: 359  
PD4 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  5243

Name:  PS Rachel Usher

Organisation:  South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number:  359

Policy:  PD4  
Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:  
Need for sufficient super markets and a variety of leisure opportunities to enhance night time security. Promote "shop watch".

Councils Response:  
During the summer, site surveys and settlement analyses of all communities and settlements within the Borough (including Rotherham urban area) will be undertaken by the LPA. It is anticipated that all the sites will be considered by stakeholders in preliminary consultation early next year. By promoting a variety of activities and uses in an area, this will encourage natural surveillance by people in the area. It is appropriate for the Borough's spatial strategy to promote the "shop watch" initiative.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved and sites identified for specific uses (or mix of uses) including retail and leisure opportunities. Consideration will be given to a wide mix of uses promoting activity at different times of the day, which will promote natural surveillance in that locality/neighbourhood.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 358
PD4 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  5243
Name:  PS Rachel Usher
Organisation:  South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number:  358
Policy:  PD4  Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Environmental cleaning up of the town centre encouraged to enhance areas of the town and improve desirability of town centre living.

Councils Response:
This is not an issue for spatial planning. This is an issue more appropriately dealt with through other Council Services such as Streetpride – street cleansing and RiDO who promote new environmental improvements. Through the granting of planning permissions environmental improvements to localities can be achieved through demolition and new build or through the refurbishment of an existing building such as Imperial Buildings. Grant of planning permission may also give rise to environmental improvements to the immediate surroundings enabling enhancements to the wider environment to be undertaken.

RMBC/ Yorkshire Forward have commissioned a Public Realm Strategy that when implemented will enable a co-ordinated approach to improvements to be undertaken.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the outcomes from the Public Realm Strategy when granting new planning permissions to enable improvements to the wider environment to be achieved. Consider adopting the Public Realm Strategy as a Supplementary Planning Document in due course.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 596
PD4 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5247
Name: Mr Edward Uwechue
Organisation: The Development Planning Partnership

Representation Number: 596
Policy: PD4 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Floorspace figures quoted should be clarified to confirm that these are indicative of the relative scale of the centres and not upper limits on floor space. Size thresholds should be based on the individual merits of proposed developments.

Councils Response:
The floorspace figures in PD4 indicate the relative scale of the types of centres in the retail hierarchy and are not upper limits on floorspace.

Paragraph 2.42 of PPS6 indicates that local planning authorities should consider setting an indicative upper limit for the scale of developments likely to be permissible in different types of centres, and that development above these limits should be directed to centres higher up the town centre hierarchy. Further work to inform the Submission Core Strategy document and the Allocations DPD will be required to consider the appropriateness of the retail hierarchy with regard to the typology of centres set out in Annex A of PPS6. In conjunction with this consideration will be given to upper limits for the scale of developments which will be appropriate for centres within the retail hierarchy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further work to inform the Submission Core Strategy document and the Allocations DPD will be required to consider the appropriateness of the retail hierarchy with regard to the typology of centres set out in Annex A of PPS6. In conjunction with this consideration will be given to upper limits for the scale of developments which will be appropriate for centres within the retail hierarchy.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 594
PD4 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5247

Name: Mr Edward Uwechue

Organisation: The Development Planning Partnership

Representation Number: 594

Policy: PD4 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Para. 3.17 & 3.18

Summary of Representation:
General shopping developments appropriate in scale to the centre should be promoted alongside niche shops to enhance vitality and viability of Rotherham town centre and assist regeneration.

Councils Response:
Section 3 of the Core Strategy Preferred option document provides a profile of Rotherham and highlights a number of key issues across a range of topics to be addressed in the Core Strategy. This includes highlighting the need to promote niche shops within Rotherham Town Centre to help combat competition from out of town shopping centres. Policy Direction 4 highlights Rotherham Town Centre as the borough’s principal town centre for shopping and that this role will be sustained and enhanced. This includes promoting general as well as niche shopping opportunities to ensure the vitality and viability of the town centre.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure any future policy and explanatory text promotes general shopping developments appropriate in scale to the centre, and its position in the retail centre hierarchy.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 595
PD4 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 5247

Name: Mr Edward Uwechue

Organisation: The Development Planning Partnership

Representation Number: 595

Policy: PD4
Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Rotherham town centre

Summary of Representation:
Welcome the identification of Rotherham town centre’s sub-regional role and principal centre for commerce, cultural and leisure facilities

Councils Response:
Support for Rotherham town centre’s sub-regional role and as the principal centre for commerce, cultural and leisure facilities are noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for Rotherham Town Centre’s role in Policy Direction 4 will be taken into account in preparing retail and leisure policies in the Core Strategy Submission Document.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 591
PD4 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5247

Name: Mr Edward Uwechue

Organisation: The Development Planning Partnership

Representation Number: 591
Policy: PD4 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Para. 7.87

Summary of Representation:
Generally support delivery principles in supporting text for PD4 but recommend work on Rotherham town centre area action plan should start as soon as possible before other documents are programmed into the LDS. It should be developed and produced in conjunction with other LDF documents to avoid unnecessary delays which would detrimentally harm implementation of Rotherham Renaissance activity.

Councils Response:
General support for the delivery principles in the supporting text for PD4 is noted.

The Council's programme for preparing LDF documents is set out in the Local Development Scheme and agreed with the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber. An Area Action Plan for Rotherham Town Centre has yet to be programmed however work is underway to refresh the Rotherham Town Centre Strategic Development Framework and to adopt this as an Interim Planning Statement which will feed into any future Area Action Plan. Consideration of Rotherham Town Centre will also be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
General support for the delivery principles in the supporting text for PD4 will be taken into account in preparing retail and leisure policies in the Core Strategy Submission Document.

Current work to refresh the Rotherham Town Centre Strategic Development Framework and to adopt this as an Interim Planning Statement and detailed consideration of Rotherham Town Centre as part of the Allocations DPD work will feed into any future Area Action Plan for Rotherham Town Centre.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 592
PD4 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5247
Name:  Mr Edward Uwechue
Organisation:  The Development Planning Partnership

Representation Number:  592
Policy:  PD4  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Forge Island should be retained within Rotherham town centre boundary, and the town centre boundary should be extended (to include sites within the emerging town centre masterplan) to facilitate the Rotherham Renaissance programme

Councils Response:
Paragraph 2.16 of PPS6 sets out the broad requirements for local planning authorities in planning for town centres, including assessing the need for new floorspace for retail, leisure and other main town centre uses, identifying deficiencies in provision, and assessing the capacity of existing centres to accommodate new development, including, where appropriate, the scope for extending the primary shopping area and/or town centre. Further work will therefore be required to support the Allocations DPD on the need for and capacity of Rotherham Town Centre to accommodate further development of main town centre uses, including the appropriateness of the existing town centre boundary.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Detailed consideration of the Rotherham Urban Area including Rotherham Town Centre and its periphery will be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work. The comments will be taken into account in considering the extent of any future town centre boundary.
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Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5247

Name:  Mr Edward Uwechue

Organisation:  The Development Planning Partnership

Representation Number:  593

Policy:  PD4  
Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Para. 3.17 & 3.18

Summary of Representation:
Text within these paragraphs should promote expansion of Rotherham town centre to facilitate regeneration programmes.

Councils Response:
Paragraph 2.16 of PPS6 sets out the broad requirements for local planning authorities in planning for town centres, including assessing the need for new floorspace for retail, leisure and other main town centre uses, identifying deficiencies in provision, and assessing the capacity of existing centres to accommodate new development, including, where appropriate, the scope for extending the primary shopping area and/or town centre. Further work will therefore be required to support the Allocations DPD on the need for and capacity of Rotherham Town Centre to accommodate further development of main town centre uses, including the appropriateness of the existing town centre boundary. It is not considered appropriate to promote expansion of Rotherham Town Centre in the Core Strategy prior to this more detailed work.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Detailed consideration of the Rotherham Urban Area including Rotherham Town Centre and its periphery will be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work. Dependant upon the outcome of further work the Submission Core Strategy may promote the expansion of Rotherham Town Centre if this is considered appropriate.
Summary of Representation:
Retail and leisure.
The core strategy in supporting sustainable patterns of development should make provision for the development of additional retail outlets to serve local communities. These additional retail outlets should include supermarkets of an appropriate scale where the existing provision is shown to be inadequate and results in local communities having to travel further a field to do their shopping resulting in potentially unnecessary journeys.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction 4 is clear that such developments could be allowed, provided that they comply with PPS6.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 600
PD4 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5252
Name: Miss Beverley Smith
Organisation: GVA Grimley (for Express Park Developments Ltd)

Representation Number:  600
Policy: PD4 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Rotherham town centre

Summary of Representation:
This should make reference to reviewing Rotherham town centre boundary. Potentially extending town centre boundary will ensure continuing vitality and viability and allow it to compete effectively with other centres

Councils Response:
Paragraph 2.16 of PPS6 sets out the broad requirements for local planning authorities in planning for town centres, including assessing the need for new floorspace for retail, leisure and other main town centre uses, identifying deficiencies in provision, and assessing the capacity of existing centres to accommodate new development, including, where appropriate, the scope for extending the primary shopping area and/or town centre. Further work will therefore be required to support the Allocations DPD on the need for and capacity of Rotherham Town Centre to accommodate further development of main town centre uses, including the appropriateness of the existing town centre boundary.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Detailed consideration of the Rotherham Urban Area including Rotherham Town Centre and its periphery will be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work. The comments will be taken into account and, dependant upon the outcome of further work the Submission Core Strategy may promote the expansion of Rotherham Town Centre if this is considered appropriate.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 603
PD4 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5253

Name:  Miss Beverley Smith

Organisation:  GVA Grimley (for Evans Regeneration Investments Ltd)

Representation Number:  603

Policy:  PD4  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
This should make reference to reviewing Rotherham town centre boundary. Potentially extending town centre boundary will ensure continuing vitality and viability and allow it to compete effectively with other centres

Councils Response:
Paragraph 2.16 of PPS6 sets out the broad requirements for local planning authorities in planning for town centres, including assessing the need for new floorspace for retail, leisure and other main town centre uses, identifying deficiencies in provision, and assessing the capacity of existing centres to accommodate new development, including, where appropriate, the scope for extending the primary shopping area and/or town centre. Further work will therefore be required to support the Allocations DPD on the need for and capacity of Rotherham Town Centre to accommodate further development of main town centre uses, including the appropriateness of the existing town centre boundary.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Detailed consideration of the Rotherham Urban Area including Rotherham Town Centre and its periphery will be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work. The comments will be taken into account and, dependant upon the outcome of further work the Submission Core Strategy may promote the expansion of Rotherham Town Centre if this is considered appropriate.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5270
Name:  Mr Keith Ellis
Organisation:

Representation Number:  568
Policy:  PD4 Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Out of centre developments

Summary of Representation:
The current sites for retail parks need to be maintained and expanded with limitations.

Councils Response:
Although recognition is made that the influence of the planning system upon the extent of existing retail park provision is limited the Core Strategy states that additional retail and leisure development outside of the designated centres will need to demonstrate compliance with PPS6. Therefore to take on board these comments would be contrary to central government guidance whose main emphasis is on contributing as far as possible to the economic growth and vibrancy and function of town and district centres.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 567
PD4 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 5270
Name: Mr Keith Ellis
Organisation:

Representation Number: 567
Policy: PD4
Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: Rotherham Town Centre

Summary of Representation:
Concern at the state of the outdoor and indoor markets. Also the Council should have a pro-active strategy to bring in larger retailers. Niche shops will only be used by the more wealthy, for example, the site at Wickersley which in itself has a good parking area.

Councils Response:
The respondent’s concerns and ideas are shared by the Council in promoting Rotherham Renaissance and Town Centre management initiatives. Concerning the LDF, Section 3 of the Core Strategy Preferred option document provides a profile of Rotherham and highlights a number of key issues across a range of topics to be addressed in the Core Strategy. This includes highlighting the need to promote niche shops within Rotherham Town Centre to help combat competition from out of town shopping centres. Policy Direction 4 highlights Rotherham Town Centre as the borough’s principal town centre for shopping and that this role will be sustained and enhanced. This will include promoting general as well as niche shopping opportunities to ensure the vitality and viability of the town centre.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 572
PD4 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  5272
Name: Margaret Maher
Organisation:

Representation Number:  572
Policy:  PD4 Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  General

Summary of Representation:
Concern at the loss of swimming pools that has taken place.

Councils Response:
It is recognised that at present leisure provision may not be entirely satisfactory but the Council programme to create a new generation of indoor sports centres is well on track. It will be providing new leisure centres in Rotherham Town Centre (St Ann’s car park), Maltby (site of existing Civic Offices), Aston (Aughton Road frontage of Aston Comprehensive School), and Wath upon Dearne (Festival Road frontage of Wath Comprehensive School).

The St Ann’s Leisure Centre will include leisure water, a flume, teaching pool and 6-lane main pool, indoor climbing tower, sports hall, squash courts and fitness suite. Maltby Leisure Centre will include a 6-lane competition pool, separate diving/teaching pool, four-court sports hall and fitness suite. It will also offer direct indoor access to a brand-new Customer Service Centre incorporating Council Offices and Health Centre. Aston Leisure Centre will include a five-lane pool, separate teaching pool, four-court sports hall and fitness suite. Wath Leisure Centre will include a five-lane pool, separate teaching pool and fitness suite; it will be located next to the existing school sports centre.

The leisure centres at St Ann’s, Wath and Aston are expected to be open by the summer of 2008, with Maltby Leisure Centre following on in the summer of 2009. Existing swimming pools and Herringthorpe Leisure Centre will remain open until replacement facilities are available, at which point they will close.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consideration will be given to further drafting of the policies to more accurately reflect the contribution that leisure (and cultural) facilities make to the quality of life and the creation of sustainable mixed communities.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 632
PD5 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1565
Name: Mr Brian Davies
Organisation: Natural England

Representation Number: 632
Policy: PD5 Object/SUPPORT: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Sustainable waste management has been identified as a key component in safeguarding the natural environment this could be further developed to mitigate adverse effects on natural resources and encourage the collection and use of landfill gas for renewable energy.

The proposed SPD should include a full range of design measures that relate to waste management development for example design principles for the conservation and enhancement of nature conservation and landscape resources.

Councils Response:
Agree

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Further development of the Policy Direction to include mitigation of the adverse effects on natural resources and encourage the collection and use of landfill gas for renewable energy. Future SPD, as yet not programmed in the Local Development Scheme, to be developed to include a full range of design measures that relate to waste management development for example design principles for the conservation and enhancement of nature conservation and landscape resources.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 631
PD5 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  1565
Name:  Mr Brian Davies
Organisation:  Natural England

Representation Number:  631
Policy:  PD5  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Natural England is pleased that waste management is a key component in safeguarding the local environment and that there is an intention to produce a SPD.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action required.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 199
PD5 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 1824
Name: Mr David Cassidy
Organisation: The Banks Group

Representation Number: 199
Policy: PD5 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Policy PD5 is supported, as is the statement “Enable(s) innovation within the waste industry, the development of waste clusters and the sustainable transportation of waste utilising rail and canal. Suggested waste transfer/ treatment sites in Rotherham include Masborough sidings, Aldwarke Lane wharf and Rawmarsh steelworks.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of this policy direction. The potential waste transfer/ treatment sites you have put forward will be considered as part of the land allocations DPD process.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The sites put forward as potential waste transfer/ treatment site be thoroughly investigated
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 651
PD5 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 1960

Name: Ms Krys Craik

Organisation: South Yorkshire Forest Partnership

Representation Number: 651

Policy: PD5 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Section 7.91

Summary of Representation:
Support approach in 7.91 and bullet points that follow.

SYF would be keen to explore areas which enable innovation within the waste industry the development of waste clusters and the sustainable transport of waste utilising rail and canal.
SYF is active in promoting the use of Green Timber residue for local use by makers of furniture crafts and the growing market for wood fuel.

Councils Response:
Support and assistance welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Discuss further with respondent the offer to explore means to enable innovation within the waste industry the development of waste clusters and the sustainable transport of waste utilising rail and canal.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 524
PD5 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  2121
Name:  Mr & Mrs Peter & Sue Hubbard
Organisation:  Ulley Parish Plan Steering Committee

Representation Number:  524
Policy:  PD5  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Waste management

Summary of Representation:
The inclusion of the use of green belt land for waste management facilities is strongly contested and would want to see any reference to green belt being removed from this section. The phrasing also is too general. A waste handling facility could encompass anything from an incinerator the size of Sheffield Bernard Road waste incineration plant to a small wood chipping operation.

Councils Response:
The respondents concerns about waste management facilities in the Green Belt are understood. However it is felt that PD5 makes it clear that any waste management facilities within the Green Belt will need to be appropriate (e.g. on farm composting facilities or temporary uses) and will be subject to suitable environmental, amenity, public health and transport requirements (this approach being in line with paragraph 3 of Planning Policy Statement 10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management).

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Make more explicit the type of waste management facilities and appropriate safeguards that would apply in Green Belt locations in formulating a criteria based policy for waste management facilities in the submission Core Strategy and supporting Policies DPD.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 328

PD5 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  2413
Name:  Mr John Dunshea
Organisation:  Atisreal UK

Representation Number:  328
Policy:  PD5  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
PD5 does not explain the principles of sustainable waste management.

Councils Response:
Concern that the respondent takes this view as it is felt that PD5 does explain the principles of sustainable waste management. It appears that the respondent has not fully considered aspects of sustainable construction principles that are included in PD8 which, with further discussion, may resolve the issue.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Meet respondent to clarify further.
Representations Report.doc

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 289
PD5 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635
Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton
Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 289
Policy: PD5 Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)

PPS10 and Article 5 of the Waste Framework Directive require plans to identify specific sites for waste facilities or to have clear locational criteria for the identification of acceptable sites. There should be sufficient detail in the Core Strategy to guide this process.

The Core Strategy should set out the preferred types of strategic waste treatment facilities and identify broad locations for them within the Borough or to be shared with neighbouring authorities.

The Site Allocations DPD may identify specific sites within those broad locations or criteria based policies could be included in the Core Strategy to support the broad locations. Alternatively, such decisions could be made in a joint South Yorkshire Waste DPD.

Councils Response:
Comments noted. The approach to waste management in the Core Strategy is dependent on discussions with the other South Yorks LPAs concerning prospects for a Joint Strategic Waste Management DPD for all waste streams, including municipal waste which is currently subject to PFI procurement. The Council along with Barnsley and Doncaster is currently preparing preliminary assessments of strategic sites to inform the municipal waste PFI process and the joint DPD. This will assist in identifying broad locations in the Core Strategy which could also set out criteria to assess other proposals which may be required in the future. The Allocations DPD then identify specific shortlisted strategic sites and locations for more local waste management facilities.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Agree joint approach with GOYH and other South Yorks LPAs - identification of broad locations for strategic sites and criteria (to replace UDP Policy WM 1.2) for the assessment of other more local facilities in the submission Core Strategy. Identification of specific preferred strategic sites in the Allocations DPD along with other local site options. Look at approach taken in N. Yorks and Cornwall CC Waste Core Strategies.
Summary of Representation:
The Core Strategy should require developers to incorporate a recycled content target (by value) of at least 10% to promote sustainable construction. In addition, developers should be encouraged to use materials that have a low environmental impact in terms of their full life cycle, e.g. through consulting the Building Research Establishment’s Green Guide to specification.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction PD5 promotes sustainable construction and waste management within the development process. Further detail on appropriate construction standards for new development will be contained in the supporting Policies DPD and/or SPD. As standards are likely to change frequently, the Council considers this approach more appropriate for the longevity of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include appropriate sustainable construction standards and construction waste management targets in the Policies DPD and/or SPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 125
PD5 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3328
Name:  Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation:  Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number:  125
Policy:  PD5  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  PD5.7 7th bullet

Summary of Representation:
The commitment to enable innovation within the waste industry and the enabling of the sustainable transport of waste is supported.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 122
PD5 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 3328

Name: Ms Lucy Mitchell

Organisation: Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number: 122

Policy: PD5
Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: PD5.1 1st bullet

Summary of Representation:
Policy PD5 and its commitment towards safeguarding the local environment and reducing emissions to combat climate change is supported.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 124
PD5 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 3328

Name: Ms Lucy Mitchell

Organisation: Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number: 124

Policy: PD5  Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: PD5.2 2nd bullet

Summary of Representation:
Policy PD5 and its recognition of the waste hierarchy, the need to reduce the volume of waste sent to landfill and the need to improve resource efficiency through maximising the reduction, re-use and recycling of waste is supported.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 161
PD5 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3418
Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  161
Policy:  PD5    Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The Sustainability Appraisal identified that this policy fails to promote the wider concept of sustainable waste management. We would agree with this statement, and suggest that the policy or explanatory text provide more detail on the principles of sustainable waste management.

Councils Response:
The Council accept this view.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Submission Core Strategy will incorporate appropriate wording to promote sustainable waste management.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 162  
PD5 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  3418

Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  162

Policy:  PD5  
Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
It would also be helpful if the explanatory text referred to the Annual RTAB Waste Data Report. The latest RTAB Waste data identifies a significant oversupply of landfill capacity in South Yorkshire. This would give a solid basis for the promotion of more sustainable methods of waste management.

Councils Response:
The Council accept this view.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Submission Core Strategy will incorporate reference to the Annual RTAB Waste Data Report.
Summary of Representation:
Strategic policy direction PD5 Waste Management does not appear to have any spatial priority, particularly as regards landfill. It is acknowledged that this method of waste management has a reduced hierarchical importance given emphasis on recycling. However, the method also represents a mechanism for restoring derelict and neglected land, improving the visual amenity of landscapes once restored, and opportunity to protect health where contaminated substances are concerned. Strategic policy should provide broad geographical direction to inform the future development of a Waste Strategy DPD.

Councils Response:
The waste management content of the submission core strategy is dependent on the outcome of discussions between GOYH and the South Yorkshire LPAs concerning the prospect of a Joint Strategic Waste Management DPD. Although landfill is now a less desirable method of waste management, its role as part of land restoration is acknowledged.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Dependent on the decision over a Joint DPD include reference to landfill as a means of land restoration in the submission version of PD5. (see also Rep No 1837a).
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 586
PD5 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5135
Name:  Ms Annette Elliott
Organisation:  United Co-operatives Ltd

Representation Number:  586
Policy:  PD5  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Support the minimisation of environmental impact, and sustainable energy production.

Councils Response:
Support for the minimisation of environmental impact, and sustainable energy production is noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for the minimisation of environmental impact, and sustainable energy production will be taken into account in preparing waste management policies in the Core Strategy Submission Document.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations  
Rep No: 468  
PD5 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5147  
Name:  Mr John King  
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  468  
Policy:  PD5  
Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Bullet Point 2

Summary of Representation:  
Support reference reduction of landfill and movement of waste up the hierarchy as indicated in bullet 2.

Councils Response:  
Support welcome

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
None

*******************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations  
Rep No: 469
PD5 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5147
Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 469
Policy: PD5  
Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Bullet 7

Summary of Representation:
(Actually bullet 6) Remove reference to Green Belt as such development inappropriate in the Green Belt and therefore special circumstances must apply. An in principle acceptance of waste facilities on brownfield sites within the Green Belt would not comply with this policy.

Councils Response:
While some recycling facilities may be appropriate development because they do not affect the openness of the Green Belt, many will not and in those cases special circumstances will need to apply to outweigh the harm done to other Green Belt. However, any policy in the core strategy may have to acknowledge that sites in the Green Belt may be the only option for what are often “bad neighbour” uses. It is acknowledged that policies relating to this issue will need to be carefully worded in order to accord with PPG2.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments should be noted in the production of the submission draft.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 470
PD5 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 470
Policy: PD5 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Bullet 8

Summary of Representation:
Replace “prompts contributions from” with “demands”

Councils Response:
The precise wording of the policy is yet to be determined, it may be that we may prompt contributions by demanding them.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None

........................................................................................................
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 266
PD5 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 5200

Name: Claire Whittaker

Organisation: Fairhurst Consultants (for Lafarge Aggregates Ltd)

Representation Number: 266

Policy: PD5 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Support the aim of minimising consumption of raw materials through reduction, re-use and recycling.

Harry Crofts Quarry has a recycling permission.

Not all waste can be recycled and there is a continuing need for some waste landfilling and infilling quarries has the dual benefit of disposing of waste that cannot be recycled as well as contributing to restoration.

Suggested additional policy wording - "uses waste materials as part of the fill to restore existing quarries"

Councils Response:
Support for the policy direction is noted along with the particular circumstances of Harry Crofts Quarry. Waste management by landfilling is becoming increasingly undesirable although some capacity will still be required to dispose of material at the end of the waste hierarchy and, subject to suitability, this material could assist quarry restoration. The point being promoted in the suggested additional policy wording is already covered in the fourth bullet in PD8: Efficient Use of Resources but it will be reconsidered in finalising strategic policies for the submission Core Strategy bearing in mind "saved" UDP policies, LDF priority topics and the detailed scope of the Policies DPD together with RSS and PPS10.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Note support and the particular circumstances of Harry Crofts Quarry. Consider scope for additional policy wording in the submission Core Strategy. Include Harry Crofts Quarry as a waste management site option in the Allocations DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 61
PD5 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 5205
Name: Mr Sam Kipling
Organisation: Environment Agency

Representation Number: 61
Policy: PD5 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
We welcome this policy and approve of the inclusion of the waste hierarchy and the holistic approach it takes to the waste issue as a whole.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for PD5 (Waste Management) be noted.

*******************************************************************************
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 669
PD5 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5255
Name:  Mr Bill Davidson
Organisation:  Indigo Planning Ltd (for Safety Kleen Ltd)

Representation Number:  669
Policy:  PD5  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Support this policy, which encourages the extension of existing waste management facilities.

Councils Response:
Support is noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for Policy Direction 5, which encourages the extension of existing waste management facilities, will be taken into account in preparing waste management policies in the Core Strategy Submission Document.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 495
PD6 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 958

Name: Mrs Alice Rodgers
Organisation: Maltby Environmental Group

Representation Number: 495
Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: General

Summary of Representation:
There must be long term planning for multi-directional public transport and particularly for cross-border services to Finningley and into Bassetlaw. Equally recognition/realism in terms of car parking provision needs to be made if no feasible public transport alternative exists.

Councils Response:
Agree. Policy Direction 6 within the transport management corridors subsection makes explicit the need to improve Rotherham’s strategic road, rail and air transport connectivity. Specific transportation proposals will be considered for the Allocations DPD.

In responding to Central Government Guidance, Policy Direction 6 is seeking to use parking policies alongside other planning and transport measures, to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce the reliance on the car for work and other journeys. These aims need to be balanced with the need to promote adequate car parking to support the viability of local centres like Maltby.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider comments for public transport corridors as part of Allocations DPD.

..............................................................................................................................................................................
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 958

Name: Mrs Alice Rodgers

Organisation: Maltby Environmental Group

Representation Number: 489

Policy: PD6  
Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Road schemes

Summary of Representation:
If the A631 corridor (i.e. Wickersley, Bramley, Hellaby, Maltby) is to be the greater sustainable community then the Hellaby-Addison Road dualling plan is needed.

Councils Response:
As Policy Direction 6 states the dualling of Hellaby to Addison Road is to be abandoned because it is no longer considered to assist sustainable transport solutions in so far as it will increase road capacity and encourage car use. However, this scheme is likely to substituted by bus priority measures as part of the Quality Bus Programme. Confirmation of this stance will be attained by presentation of a report by the Transportation Unit to Councillor Gerald Smith under Regeneration and Development Services matters, outlining which major Highway Schemes (identified in the UDP) will be abandoned and what measures will be adopted in their place.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider comments upon abandoned road scheme within Policies DPD. Explore implications of report presented by Transportation Unit to Gerald Smith under Regeneration and Development Services matters.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 490  
PD6 \ Other  

Respondent I.D.  958  
Name: Mrs Alice Rodgers  
Organisation: Maltby Environmental Group  

Representation Number: 490  
Policy: PD6  
Object/Support: Other  

Section / Paragraph: Sustainable transport-urban areas/sust' sett'ments  

Summary of Representation:  
For Maltby to be asked to grow sustainably without the development of a local public transport hub makes no sense.  

Councils Response:  
Maltby is located on a major road corridor with very regular bus services and hence Rotherham Interchange is fairly accessible. It is recognised that this needs to be assessed further and discussions with South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive will take place to examine these proposals.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
Consider comments for a new interchange within the Allocations DPD.
Summary of Representation:
The Agency would support Point 1 on PD6, where sustainable transport solutions are encouraged. The Agency also support the provision of mixed use developments and the improvement of public transport interchanges to encourage non-car journeys. The Agency would support improvements within the Transportation Management Corridors. This includes the improvements of rail facilities for passengers and to encourage freight travel off the SHN onto the rail network. The use of other trunk roads would remove some of the traffic currently on the SHN for trips within the district. The Agency would support the “efficient management of existing road space with continuing emphasis on bus, cycle and pedestrian priorities”. This is in line with the Agency’s overall priority to make the best possible use of existing resources. The Agency also supports the “Future development of rapid transit systems with park and ride facilities related to town centre parking pricing and management” which is in line with the Government policy of aiming to reduce the number of private car trips on the SHN. PD6: Transportation – 3 Transport Assessments, Air Quality Assessments and Travel Plans
The Agency would wish to support point 3 on PD6, through which developers would be required to submit Transport Assessments, Air Quality Assessments and Travel Plans. (full response)

Councils Response:
The Agency’s support is welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Note the Agency’s support in developing the submission version of PD6.
**Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council**  
**CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS**  

**Assessment of Representations**  

**Rep No:** 635  
**PD6 \ Object**

---

**Respondent I.D.** 1565  

**Name:** Mr Brian Davies  

**Organisation:** Natural England  

**Representation Number:** 635

**Policy:** PD6  
**Object/Support:** Object  
**Section / Paragraph:** Section 8.2.6

**Summary of Representation:**  
In line with the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal, Policy Direction 6 (Transportation) should better recognise that transport infrastructure improvements provide major opportunities for habitat creation and biodiversity enhancement and the provision of valuable wildlife corridors.

**Councils Response:**  
The potential for transport infrastructure improvements to provide major opportunities for habitat creation and biodiversity enhancement and the provision of valuable wildlife corridors is recognised and it is agreed that further development of PD6, possibly in conjunction with PD7 (Local Heritage), to reflect this should be investigated.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**  
Investigate the incorporation of measures to encourage habitat creation, biodiversity enhancement and wildlife corridors in the further preparation of PD6 and possibly PD7.
Natural England believes that planning policy should encourage access to new development through a wider range of sustainable transport modes and aim to reduce reliance on car travel. PD6 takes into account the location of new development and endeavours to achieve more sustainable transport solutions. Also welcomed is the identification of continuing improvements to the accessible environment and pedestrian and cycling links within and between neighbourhoods and local service centres.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action required.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 633
PD6 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1565

Name: Mr Brian Davies

Organisation: Natural England

Representation Number: 633

Policy: PD6
Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Policy does not explicitly refer to safeguarding existing recreational and public rights of way from obstructive developments.

Councils Response:
Whilst the Policy does refer to continuing improvements to the accessible environment and pedestrian and cycling facilities and links within and between neighbourhoods and local service centres it is accepted there should be reference to the need to safeguarding existing recreational and public rights of way.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend Policy Direction or its successor to refer to the need to safeguarding existing recreational and public rights of way from inappropriate development.

******************************************************************************
Summary of Representation:
Para.2: Bearing in mind the off road parking requirements for new housing, an increase in car numbers is anticipated. Reducing spending on road schemes will therefore likely increase congestion.

Councils Response:
Agreed that increased car use with reduced spending on roads is likely to increase congestion. However, it would not be sustainable to attempt to escalate road building to combat congestion. The challenge ahead lies in achieving more sustainable transport solutions and development locations together with optimising the management of finite network capacity. These principles are promoted in PD6 and will be further developed for submission.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments be noted.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 655
PD6 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 1960

Name: Ms Krys Craik

Organisation: South Yorkshire Forest Partnership

Representation Number: 655

Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
We support the general strategy

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action required.

............................................................................................................
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 657

PD6 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1960

Name: Ms Krys Craik

Organisation: South Yorkshire Forest Partnership

Representation Number: 657

Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Agrees with SA appraisal last paragraph under heading enhancement opportunities. SYF consider that a recognition that the development of green corridors which facilitate movement for pedestrians, cyclists and other non motorised transport which also serve as wildlife corridors should be facilitated. Support for the planning of a green corridor network would link directly to the development of a green infrastructure plan.

Councils Response:
Accept.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend Policy Direction 6, and possibly Policy Direction 7 (Greenspace Networks) in line with the suggested enhancement opportunities.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 525
PD6 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 2121

Name: Mr & Mrs Peter & Sue Hubbard

Organisation: Ulley Parish Plan Steering Committee

Representation Number: 525

Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: General

Summary of Representation:
Whilst supportive of the overall thrust of PD6 the comments regarding car parking are seen as of paramount importance to its effectiveness. If the necessary infrastructure is put in place to improve public transport the need for town centre long stay parking will reduce of its own volition. There should be some recognition in the policy direction that gives indications of timelines that moves towards a clear strategic direction taking account of the reality of the situation and the real connectivities between the differing elements relevant to achieving modal shift rather than a policy direction that appears to be designed merely to support unsustainable parking bans.

Councils Response:
The way people travel and the continued growth in road traffic is damaging to the environment and Rotherham. In responding to Central Government Guidance, Policy Direction 6 is seeking to use parking policies alongside other planning and transport measures, which are designed to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce the reliance on the car for work and other journeys. However it is recognised that managing car parking capacity needs to be related to the availability of alternative and economic public transport provision which in turn is ultimately dependent on enhanced funding from Central Government.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Make more explicit the link between the management of car parking capacity and the provision of alternative public transport in developing transportation policies for the submission core strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 275
PD6 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 2243

Name: Mr Michael Long

Organisation: South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE)

Representation Number: 275

Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Support the principles of this policy.

In "urban areas and settlements" public transport "interchange" could be changed to "infrastructure".

Within "transport management corridors" improved rail services need to be in line with the approved South Yorkshire Rail Strategy.

Support roadspace allocation towards more sustainable roads and public transport rapid transit aligned with park and ride and central area parking strategy.

The policy on Travel Plans should allow scope for penalty clauses or bonds to implement mitigation measures should targets not be met.

Councils Response:
Support for the general transportation policy direction welcomed. The specific policy and site implications of the South Yorkshire Rail Strategy for the Core Strategy and supporting DPDs will be considered further. Scope for Travel Plan penalty clauses are likely to be best considered in the Policies DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Incorporate detailed points into Core Strategy strategic transportation policy and supporting DPDs as appropriate.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 331
PD6 \ Comment

Respondent I.D.  2413
Name:  Mr John Dunshea
Organisation:  Atisreal UK

Representation Number:  331
Policy:  PD6  Object/Support:  Comment

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
PD6 should recognise the contribution that well designed public realm and dual transport corridors that incorporate cycle paths and footpaths, within development sites such as Waverley.

Councils Response:
Accept that the LDF should recognise the contribution that well designed public realm can make within any new development proposals. The issue of the dual use of transport corridors may not be appropriate in all instances and will be considered at the detailed policies DPD preparation stage and within any subsequent planning applications. There may be a need to put in place more footpath and cycle links throughout a development area than road links and an ill considered policy could jeopardise this. Permeability of new development proposals that create safe links with natural surveillance is essential to the success of any future development proposals.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the Core Strategy and any subsequent detailed policy DPD’s address the issue of movement and the inclusion of cycleways and footpaths within new developments. The LDF will promote well designed public realm and quality design in new development schemes.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 329
PD6 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  2413
Name:  Mr John Dunshea
Organisation:  Atisreal UK

Representation Number:  329
Policy:  PD6  Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Support for the promotion of sustainable transport solutions, and the reduction in the need to travel through the location of new development and for the development of the Waverley link road.

Councils Response:
The respondent’s support is welcomed

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action required.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 216
PD6 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3165

Name: Mr & Mrs J & S Dixon

Organisation:

Representation Number: 216

Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: 1

Summary of Representation:
Do not take the easy option of Green Belt/ Greenfield in choosing sites for park and ride schemes. Please consider the following sites:

a) Old Smithywood pit site near Junction 35
b) Sites at Blackburn
c) Sites adjacent the cooling towers at Tinsley

Councils Response:
The sites mentioned all fall within Sheffield’s administrative boundaries but are worthy of further investigation for a joint provision between Sheffield and Rotherham.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Liaise with Sheffield Council about the provision of Park-and-ride schemes close to the boundary of the two authorities.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 215
PD6 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3165
Name: Mr & Mrs J & S Dixon
Organisation:

Representation Number: 215
Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: 1

Summary of Representation:
The policy direction does not address issues of improved transportation links to rural areas. Scholes village is poorly served by current transport services.

Councils Response:
This is a valid objection since concentration on sustainable communities could disadvantage existing less-sustainable settlements.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include the issue of public transportation links to rural areas within the transportation section.
Summary of Representation:
Paragraph 1 refers to park and ride facilities to serve the town centre but there is no indication of the provisional locations of these facilities. Please supply a list of provisional locations for park and ride schemes.

Councils Response:
Potential sites are still under investigation. The Council’s preferred options for Park and Ride will be published in the Allocations DPD (Development Plan Document) later this year.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Park and Ride schemes to be included in the Allocations DPD
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Report No: 128
PD6 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3328

Name: Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation: Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number: 128

Policy: PD6  Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: PD6.1 4th bullet

Summary of Representation:
The emphasis placed upon improving local rail services and interchanges is supported.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 127
PD6 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 3328

Name: Ms Lucy Mitchell

Organisation: Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number: 127

Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: PD6.1

Summary of Representation:
The emphasis placed upon locating new development in accessible locations is supported.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 164
PD6 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3418

Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  164

Policy:  PD6  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
It is pleasing to see that road schemes considered to no longer assist sustainable transport solutions have been abandoned.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.

*******************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 163
PD6 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3418

Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  163

Policy:  PD6  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
We support the emphasis on reducing the need to travel outlined in this policy. We feel however, that the wording of point 1 of policy PD6 concentrates too much on the location of development as a means of reducing the need to travel.

Councils Response:
Support noted. The Council considers that the wording of Policy Direction PD6 section 1 sets out an appropriate approach to reducing the need to travel. While acknowledging the broader remit of the new planning system embodied by local development frameworks, the main tool at the disposal of local planning authorities remains the allocation of land and hence the ability to influence the location of development.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 165
PD6 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3418

Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon

Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  165

Policy:  PD6 Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
We also welcome the requirement for developers to submit a Transport Assessment and Air Quality Assessment with certain planning applications, the nature of which to be defined within a specific DPD.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 70

PD6 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3424

Name:  Mr Henryk Peterson

Organisation:  Sport England

Representation Number:  70

Policy:  PD6  
Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The indicators selected for strategic policy direction PD6 Transport should apply cycling walking time thresholds to facilities; distance criteria to infrastructure facilities. Ideally, use of some of Sport England’s KPI’s would allow for a more joined up approach.

Councils Response:
The respondent's suggestions are unclear. The Council is supported by the SYPTE in applying accessibility criteria and Accession software in the selection of sustainable site allocations. The Council is also anxious to include a manageable number of feasible and meaningful indicators that are also consistent with those set out in guidance and those included in RSS. Sport Englands KPIs will be considered when finalising performance indicators under the strategic policies within the submission document.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Clarify Sport England's suggestions for time thresholds/distance criteria in developing PD6 together with the general use of Sport England's KPIs in the submission document.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3463
Name:  Mr C. J. Harper
Organisation:  

Representation Number:  225
Policy:  PD6          Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
More thought should be given to walking to local services and schools to reduce car usage.

Councils Response:
The reduction of car usage as part of the actions to combat climate change will be an important aspect of the plan.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change in direction with regards to reduction in car usage.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 193
PD6 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183
Name: Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number: 193
Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Transport assessments

Summary of Representation:
What measures will be taken against developers who “by-pass” agreed schemes to mitigate the adverse traffic impacts of their developments?

Councils Response:
It is the role of the planning enforcement team to monitor developments to ensure planning conditions are being adhered to, and to take action against those individuals and companies who try to flout such conditions.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action required
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 196
PD6 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183
Name: Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number: 196
Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Transportation

Summary of Representation:
“Already Programmed” and “potential” road schemes should be publicly declared and not held for later disclosure. It is absurd thinking that “these schemes are now likely to be substituted by bus priority measures as part of the Quality Bus Programme.”

Councils Response:
The plan will include those road schemes which are highly likely to come to fruition within the plan period. Since these schemes will be included in the plan they will be subject to the same levels of public consultation. Road schemes which are unlikely to be undertaken within the plan period will not be included in the plan. Where finance for other initiatives, e.g. Quality Bus Routes, is made available this will be utilised where it will be of most benefit.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
make it clear that those road schemes included in the plan are those most likely to be completed within the plan period.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 235
PD6 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5137
Name:  Mrs Angela Anson
Organisation:

Representation Number:  235

Policy:  PD6  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Specific issues of unsuitable vehicles using Grange Lane, and the need for traffic lights at the junction of Grange Lane and Upper Wortley Road.

Councils Response:
This is a localised issue that is too small to be considered under the Local Development Framework, however I shall pass this on to the Council’s traffic section for investigation.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Pass this comment on to transportation/road safety colleagues for further investigation
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 474
PD6 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5147
Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 474
Policy: PD6 Object/!Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Part 1

Summary of Representation:
Suggests the addition of an additional rural heading:

In Rural Areas

• Provision of a sustainable and safe transport network for those who live work and visit the countryside that protects and enhances its character and community;
• Minimise the use of road side furniture, signing and lighting;
• Use of road alignments and natural features to slow speeds;
• Provision of local services and facilities in local centres including innovative means of access and delivery

Councils Response:
A specifically rural section may be useful or it may be possible to include a rural element in the policies as a whole, to address the particular problems and needs of the rural areas. The difficulty arises in that the planning system generally deals in areas of change, i.e. where new development is most likely. Development is most likely in urban areas and sustainable settlements and within transportation management corridors. Development is directed away from more isolated rural areas, in part, to avoid increasing the transport difficulties often experienced in these communities. Paradoxically, this means that opportunities to improve infrastructure, as part of new developments, will be limited.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider giving more emphasis to consideration particular to rural areas in drafting the submission Core Strategy and the Policies DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  472
Policy:  PD6  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Para. 1

Summary of Representation:
Add education after social and add including maximum use of energy efficient modes and decreasing transport’s contribution to climate change.

Councils Response:
Educational transport needs are important and contribute to peak traffic flows, particularly in the morning, although it could be argued that education is covered under “social and Welfare”. The policy direction as a whole does address energy efficient modes of transport i.e. none car, including public transport and provision for walking and cycling facilities and links between and within communities. Any final policy should emphasise that, developments should be sited and designed with the needs of pedestrians and cyclists in mind in addition to providing “facilities”.

Decreasing transport’s contribution to climate change is a key aim of PPG13 and is one of the reasons for the need for “Sustainable Transport Solutions”, it may by useful to state this explicitly in any subsequent policy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Address the need to maximise the use of energy efficient modes and design with non-car based transport in mind and decrease transport’s contribution to climate change in policies.
Several suggestions are made to the various bullet points within Part 1, some of which are matters of wording/phrasing; these are difficult to address as newly drafted policies, rather than these policy directions, will appear in the Submission Core Strategy. However substantial points made are:

Bullet 3: Change to: maximise and promote access by foot and cycle, and for those with impaired mobility, within and between neighbourhoods and to local services, including the provision of necessary facilities.

Bullet 4: Change to: Integrate the operation of strategic road, rail, water and air transport connectivity to sub-regional, regional, national and international destinations using modes of transport that are energy efficient and that Reduce Rotherham’s Carbon footprint!

Bullet 8: should end: based on an integrated strategic freight routeing network for road, rail, water and air.

The big test of the evidence base is – have the RSS public transport accessibility criteria been used to guide the allocation of sites and provision of new transport services and infrastructure?

Councils Response:
Bullet 3: The suggested inclusion of “those with impaired mobility” is accepted, other suggested re-wording are noted and will be considered when the submission policies are drafted.

Bullet 4: Integration of the various networks is important and the LDF has a key role in ensuring that the physical infrastructure is such that integration can be achieved. However,
to drop the word “Improving” from this bullet would suggest that now physical improvements were required and that integration is merely a matter of organisation. The policy direction as drafted is fairly general, but does cover the issues raised in the suggested changes. The need to reduce carbon emissions underlies much of transport policy, and although this needs stating at some point, it does not need repeating at every point where it may be relevant.

Bullet 8: This bullet is stating a strategic aim and details relating to its implementation will be dealt with in the Policies and Allocations DPDs. Locations for strategic interchanges relating to bulk freight may need to be identified in the Submission Core Strategy.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Include “those with impaired mobility” within any policy relating to the accessible environment.

The need to reduce transport related carbon emissions needs to be stated in subsequent DPDs (see PD6b) (Representation No. 472)

Locations for strategic interchanges relating to bulk freight may need to be identified in the Submission Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 471
PD6 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 471
Policy: PD6  
Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Transportation not very Rotherham Specific – could apply to any borough so it has ticked all the boxes. Also the policy is about end points and 4 bullets refer to “improving” which could mean anything.

Councils Response:
Accept; policies will be more locally specific at the submission stage. More detail regarding what “improving” means will be provided in either the submission Core strategy or the Policies DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that policies in the submission version are more locally specific.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 538
PD6 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5167
Name: Mr Brian Upstone
Organisation: RAP Residents Against Pollution

Representation Number: 538
Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Transport Assessments, Air Quality Assessments

Summary of Representation:
Strongly object to the four lane motorway as it is felt that it would cause more noise and air pollution in this over polluted area.

Councils Response:
As PD6 makes no mention of motorway widening it is assumed that the respondent refers to the current proposal of the Highways Agency to increase motorway capacity between junctions 30 and 42 of the M1 arising from the South and West Yorkshire Motorway Best Utilisation Study. This is intended to mitigate air and noise pollution by creating free flowing traffic at speeds regulated by improved telemetry and overhead signage. The Council has a limited remit over the motorway parts of the strategic road network but within Policy Direction 9 explicit mention is made of the need to have particular regard to the potential adverse effects of additional development within or which impact upon Air Quality Management Areas. In addition Policy Direction 6 states that developers will be required to submit with certain applications transport assessments and air quality assessments to demonstrate how the potential adverse transport impacts of new developments can be mitigated.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 539

PD6 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 5167

Name: Mr Brian Upstone

Organisation: RAP Residents Against Pollution

Representation Number: 539

Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: Sustainable Transport - urban areas/sustainable

Summary of Representation:
Proposals for public transport could work.

Councils Response:
Support is welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support taken into account in preparing submission draft Core Strategy.
**Assessment of Representations**

**Respondent I.D.**  5228

**Name:**  Mr Adrian Hartley

**Organisation:**

**Representation Number:**  44

**Policy:**  PD6  

**Object/Support:**  Comment

**Section / Paragraph:**

**Summary of Representation:**
Suggesting building a train station/park and ride facility behind Matalan and Retail World. It would link Retail World, Rotherham and Meadowhall for trams and shopping. Believes it would be a cost effective way of cutting rush hour traffic.

**Councils Response:**
A potential interchange is identified in the current Unitary Development Plan. However, it has not been included in the South Yorkshire Rail Strategy/LTP2 five year funding programme (see Transportation Unit's comments) and new infrastructure included in the LDF for the longer term has to be feasible and deliverable.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Reconsider the suggestion for a Parkgate rail station/park and ride at the options stage of the Allocations DPD which will inform the submission Core Strategy.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 597

PD6 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5247

Name: Mr Edward Uwechue

Organisation: The Development Planning Partnership

Representation Number: 597

Policy: PD6  Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The Core Strategy and emerging Transport DPD and/or supporting SPD’s should give further details on the emerging transport strategies for Rotherham town centre, including a phasing timetable which indicates their implementation.

Councils Response:
An Area Action Plan for Rotherham Town Centre has yet to be programmed however work is underway to refresh the Rotherham Town Centre Strategic Development Framework and to adopt this as an Interim Planning Statement which will feed into any future Area Action Plan. This will incorporate the emerging transport strategies for Rotherham Town Centre.

It will be appropriate for the Submission Core Strategy to set out the vision for Rotherham Town Centre, and it may be appropriate for this to include further details of the emerging transport strategy. The comments will be taken into account in preparing the Submission Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
That consideration is given to the inclusion of details of the transport strategy for Rotherham Town Centre in the Submission Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 243
PD6 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5258
Name:  Mrs Ann Roche
Organisation:  Wath Festival

Representation Number:  243
Policy:  PD6  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  sustainable transport solutions

Summary of Representation:
Support for more public transport and fewer cars to combat global warming

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of this policy direction

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 678
 PD6 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5262

Name: Julie Deptford

Organisation: GVA Grimley (for Sheffield City Airport and Sheffield Airport Properties Ltd)

Representation Number: 678

Policy: PD6  Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Sheffield City Airport will retain aviation facilities and therefore it will be necessary for the Core Strategy to include aerodrome safeguarding policies in accordance with ODPM circular 01/2003.

Councils Response:
Further consideration will be required to determine appropriate safeguarding policies having regard to the aviation facilities at Sheffield City Airport. Where appropriate aerodrome safeguarding policies will be included in the Submission Core Strategy or, if more appropriate, in the supporting Policies DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The comments will be taken into account and further consideration will be given to the inclusion of aerodrome safeguarding policies in the Submission Core Strategy or Policies DPD as appropriate.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 311
PD6 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 5263
Name: Mr Bob Wolfe
Organisation: Airport Planning & Development Ltd (for Peel Airports Group)

Representation Number: 311
Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: 6.1

Summary of Representation:
RHADS makes a contribution to connectivity within the sub-region via improving international air services, the FARRS Link to the national road network, the proposed Airport Rail Station and the Surface Access Strategy/Airport Transport Forum.

Councils Response:
Noted

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Emphasise need for ongoing improvements to surface access in the submission document
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  569
PD6 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5270
Name:  Mr Keith Ellis
Organisation:

Representation Number:  569
Policy:  PD6  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Sustainable transport - urban areas/sustainable

Summary of Representation:
Reducing car access to the town centre will be detrimental in that it will send people away to competing retail areas such as Sheffield.

Councils Response:
The way people travel and the continued growth in road traffic is damaging to the environment. PD6 in responding to Central Government Guidance, is seeking to use parking policies alongside other planning and transport measures, which are designed to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce the reliance on the car for work and other journeys. However it is accepted that managing car parking capacity also needs to avoid prejudicing the economic viability of the town centre.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Make appropriate reference in submission policy that the management of car parking should not prejudice the general commercial viability of town centres.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 573
PD6 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 5272
Name: Margaret Maher
Organisation:

Representation Number: 573
Policy: PD6 Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: General

Summary of Representation:
In the centre of Rotherham many parking spaces have been lost.

Councils Response:
The way people travel and the continued growth in road traffic is damaging to the environment. PD6 in responding to Central Government Guidance, is seeking to use parking policies alongside other planning and transport measures, which are designed to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce the reliance on the car for work and other journeys. However it is accepted that managing car parking capacity also needs to avoid prejudicing the economic viability of the town centre.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments noted.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 516
PD7 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 1018

Name: Cllr T. G. Bell

Organisation: Laughton Common Residents

Representation Number: 516

Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Landscape character

Summary of Representation:
Trees, hedges, grass verges, walls must remain.

Councils Response:
Agree that this should be this case in appropriate circumstances. Policies to safeguard existing local heritage will be included in a future Policies DPD (with appropriate designations on the Proposals Map).

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Policies to safeguard existing local heritage will be included in a future Policies DPD
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 638  
PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  1565  
Name: Mr Brian Davies  
Organisation: Natural England  

Representation Number: 638  
Policy: PD7  
Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:  

Summary of Representation:  
The Countryside Resources section should refer to the protection and enhancement to public rights of way, open access and National Trails for the benefit of visitors and residents of Rotherham.

Councils Response:  
It is intended that countryside resources include rights of way, trails and any open access areas but this needs to be made more explicit in further developing the policy for submission.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
Make the definition of facilities and assets included as countryside resources more explicit in further development of PD7 to submission.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 1565
Name: Mr Brian Davies
Organisation: Natural England

Representation Number: 640
Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Support

Summary of Representation:
PD7 generally fit for purpose. Natural England is pleased with the landscape elements through use of Landscape Character Assessment and that appropriate mitigation measures will be required to combat any potential direct and or indirect adverse impacts of development through specific detailed policies.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action required.
Respondent I.D. 1565

Name: Mr Brian Davies

Organisation: Natural England

Representation Number: 639

Policy: PD7  Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Natural England is pleased with the intention to produce a Greenspace Strategy and the proposed incorporation of recreational and biodiversity resources in it. Natural England looks forward to commenting on consultation drafts of the Greenspace Strategy in the future.

Natural England notes that the criteria for the identification and surveying of sites of local importance to inform future biodiversity policies are to be included in a future policies DPD. Natural England is involved in contributing to this area of work through the LWS Panel and looks forward to commenting on the policies in due course.

Councils Response:
Support and offer of continued involvement welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
To progress the production of Corporate Greenspace Strategy and a future Policies DPD related to Local Wildlife Sites
Respondent I.D.  1565
Name:  Mr Brian Davies
Organisation:  Natural England

Representation Number:  642
Policy:  PD7  Object

Summary of Representation:
Explicit reference to geological conservation needed and also the need to conserve, interpret and manage geological sites.

Councils Response:
Agree.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend to include explicit reference to geological conservation and also the need to conserve, interpret and manage geological sites.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 636
PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1565
Name: Mr Brian Davies
Organisation: Natural England

Representation Number: 636
Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Natural England does not consider the title reflects the topic area and suggests the title should be Natural Built and Cultural Heritage

Councils Response:
Agree for the sake of clarity.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend title of Policy Direction 7 to ‘Natural Built and Cultural Heritage’.

..........................................................................................................................................................................................................................
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 637
PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1565

Name: Mr Brian Davies

Organisation: Natural England

Representation Number: 637

Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Natural England suggests proposals in Landscape Section for a SPD to help deliver the Landscape Character Assessment approach to guide development and developers

Councils Response:
Agree. Although, not explicitly stated, the suggestion is in line with the intention given in Paragraph 7.103 of the supporting text to PD7. This should be clarified in the submission draft of the Core Strategy.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include explicit reference to the future preparation of SPD to accompany the intended Landscape Character Assessment, which will act as a guide to development and developers.
Respondent I.D.  1960
Name:  Ms Krys Craik
Organisation:  South Yorkshire Forest Partnership

Representation Number:  666
Policy:  PD7   Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Sustainability Appraisal

Summary of Representation:
SYF views correspond to the sustainability appraisal as given in subsections headed “Weakness and Enhancement Opportunities” (first paragraph only) as given on p110. SYF believe the strategy would benefit from a more holistic approach which advocates connectivity and the development of Green Infrastructure Planning. Such an approach would recognise that the network of open spaces, habitats and green corridors present in the Borough has a collective value which benefits people and wildlife and which adds to the value of individual designated sites.

Councils Response:
Accepted. Consideration of integrating Green Infrastructure Planning into the Core Strategy should be undertaken.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the integration of Green Infrastructure Planning into further preparation of the Core Strategy.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 659
PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1960
Name: Ms Krys Craik
Organisation: South Yorkshire Forest Partnership

Representation Number: 659
Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Page 110

Summary of Representation:
Introduction should have more emphasis on positive action. The opening phrase “where appropriate” appears weak consider replacing with “where possible”

In the subsections of the Policy Direction it is not always clear what action is being proposed with regard to the subheadings. The subsections should read as clear action points or explanatory text –detailed suggestions are given.

Councils Response:
In terms of the comment regarding the sub-sections - the suggestions are noted but as a Policy Direction, PD7 will require further translation to a policy/policies in the Submission Core Strategy which will clarify the requirements of development proposals.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Take account of the suggested rewording in translating the Policy Direction into a strategic policy in the submission Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  
Rep No: 664  
PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1960  
Name: Ms Krys Craik  
Organisation: South Yorkshire Forest Partnership  

Representation Number: 664  
Policy: PD7  
Object/Support: Object  
Section / Paragraph: para 7.104

Summary of Representation:  
Amend countryside resources paragraph of PD7 to read:

“The quality, character, heritage and amenity value of the countryside brings cultural and leisure benefits to the Borough’s residents and visitors, and will be sensitively promoted as part of an integrated and sustainable approach to land management”

in paragraph 7.104, insert ‘Partnership’ after Forest

Councils Response:  
Detailed wording amendments are accepted but noting - as a Policy Direction further work is required to translate to policy / policies.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
Amend Countryside resources paragraph of PD7 to read:

“The quality, character, heritage and amenity value of the countryside brings cultural and leisure benefits to the Borough’s residents and visitors, and will be sensitively promoted as part of an integrated and sustainable approach to land management”  
In paragraph 7.104, insert 'Partnership' after 'Forest'.  

******************************************************************************
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 663

PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1960

Name: Ms Krys Craik

Organisation: South Yorkshire Forest Partnership

Representation Number: 663

Policy: PD7

Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Clarification and amendment of the green space section is suggested to incorporation of green infrastructure concepts, which is anticipated will be incorporated into the RSS.

The respondent defines green infrastructure as describing “the basic structure of the natural environment within and between our cities, towns and villages, and which is needed to deliver economic growth and liveability for communities. It is the network of open spaces, waterways, woodlands, green corridors, street trees and open countryside that brings many social, economic and environmental benefits to local people and communities, informal recreation, children’s plays and pitch sports as well as for their general amenity, biodiversity and habitat value.

It is suggested the Policy Direction focuses too much upon the more traditional character, functions and uses of recreation areas - this should be widened to make it clear that semi-natural areas including woodlands, grassland, wetlands etc which are used for informal recreation are included in this policy.

Councils Response:
Accepted. Consideration of integrating Green Infrastructure Planning into the Core Strategy should be undertaken.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the integration of Green Infrastructure Planning into further preparation of the Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 662
PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  1960
Name:  Ms Krys Craik
Organisation:  South Yorkshire Forest Partnership

Representation Number:  662
Policy:  PD7  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Amend the Landscape Character paragraph by the insertion of “All new development will be required to respect” at the start to read:

Landscape character
All new development will be required to respect Landscape character and distinctiveness derived from the intrinsic qualities of the countryside related to geology and geomorphology, biodiversity, ancient woodlands and hedgerows, settlement and field patterns, historic buildings, ancient monuments and archaeology. (A Borough wide Landscape Character Assessment is to be undertaken to identify locally distinct landscape areas to inform specific detailed policies in a future Policies DPD (with designations on the Proposals Map) yet to be programmed in the Local Development Scheme).

Councils Response:
As a Policy Direction, the wording will be translated to policy / policies for the Submission Core Strategy. However, the wording suggested is accepted in principle at this stage of preparation.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend Policy Direction as suggested - noting further development of PD7 is required in its translation from Policy Direction to policy / policies in the Submission Core Strategy.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 660
PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1960
Name: Ms Krys Craik
Organisation: South Yorkshire Forest Partnership

Representation Number: 660
Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Suggested rewording of the Biodiversity/geodiversity section:

This policy is designed to protect biodiversity, habitat networks and geological features within designated sites as well as within areas of recognised local importance from the effects of adverse development (‘naturally regenerated brownfield sites’ are difficult to define, being dependant upon length of time since they were last developed, interim management activities etc, it is probably preferable to protect sites for their proven wildlife/geological value, rather than on the history of their past use.). Future biodiversity policy and management regimes will need to take account of the potential effects of climate change, and to take appropriate mitigating action. The phrase ‘taking account of’ will not in itself achieve the desired action. (Detailed biodiversity policies are to be included in a future Policies DPD (with designations on the Proposals Map) yet to be programmed in the Local Development Scheme).

Councils Response:
As a Policy Direction, the wording will be translated to policy / policies for the Submission Core Strategy. The spirit of the suggested wording is acceptable but would be inappropriate as currently suggested.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Policy Direction 7 to be amended in its translation from Policy Direction to policy / policies in the Submission Core Strategy including reflecting the concerns of the respondents’ representation.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 665
PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1960
Name: Ms Krys Craik
Organisation: South Yorkshire Forest Partnership

Representation Number: 665
Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Provisional Monitoring Indicators
As discussed at the Biodiversity Partnership workshop, there needs to be more emphasis on quality - eg woodland indicator should include a reference to woodlands in management and woodland creation. SYFP holds very extensive databases on the area and condition of woodlands and we would be able to supply monitoring data on woodlands as part of our delivery plan

Councils Response:
It is accepted that the list of monitoring indicators are provisional and that there may be a need to substitute more pertinent local indicators, including those with an emphasis on quality (where appropriate). Further discussion with the respondent to improve monitoring data is welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Continue to investigate the improvement of the provisional monitoring indicators listed, including further discussion with the respondent.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 661
PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1960
Name: Ms Krys Craik
Organisation: South Yorkshire Forest Partnership

Representation Number: 661
Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Suggested rewording
Amend the Historic built environment paragraph by the insertion of “This policy is designed to protect” at the start to read:

“This policy is designed to protect Historic architectural and archaeological assets, including its conservation areas, listed buildings, ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens from inappropriate development. (Conservation Area assessments and reviews will inform scope for Conservation Area Management Plans and townscape enhancement initiatives in future Supplementary Planning Documents yet to be programmed in the Local Development Scheme).”

Councils Response:
As a Policy Direction, the wording will be translated to policy / policies for the Submission Core Strategy. However, the wording suggested is accepted in principle at this stage of preparation.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend Policy Direction as suggested - noting further development of PD7 is required in its translation from Policy Direction to policy / policies in the Submission Core Strategy


Summary of Representation:
It is important that some form of classification similar to the current Area of High Landscape Value be retained. Local standards that relate to valued landscapes should not be lost. Recognition and mention of the leisure, tourist and health benefits that accrue from the protection and use of such areas should also be made.

Councils Response:
In line with government guidance (PPS7) criteria based policies utilising tools such as landscape character assessment should provide sufficient protection for those areas that are particularly valued locally. Rigid local designations may unduly restrict acceptable, sustainable development and the economic activity that underpins the vitality of rural areas.

Local landscape designations should only be maintained or, exceptionally, extended where it can be clearly shown that criteria-based planning policies cannot provide the necessary protection. Such designations will be based on a formal and robust assessment of the qualities of the landscape concerned.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments will be considered as part Landscape Character Assessment process which will ultimately feed into the Allocations DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 526
PD7 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 2121

Name: Mr & Mrs Peter & Sue Hubbard

Organisation: Ulley Parish Plan Steering Committee

Representation Number: 526

Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph: Historic built environment

Summary of Representation:
In the UDP Ulley was identified as being one of the settlements that was to become a conservation area. Wording should being included in the LDF that makes specific reference to a continuing commitment to those areas already identified in the UDP and acknowledges the need to give priority to them in any assessment process.

Councils Response:
PD7 indicates that ongoing Conservation Area assessments and reviews are looking at the scope for further designations and boundary changes. Ultimately these will be used to inform scope for Conservation Area Management Plans and townscapes enhancement initiatives in future Supplementary Planning Documents yet to be programmed in the Local Development Scheme.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure submission review of this policy includes the commitment to further conservation area designation. Specify intended new designations dependent on completion of the current review / assessment programme.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 78
PD7 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 2218

Name: John Thickitt

Organisation:

Representation Number: 78

Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
I have little specific comment, other than that the built/natural heritage is recognised in your document as having importance, and I agree with this.

The landscape character paragraph: does the term "hedgerows" include 'veteran' trees? (i.e. very old trees). I think it should, as they can be, amongst other things, a focal point.

Councils Response:
Support for the built and natural heritage sections of PD7 is welcomed. It is implicit that all components contributing to the diversity and landscape value of hedgerows are included.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support be noted. Consider the need to briefly elaborate on the diversity and landscape value of hedgerows in the submission version of PD7, and include specific reference to aged and veteran trees. Policy requirements to address the safeguarding, maintenance and enhancement of aged and veteran trees will be detailed in a future policy document, yet to be programmed into the Local Development Scheme.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 332
PD7 \ Comment

Respondent I.D.  2413

Name:  Mr John Dunshea
Organisation:  Atisreal UK

Representation Number:  332

Policy:  PD7  Object/Support:  Comment

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
PD7 should recognise that biodiversity can contribute to sustainable development.

Councils Response:
Accept that the LDF should recognise the contribution that biodiversity can make to sustainable development.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the Core Strategy and any subsequent detailed policy DPD’s include sufficient and appropriate references to the inclusion of biodiversity and geo diversity and the contribution that they make to sustainable development. Consideration may need to be given to preparing supplementary planning guidance in the future to ensure that this issue is appropriately dealt with in any forthcoming planning applications.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3165

Name:  Mr & Mrs J & S Dixon

Organisation:

Representation Number:  218

Policy:  PD7  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Local Heritage

Summary of Representation:
The ARUP consultant’s statement of weaknesses and enhancement opportunities in this section is endorsed.

Councils Response:
ARUP’s comments will be given full consideration in the drafting of the plan for submission to the Secretary of State.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Strengthen this section of the plan by reference to the comments supplies by ARUPs.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 3165
Name: Mr & Mrs J & S Dixon
Organisation:

Representation Number: 217
Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Support

Summary of Representation:
Support for the Greenspace Network, but ask that the audit be checked to ensure it includes land adjacent Brook Hill, Thorpe Hesley which is used for informal recreation.

Councils Response:
The land at Brook Hill is allocated as Urban Greenspace in the adopted development plan. It is also included in the Green Spaces Audit, where it is classified as being of low quality but high value.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Retain this site as green space.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3328
Name:  Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation:  Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number:  129
Policy:  PD7  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  General

Summary of Representation:
The importance given to the historic built environment, green space networks and biodiversity is supported.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 166
PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3418
Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  166
Policy:  PD7  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The title of this policy could prove slightly confusing, given it deals with a range of environmental and heritage issues, including biodiversity, landscape character and the built environment. Given that this is the only policy dealing with these issues, we feel it would have been helpful if there were more references to urban and woodland planting and forestry, which have both been identified as important issues for South Yorkshire. In addition, urban fringe landscapes have been identified in draft RSS as a particular landscape that would benefit from enhancement in South Yorkshire. It would be beneficial if these areas were identified in either the core strategy or a specific DPD.

Councils Response:
The Council accept this view.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Submission Core Strategy will incorporate appropriate wording on urban and woodland planting, forestry and urban fringe landscapes. Further detailed policy will be incorporated in supporting DPDs.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 71

Policy: PD7
Object/Support: Object

Respondent I.D. 3424
Name: Mr Henryk Peterson
Organisation: Sport England

Representation Number: 71

Summary of Representation:
Strategic policy direction PD7 Local Heritage. Sport England comments are broadly similar to those made on policy direction PD1- lack of evidence base in place, awaiting Greenspace Strategy and standards. The weaknesses identified by Arup are supported. More linked indicators as part of quality of life indices would be supported. Again, there is scope to link with some of Sport England KPI's.

Councils Response:
These comments are generally accepted but the new planning regime requires the Council to set out its priority LDF programme in the Local Development Scheme to be agreed with the Government Office. It was made clear that the LDF was not to be seen as a replacement UDP which has comprehensive topic coverage. PPG17, RSS and "Saved" UDP policies for community facilities will provide an interim planning policy framework for sport and recreation pending further work in providing the evidence base (particularly concerning need, strategy and appropriate local standards) to underpin policies and proposals in future Policies and Allocations DPDs to be programmed in a future LDS.

There is scope to expand the potential wider benefits of biodiversity for submission, as identified in the Arup sustainability commentary.

The Council is anxious to include a manageable number of feasible and meaningful indicators that are also consistent with those set out in guidance and those included in RSS. Sport Englands KPIs will be considered when finalising performance indicators under the strategic policies for the submission document.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Discuss with Sport England the scope to expand PD7 in relation to sport and recreation together with the general use of Sport England's KPIs in the submission document.

**************************************************************************************
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 667
PD7 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 3673
Name: Mr Nick Sandford
Organisation: The Woodland Trust

Representation Number: 667
Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Woodland Trust suggests amendments to PD7.

1. Add ancient and veteran trees added to the list of landscape types and habitats area to be safeguarded, maintained and enhanced.

2. Policy should contain a commitment to restoring habitats which have been damaged or degraded. There should be a commitment to restoring ancient woodland sites which have been cleared and replanted.

3. Policy should be revised to take account of the finding of the sustainability appraisal quoted on page 110 that the PD could be used to promote the use of biodiversity and the wider environment to respond to the effects of climate change.

Councils Response:
1. For the sake of brevity it is considered unnecessary to specifically mention ancient and veteran trees in the examples of landscape types and habitats to be safeguarded, maintained and enhanced. The examples given are not an exhaustive list. Policy requirements will be detailed in a future policy document, yet to be programmed into the Local Development Scheme. In the interim it is considered sufficient policy coverage exists through the UDP and Planning Policy Guidance 9.

2. Policy Direction 7 includes wording to protect and where appropriate enhance habitats which is considered also includes restoring damaged and degraded habitats. No further amendment is therefore considered necessary. The practicalities of including a commitment to restoring ancient woodland sites which have been cleared and replanted is queried but will be investigated further in the preparation of a future policy document, yet to be programmed into the Local Development Scheme.
3. The principle of making more explicit reference to climate change is accepted and the means of inclusion will be considered for the submission Core Strategy noting that the Sustainability Appraisal Report recommended an alternative approach to that being suggested by the respondent. The Report concluded that the cross cutting theme of responding to the effects of climate change could be highlighted by making reference to these issues across all of the spatial Policy Directions.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
1. Policy requirements to address the safeguarding, maintenance and enhancement of ancient and veteran trees will be detailed in a future policy document, yet to be programmed into the Local Development Scheme.
2. The practicalities of including a commitment to restoring ancient woodland sites which have been cleared and replanted is queried but will be investigated further in the preparation of a future policy document, yet to be programmed into the Local Development Scheme.
3. Submission Core Strategy to include greater reference to the climate change by means yet to be determined.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D. 3763
Name: Mr Ian Smith
Organisation: English Heritage

Representation Number: 612
Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: PD7 and Appendix 4

Summary of Representation:
Support the production of a landscape character assessment of the borough informed by the Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) already carried out.

Mention HLC in Appendix 4

Councils Response:
Support welcomed. Historic Landscape Characterisation to be referenced within Core Strategy as and when released for use by the Borough Council.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Historic Landscape Characterisation to be referenced within Core Strategy as and when released for use by the Borough Council.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 604
PD7 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3763
Name:  Mr Ian Smith
Organisation:  English Heritage

Representation Number:  604
Policy:  PD7  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Para 3.28

Summary of Representation:
Support for the production of a landscape character assessment
Include Historic Parks and gardens under the section dealing with historic environment

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Historic Parks and Gardens are already included under the Historic Built Environment section of PD7 - Local Heritage.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 610
PD7 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 3763
Name: Mr Ian Smith
Organisation: English Heritage

Representation Number: 610
Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: Page 107

Summary of Representation:
Support of the intentions of PD7 which relate to the historic environment
Support the intention to produce updated conservation policies in a future development plan document, the production of conservation area assessments and management plans and the development of townscape enhancement initiatives.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Noted.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 611
PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3763
Name: Mr Ian Smith
Organisation: English Heritage

Representation Number: 611
Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
In the context of Rotherham Townscape Heritage Initiative, consider the development of a strategy to identify and protect locally important historic buildings parks etc. (see PPG15).

This is an aspect identified in the Sustainability Appraisal.

Councils Response:
Agree. Updated conservation policies will be included in a future policies DPD, yet to be programmed into the Local Development Scheme, which would consider the development of a strategy to identify and protect locally important historic buildings, parks etc.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the development of a strategy to identify and protect locally important historic buildings, parks etc., in a future policies DPD, yet to be programmed into the Local Development Scheme.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 194
PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183
Name: Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number: 194
Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Local Heritage

Summary of Representation:
A policies DPD and Proposals Map are needed now, not in the future, if we are to save the Borough’s local heritage. Two prominent mistakes are the deterioration of Keppels Column and failure to hold onto Wentworth Woodhouse.

Councils Response:
The sequence of document production and consultation and timescales is clearly set out in government guidance which necessitated prioritising the topic areas to be covered in the initial Local Development Framework (LDF) and agreeing these priorities with Government Office. This LDF will cover Housing, Employment, Retail and Transportation issues, these being the topics where guidance has changed most since the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) was adopted in 1999.

For those topics not being reviewed at this time the UDP policies will be safeguarded to ensure continued protection until a review can be programmed with Government Office.

The Council is constantly seeking finance, and working in partnership with the owners of Listed Buildings to ensure the adequate protection of such treasures.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 233  
PD7 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  4969
Name:  Mr Ian Rowe
Organisation:  Signet Planning (for Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estates)

Representation Number:  233
Policy:  PD7  
Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Support for the principles embodied in PD7 and for the recognition that appropriate development can play an important part in achieving the conservation of the historic environment, particularly with respect to listed buildings and Conservation Areas.

Councils Response:
Support Noted

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action required
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 476
PD7 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5147

Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  476

Policy:  PD7  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Greenspace networks should include references to river and canal corridors

Councils Response:
This section does not exclude river and canal corridors, and opportunities should be taken, where proposed development has an appropriate relationship to rivers and canals, to enhance and improve accessibility to this valuable resource.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider including particular reference to river and canal corridors in the submission draft Core Strategy and the Policies DPD.

******************************************************************************
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  477
Policy:  PD7  
Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
CPRE supports of the final paragraph Countryside Resources but feel it should be re-written as it may be difficult for the lay person to understand. What sort of cultural and leisure benefits?

Councils Response:
Comments noted

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider expanding future policies, and/or supporting explanatory text, to describe culture and leisure benefits.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  475
Policy:  PD7  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Landscape Character Assessments should assess the whole borough and each areas capacity to absorb different types of development

Councils Response:
The Landscape Character Assessment will asses the whole Borough and will provide specific design guidance for land use development types.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure the progression of the Landscape Character Assessment. This will provide specific guidance on the capacity of areas of the Borough to absorb different types of development.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 540
PD7 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 5167
Name: Mr Brian Upstone
Organisation: RAP Residents Against Pollution

Representation Number: 540
Policy: PD7 Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: Greenspace networks

Summary of Representation:
Important that greenspaces are not lost to a great extent.

Councils Response:
Agree that this should be this case in appropriate circumstances. Policies to safeguard existing greenspaces and the application of standards of provision within new development are to be included in a future Policies DPD (with appropriate designations on the Proposals Map).

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Policies to safeguard existing greenspaces and the application of standards of provision within new developments are to be included in a future policies DPD.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  62
PD7 \ Comment

Respondent I.D.  5205
Name:  Mr Sam Kipling
Organisation:  Environment Agency

Representation Number:  62
Policy:  PD7  
Object/Support:  Comment

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
We welcome the coverage this policy gives to protected habitats and species. We also welcome the inclusion of habitat networks however, the wording of the first sentence of the ‘Biodiversity/Geodiversity’ section is unclear. It is our understanding that only developments within designated sites will be required to safeguard, maintain and enhance biodiversity, habitat networks and geological features. This requirement should apply to all new developments, not just development in designated sites. The wording of this section of the policy should be reviewed to ensure its clarity and to encapsulate all new development.

In addition, the development of Green Networks and Habitat Networks would be specifically encouraged around watercourses. Biodiversity is particularly important in and around watercourses as they act as corridors for movement and as strong linkages between different habitats. Any setting aside of land adjacent to watercourses would also be beneficial to flooding as it would help to minimise sensitive receptors in flooding area. Green buffer strips can also be extremely positive for amenity and recreational uses too.

Councils Response:
The biodiversity/geodiversity section of PD7 covers interest in " areas of recognised local importance" outside designated sites. However, in the light of these comment the submission version of the strategic policy needs to be more explicit and should also address biodiversity within areas liable to flooding and adjacent to watercourses.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Develop PD7 further to make explicit that the LDF will take account of biodiversity and geological interests in the wider environment, not just within designated areas. The development of green networks and habitat networks along watercourses will also be addressed.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 263
PD7 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5260

Name:   Jane Hanson

Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  263

Policy:  PD7     Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Local Heritage

Summary of Representation:
STAG feels this policy should be a priority in dealing with planning applications, particularly where there is conflict between local, regional and national strategies.

Councils Response:
The chain of conformity should mean that is no conflict between local, regional and national policy. The Planning Board, which approves or refuses planning applications consists of local councillors who will bring a local dimension to the proceedings.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 264
PD7 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5260
Name:   Jane Hanson
Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  264
Policy:  PD7          Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Historic Built Environment

Summary of Representation:
This policy is fully supported and would like to see protection given to large gardens which benefit from unique characteristics.

Councils Response:
Thank you for your support of this policy. Where large gardens form part of the historic built environment the Council has additional controls over development proposals

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5260
Name:   Jane Hanson
Organisation:  Stag Residents Action Group

Representation Number:  265
Policy:  PD7       Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Green Space Networks

Summary of Representation:
STAG would welcome the inclusion of gardens as a vital part of the green space network, helping to link existing Green Belt areas. These gardens should be reclassified so only the footprint of the existing building is considered to be brownfield land

Councils Response:
The definition of brownfield land has been determined by Central Government in Planning Policy Statement 3 Housing. The definition states that residential properties and their curtilages are brownfield sites. Rotherham Council has to abide by this ruling.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 498  
PD8 \ Support  

Respondent I.D.  958  
Name:  Mrs Alice Rodgers  
Organisation:  Maltby Environmental Group  

Representation Number:  498  
Policy:  PD8  
Object/Support:  Support  
Section / Paragraph:  Water catchments  

Summary of Representation:  
General and enthusiastic support given for these policies but were not felt to go far enough. Particular mention was made to the issue of flooding. In view of the fact that flood banks do not merely reduce its incidence, it is proposed that no vital and sensitive council building (e.g. library, archives, records management store or emergency planning base) should be sited lower down than the Parish Church of All Saints.  

Councils Response:  
The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will determine those areas which are not suitable for particular types of development. Its conclusions will form a significant part of the determination of identifying appropriate types of future development that are advocated in the Allocations DPD.  

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
Comments to be considered as part of Allocations DPD.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 499
PD8 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 958
Name: Mrs Alice Rodgers
Organisation: Maltby Environmental Group

Representation Number: 499
Policy: PD8 Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: Utility infrastructure

Summary of Representation:
Concern at the combined impact of development upon infrastructure, particularly for sewerage and power supply. These should be planned for in advance of development.

Councils Response:
Agree. Policy Direction 8 makes reference to safeguarding utility infrastructure and the need to extend utility infrastructure networks will be necessary to serve new development within sustainable settlements, in addition to regulating development to the availability of water supplies and sewerage capacity. However the issue of co-ordination is not made explicit and as such PD8 will need to be amended to take account of this. The exact details of a policy to ensure that necessary infrastructure provision occurs will be covered by the Policies DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Amend submission draft Core Strategy version of PD8 to reflect importance of co-ordination of development and infrastructure provision.
Respondent I.D.  1565

Name:  Mr Brian Davies

Organisation:  Natural England

Representation Number:  645

Policy:  PD8  Object/SUPPORT:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Bullets 4, 5 and 7

Summary of Representation:
Bullet 4 should include for the reuse, restoration and management of mineral sites to be returned to benefit the natural or rural environment

Bullet 5 should have added after “protecting “in the first line “enhance"

Within bullet point 7 an aim should be to reduce the Ecological Footprint of the Borough by using the REAP data produced by the Stockholm Institute.

Councils Response:
Bullet 4 – The issue of reuse, restoration and management of mineral workings to benefit biodiversity, geodiversity and the wider environment would be better covered in developing strategic PD7 to the submission stage, pending more detailed consideration in future supporting DPDs covering minerals policy and allocations which have yet to be programmed in the Local Development Scheme.

Bullet 5 - Accepted.

Bullet 7 – It is accepted there may be merit to use of the Stockholm Institute’s REAP methodology to measure reduction of the Borough’s ecological footprint. The practicalities require further investigation.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Make reference to the reuse, restoration and management of mineral workings to benefit biodiversity, geodiversity and the wider environment in the emerging policy on Local Heritage (currently PD7).
Natural England is pleased that PD8 considers the promotion of biomass crops and local organic food production with development for non agricultural use taking place on lower quality agricultural land. Natural England also welcomes the positive approach to management of water catchments especially in terms of safeguarding biodiversity and providing opportunities for recreation.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No action required.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 174
PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  1606
Name:  Mr David Brewer
Organisation:  Confederation Of U K Coal Producers (Coalpro)

Representation Number:  174
Policy:  PD8 Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  7.106

Summary of Representation:
PD8 makes no reference to coal production and the advantages, both economic and environmental, of indigenous production as compared with imports.

Councils Response:
The coal industry has a much smaller impact on Rotherham’s employment profile than was the case historically.
Maltby Colliery, the last deep mine in Rotherham, employs 470 people but has a limited life - scheduled for closure in 2015. Coal production therefore makes only a small contribution to Rotherham’s economy, which is likely to decrease in future years.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to the wording of this paragraph.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 198
PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1606
Name: Mr David Brewer
Organisation: Confederation Of U K Coal Producers (Coalpro)

Representation Number: 198
Policy: PD8 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: 7.106

Summary of Representation:
PD8 makes no reference to the need to avoid the sterilisation of mineral resources, including coal, by development, or that such resources should be extracted prior to development commencing.

Councils Response:
The Council will seek to prevent the sterilisation of any winnable mineral resources because of development, including coal reserves, and this should be mentioned under PD8

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
PD8 be amended to cover the avoidance of sterilising land with winnable mineral reserves and be cross-referenced to other appropriate policies.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 197
PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1606

Name: Mr David Brewer

Organisation: Confederation Of U K Coal Producers (Coalpro)

Representation Number: 197

Policy: PD8 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: 7.106

Summary of Representation:
PD8 makes reference to the treatment and mitigation of ground stability and contamination but should explicitly recognise that where old coal workings are the cause further coal extraction can remediate the problems at no cost to the public purse.

Councils Response:
The Council accepts that the winning of mineral resources can be an economic means of treating and mitigating ground stability and contamination, in appropriate circumstances.

However, as mineral working constitutes development it is not felt necessary to make explicit reference to it in the further refinement of PD8 in promoting the treatment of unstable and contaminated land related to giving priority to the development of previously developed sites. To do so might imply priority will be given to mineral working in treating unstable and contaminated land. As with all development, mineral working proposals will need to be assessed against other relevant policy considerations. In some circumstances these considerations could over-ride expediency for the prior treatment of contaminated or unstable land for development.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The comments be noted and consideration be given to including mineral working as an example of a means of treating unstable and contaminated land in the background justification to the submission version of PD8.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 386
PD8 / Object

Respondent I.D.  1702

Name:  Ms Georgina Bourne

Organisation:  The Home Builders Federation

Representation Number:  386

Policy:  PD8  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The Home Builders Federation and Britain’s home building industry is working together with the Government to start addressing how to deliver the Government’s ambitious attempt to deliver higher environmental standards as well as a significant increase in numbers. Sustainability standards are already being set by Building Regulations and the Code for Sustainable Homes. The Council’s planning policies should not seek to replace these (as PPS1 makes clear). The Code will supersede Ecohomes. Planning authorities should focus on overall objectives of carbon reduction. Code for Sustainable Homes should be used as a single national standard. (Supported by “Planning for Climate Change (supplement to PPS1 para. 31.

PPS12 is clear that planning policies should not cut across matters within the scope of other legislative regimes. There has been extremely rapid improvement in the past few years in the performance in new homes. There must come a time when more attention is based on the existing stock.

Requirements increase cost at a time when affordability is a very serious concern, further versions of the Core Strategy should be worded carefully to recognise these concerns.

Councils Response:
Comments noted, but PD8 deals with all forms of development not just housing, and the Code for Sustainable Homes does not deal specifically with issues such as density, orientation and massing, which can be dealt with by the LDF. It is accepted that where such matters are dealt with by other regulations or national standards that the LDF should not seek to replicate or replace these.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the LDF does not to replicate or replace other regulations or national standards.
**Representations Report.doc**

**Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council**
**CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS**

**Assessment of Representations**

**Rep No: 528**

**PD8 \ Object**

---

**Respondent I.D.** 2121

**Name:** Mr & Mrs Peter & Sue Hubbard

**Organisation:** Ulley Parish Plan Steering Committee

**Representation Number:** 528

**Policy:** PD8  **Object/Support:** Object

**Section / Paragraph:** Energy efficiency

**Summary of Representation:**
Not having any reference point that gives guidance as to what 10.6MW of “installed renewable energy” would look like makes it difficult for anyone to agree or disagree with the statement provided within the final bullet point. Some form of wording limiting its influence should be included in the LDF until the Council can give some form of quantified assessment of the possible impacts of this target so that the community can make informed choices and decisions as part of the consultation process.

**Councils Response:**
The Council is committed to the prudent use of natural resources. This includes renewables being promoted using solar, water and wind energy. The target set in place within the Core Strategy was established in response to a minimum figure put forward within the Yorkshire & Humber Plan to which we need to conform. Given the wide array of technologies (e.g. solar panels and wind turbines) that can be employed to attain this target makes it difficult to provide a precise indication of the impacts that may occur as a result of this development. It is emphasised that safeguarding existing character and amenity will be significant considerations in developing a criteria based policy (as referred to in PPS22) for renewable energy facilities in the submission Core Strategy or Policies DPD.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Consider including a strategic criteria based policy within the submission Core Strategy or Policies DPD to assess future renewable energy facilities alongside promoting the RSS target.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 333
PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  2413
Name:  Mr John Dunshea
Organisation:  Atisreal UK

Representation Number:  333

Policy:  PD8  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
PD8 does not show links between the use of sustainable materials, sustainable design and the creation of sustainable communities such as Waverley.

Councils Response:
Accept that the LDF should recognise the use that sustainable materials and sustainable design can make to the delivery of sustainable development. The principles for creating a sustainable settlement should be an essential part in appraising and taking forward all future development opportunities in Rotherham particularly urban extensions and other major development opportunities. However the principle of Waverley being developed as a sustainable new community has not yet been accepted and further work needs to be done to justify the release of Waverley to meet Rotherham's future housing need.

It is accepted that more work needs to be done on urban extensions/ new communities that will need to be justified in the context of national and regional policy and supported by Sustainability Appraisal. Waverley is a significant site with potential for a new mixed use community. Other urban extensions will be identified during the settlement appraisal and site options work. Justification of suitable urban extensions will be dependent on the final RSS requirements, Sustainability Appraisal and performance under other policy and spatial objectives including the housing trajectory, Housing Market Renewal objectives and sustainable transport considerations.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
All site allocations for new development will be consulted on in the Allocations DPD in 2008. This baseline information will be used to produce the "spatial development strategy" for the Borough and will be included within the Submission Core Strategy. It is at the submission stage that the outcome of the ongoing work into the Spatial Strategy for the Borough will be resolved.
Further work needs to be undertaken to support the release of Waverley as a sustainable new settlement. Identify and appraise all urban extensions options including Waverley and take forward with appropriate justification into the submission document. Confirm Waverley's brownfield position with DCLG due to the omission of green/ brownfield definitions in PPS3.

Discuss with Highways Agency/RMBC Transportation Unit the need for evidence, regarding mitigation of potential impacts on the strategic road network and Air Quality Management Areas, in support of further development in the Lower Don Valley - to include Waverley and other possibilities that might be identified in the current settlement appraisal/site options work.

Ensure that the Core Strategy and any subsequent detailed policy DPD’s include sufficient and appropriate references to the use of sustainable materials and the principles of sustainable design and the contribution these can make to the delivery of sustainable development. Consideration may need to be given to preparing supplementary planning guidance in the future to ensure that these issues are appropriately dealt with in any forthcoming planning applications.

Meet respondent to clarify further.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 206
PD8 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 2494

Name: Abigail Dodds

Organisation: The British Wind Energy Association

Representation Number: 206

Policy: PD8 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Support for the recognition of the need to meet renewable energy targets within PD8. Also highlight the importance of including a clear, robust criteria-based development control policy in the LDF. The criteria could fall under three main headings: Residential amenity; Environmental effects; and Landscape effects, but should only include planning considerations. A well executed EIA could be an appropriate tool for assessing all these aspects.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Refer to this representation when drawing up detailed policies
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 207
PD8 Support

Respondent I.D. 2494

Name: Abigail Dodds
Organisation: The British Wind Energy Association

Representation Number: 207
Policy: PD8 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
BWEA support the Council’s decision to include an on-site renewable energy policy in the policy DPD. The following wording is suggested as an example:

“All non-residential or mixed use developments (new build, conversion or renovation) above a threshold of 1,000m² will be expected to provide at least 10% of their energy requirements from on-site renewable energy generation. All residential developments (new build, conversion or renovation) of 10 or more units will be expected to provide at least 10% of their energy requirements from on-site renewable energy generation.”

Councils Response:
Support noted. Your suggested wording for an on-site renewable energy policy will be helpful in the development of such a policy for the LDF.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Refer to this representation when producing a detailed on-site renewable energy policy.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 288
PD8 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 2635

Name: Ms Rachel Wigginton

Organisation: Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Representation Number: 288

Policy: PD8 Object/Support: Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Compliance with Soundness Test 4 (Spatial Plan - National Policy/RSS conformity)

There is limited policy coverage for minerals development. No clear indication is given of the nature and scale of mineral working although some quarries contribute to regional aggregates supply. Very limited information is given in the supporting text.

Greater clarity would be provided with a policy commitment, with the other South Yorkshire MPAs, to meeting the apportioned share of regional aggregates supply and maintaining the South Yorkshire aggregates landbank.

No reference is made to other minerals worked in the Borough and the need for provision and landbank policies for these needs to be considered. There needs to be a policy safeguarding mineral resources from sterilisation by other development.

The Core Strategy should address the MPS1, para 31 requirement for MPAs to define Mineral Safeguarding Areas.

There is a need to safeguard existing, planned and potential railheads and other facilities for the transport of minerals and the transport and processing of recycled and secondary materials (MPS1, para 13).

Councils Response:
It was previously agreed with GOYH in the Local Development Scheme that minerals was not a priority topic for the initial round of LDF documents and that there would be reliance on "saved" UDP policies as an interim measure. However, it is acknowledged that strategic minerals policy in the Core Strategy needs further work prior to submission and that the current mineral sites/regional supply apportionment situation needs to be explained in more detail - reduction in mineral working sites in recent years and
representation from Regional Aggregates Working Party production apportionment that by far the greatest South Yorkshire contribution would come from quarries in Doncaster.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**
Explain more fully the current minerals position (main sites and RAWP apportionment) as background to the broad strategic policy direction. Investigate scope for agreed wording/approach with other South Yorks LPAs. Check that appropriate UDP minerals policies have been saved regarding avoidance of sterilisation, maintaining landbanks through Minerals Safeguarding Zones and safeguarding of railheads and other facilities for transport, processing and recycling of minerals in line with MPS1.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 219

PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3165

Name:  Mr & Mrs J & S Dixon

Organisation:

Representation Number:  219

Policy:  PD8  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
ARUP consultant's statement of weaknesses and enhancement opportunities in this section is endorsed. In particular, the consideration of coppicing trees as a renewable energy fuel source is supported because it is also beneficial for the woodlands.

Councils Response:
The plan will, in general, be supportive of energy generation from renewable sources. Increased use of wood-burning stoves will stimulate the bio-crop market and encourage better woodland management. The South Yorkshire Forest Partnership is at the forefront of this technology in this area.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Cross-reference this section with PD3 (9 – Rural Economy) to show that energy crops are welcomed and supported by the Council.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 130
PD8 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3328
Name:  Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation:  Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number:  130
Policy:  PD8  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  PD8.2 2nd bullet

Summary of Representation:
The proposals to achieve a minimum net density of 30 dwellings per hectare, complementing PPS3, are supported.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.

***************************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 132
PD8 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 3328

Name: Ms Lucy Mitchell

Organisation: Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number: 132

Policy: PD8          Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph: PD8.5 5th bullet

Summary of Representation:
The proposal to optimise connections to future decentralised or low carbon energy supplies is supported.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 133
PD8 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 3328
Name: Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation: Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number: 133
Policy: PD8 Object/Support: Support
Section / Paragraph: PD8.8 8th bullet

Summary of Representation:
The commitment to meet Rotherham’s indicative energy potential target of 10.6MW of renewable energy capacity as outlined in RSS and the commitment to achieve on-site renewable provision on all new developments is supported.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 131
PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3328

Name:  Ms Lucy Mitchell

Organisation:  Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number:  131

Policy:  PD8  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  PD8.2 2nd bullet

Summary of Representation:
The policy could make more explicit the role that town centre sites or sites with excellent public transport accessibility could play in achieving higher densities. Also, the Core Strategy should detail the housing mix in terms of size, tenure and design that the local authority is pursuing in the urban renaissance and HMR Pathfinder areas.

Councils Response:
The Council considers that Policy Directions PD8 and PD2 section 3 adequately set out a minimum density and a search sequence for the development and location of new housing. Further detail on a range of densities appropriate to different locations will be contained in the Policies DPD.

The Policies DPD will also set out measures to support urban renaissance and the HMR Pathfinder in relation to housing size, tenure and design.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Incorporate detailed policy on the density, size, tenure and design of new housing development in the Policies DPD.
Summary of Representation:
The Core Strategy should set an emissions reduction target for the plan period. The RES, for example, has set a target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 20-25% from the 1990 baseline before 2016.

Councils Response:
The additional impetus and clarity engendered by inclusion of strategic, long-term targets in the Core Strategy is accepted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include appropriate targets for reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in the Submission Core Strategy.
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3418
Name:  Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation:  Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number:  167
Policy:  PD8  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
We support the general approach taken in this policy.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 72
PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3424

Name: Mr Henryk Peterson

Organisation: Sport England

Representation Number: 72

Policy: PD8 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The importance of strategic policy direction PD8 Efficient Use of Resources is not fully recognised. It can condition the amount of new allocations required. Moreover Sport England would accept Arup’s comment that the policy is failing to show linkages with sustainable design in creating sustainable communities and improved resource productivity. Comments are as per those made on strategic policy design PD4:

Councils Response:
The respondents comments are unclear other than being supportive of Arup's sustainability commentary regarding linkage between sustainable materials and design and the creation of sustainable communities which will be acted upon prior to submission. See also response to Rep No 3424/68.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Clarify Sport England’s requirements. (see also Rep No 3424-68)
Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  339
PD8 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  3703
Name:  Mr L Wheatley
Organisation:  Harthill with Woodall Parish Council

Representation Number:  339
Policy:  PD8  Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
General support for Core Strategy but raised concern about a potential windfarm within the Parish.

Councils Response:
General support for the Core Strategy by the Parish Council is welcomed.

A planning application for a windfarm within Harthill parish has been submitted to this Council and is currently being progressed through Development Control. The Core Strategy will support the development of renewable energy alternatives and further detailed policies and criteria will also be contained in subsequent documents. The intention is to reduce the impact of greenhouse gases and control the negative impact of using fossil fuels on climate change. The issue of whether the current windfarm application is supported will be dealt with under the current development control planning regime.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The respondents have not objected to PD8 and to the Council's support for the promotion of renewable energy in its Core Strategy. The Parish Council are most concerned about the location of a new windfarm within their Parish. This is a detailed development control matter and should not be reflected in a change to the proposed policy that will support the creation of alternative energy sources.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  614
PD8 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3763
Name:  Mr Ian Smith
Organisation:  English Heritage

Representation Number:  614
Policy:  PD8  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  Page 111

Summary of Representation:
Support the general thrust of this policy especially regarding the reuse of existing buildings and recognition that there may be constraints to net density of 30 dwellings per hectare in certain areas in Rotherham.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Noted.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  77
PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3872
Name:  Mr T. Stanway
Organisation:

Representation Number:  77

Policy:  PD8   Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:  Para 7.107  Page 111/112

Summary of Representation:
The representation raises some general points about the perceptions of wind turbine outputs and their net contribution to carbon reduction. In particular the respondent queries whether the indicative energy potential target figures quoted in PD8 for renewable energy are for installed capacity, or generated output. This will make a vast difference to the capacity needed to produce the power.

Councils Response:
By way of clarification, the figure of 10.6 MW quoted in PD8 is Rotherham's potential target taken from the draft Regional Spatial Strategy and represents installed capacity. Power outputs are not quoted as these are not reliable due to the variable efficiency of turbines under different operating conditions. The 94 MW figure quoted by the respondent is the potential renewable energy target for all of South Yorkshire. Figures quoted in PD8 may be subject to amendment to reflect any revisions to targets in the final version of RSS due to be published prior to submission of the Core Strategy. (NB this representation has already been acknowledged with a letter of clarification)

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure that the appropriate RSS potential renewable energy target is included in the submission document and that it is explicit that this figure represents installed capacity rather than output. In the light of recent guidance also consider the need for location criteria for renewable energy schemes in the submission Core Strategy.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 481

PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5147

Name: Mr John King

Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 481

Policy: PD8

Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Point 7

Summary of Representation:
“Location” should be added to the list ‘layout, orientation …..etc’.

Councils Response:
Suggestion noted, however issues of sustainability and location are dealt with in other Policy directions.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 480
PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  480
Policy:  PD8  Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Point 5

Summary of Representation:
We support the aim of new networks of decentralised/low carbon energy supplies but transmission/distribution infrastructure should be sensitive to landscape concerns with a presumption for under-grounding of lines in sensitive landscapes.

Councils Response:
It is agreed that the visual and environmental impacts of transmission/distribution infrastructure should be minimised.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments should be noted in the production of the submission draft and the Policies DPD, but it should be noted that such developments may be covered by Acts other than the TCP Acts.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 479
PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 479
Policy: PD8
Object/SUPPORT: Object
Section / Paragraph: Point 3

Summary of Representation:
Should clarify that development of non-agricultural use may be permitted on high quality agricultural land if the land complies favourably with other sustainability criteria, such as its location. CPRE SY would be concerned that should this sentence remain un-clarified that lower agricultural land in unsustainable locations may come forward for housing and employment. Bio fuel crops should be promoted as a potential option. Significant shifts in planting patterns should be subject to landscape capacity assessments.

Councils Response:
It is accepted that this point needs further development in the Submission Core Strategy. High quality agricultural land is a finite resource that should be protected from development, but that does not infer that all lower quality land is suitable for development. All sites proposed for development in the LDF will be subject to sustainability assessments to avoid allocations in unsustainable locations.

As part of its actions to combat climate change the Council will promote the use of biomass for energy/heat generation in the LDF. While the location of such generation plant can be controlled, current planning legislation does not cover the growing of agricultural crops (including biomass). The growing of such biomass crops would be a "temporary" land use, so it would be difficult to make them the subject of landscape capacity assessments. This is an issue that needs to be raised at national level with DEFRA and DCLG.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Clarify this point in the Submission Core Strategy to highlight that development will only be acceptable in sustainable locations. Raise the matter of biomass crops, significant shifts in planting patterns and landscape capacity assessments with Government Office of Yorkshire and Humberside.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No:  546
PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  5147
Name:  Mr John King
Organisation:  CPRE

Representation Number:  546
Policy:  PD8  
Object/Support:  Object
Section / Paragraph:  Point 4

Summary of Representation:
Text unacceptable and wholly inconsistent with national minerals guidance, especially MPS1 and draft RSS. Production cannot be regulated solely to the needs of the minerals or construction industry, RMBC must make provision for sub-regional apportionments through a plan, monitor, manage approach that maximises resource conservation by promoting secondary aggregate use/recycling whilst maintaining adequate supplies of primary minerals commensurate with protecting the environment. The PMM approach needs to be based on SASEA testing before spatial allocations are made/re-confirmed. It is to be hoped that "opportunities for integrated waste management " does not refer to a strategy of quarry restoration via landfilling.

Councils Response:
It was previously agreed with GOYH in the Local Development Scheme that minerals was not a priority topic for the initial round of LDF documents and that there would be reliance on "saved" UDP policies as an interim measure. It is acknowledged that strategic minerals policy in the Core Strategy needs further work prior to submission. The current mineral sites/regional supply apportionment situation needs to be explained in more detail.

The text does not say that production will be regulated solely by the needs of the minerals or construction industry, but merely acknowledges that the needs of construction industry are reflected in regional production targets, along with likely contributions from secondary aggregates.

Waste management by landfilling is becoming increasingly undesirable although some capacity will still be required to dispose of material at the end of the waste hierarchy and, subject to suitability, this material could assist quarry restoration.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Explain more fully the current minerals position, main sites and RAWP apportionment, as background to the broad strategic policy direction. Investigate scope for agreed wording/approach with other South Yorks LPAs. Check that appropriate UDP minerals policies have been saved regarding avoidance of sterilisation, maintaining landbanks through Minerals Safeguarding Zones and safeguarding of railheads and other facilities for transport, processing and recycling of minerals in line with MPS1.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 491
PD8 \ Other

Respondent I.D. 5147
Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 491
Policy: PD8 Object/Support: Other
Section / Paragraph: Point 8

Summary of Representation:
Must be expanded. The reduction in energy produced through burning fossil fuels is a critical element of this policy. We would suggest an individual policy on this as it covers a wide range of issues:
• Large renewable energy schemes which connect to the National Grid
• Development design which reduce energy use and increase energy efficiency, and
• On site micro renewable energy generation (usually non-grid) needs to be covered by ‘Merton’ – style policy, preferably with an increasing per cent figure through time (10 – 15-20 per cent from 2010, 2015, 2020). However this may be conservative given the Government’s current drive towards zero-energy development!
These issues should be referred to in the Housing, Employment and Retail/Leisure policies (as suggested by ARUP).

Councils Response:
The details of how the strategic aims stated in the policy direction are implemented will be dealt with in the Policy DPD.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
In light of these comments the Council will look again at this policy direction to make it more robust.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 63
PD8 \ Comment

Respondent I.D. 5205
Name: Mr Sam Kipling
Organisation: Environment Agency

Representation Number: 63
Policy: PD8 Object/Support: Comment

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
It is essential that this policy sets explicit targets for renewable energy generation in new development. Whilst bullet points 7 and 8 broadly address the issue, the policy would be infinitely more effective if a specific target was included. The RSS which is currently being considered for adoption, will add support to this sort of policy. You are advised to be specific on these targets in your Core Strategy, rather than your policies DPD, as climate change is an over-arching strategic issue which should influence other policies. It is also which needs to be addressed now. The following wording is suggested:-

“All new major developments (Including new build, conversion and renovation) will be required to generate the following proportions of their predicted energy use through the use of on-site renewables:-
• 10% for the 5 years following adoption of the Core Strategy;
• 15% for the following 5 years;
• 20% for the following 5 years.
(Major is defined as 10 or more dwellings or a floor area of more than 1,000 sqm for non-residential developments).”

We welcome the inclusion of the treatment and mitigation of contaminated land, attempts to encourage decentralised renewable or low carbon energy supplies, the detail on regulating development to the availability of water supplies and sewerage capacity (this should help to improve water quality in the district and to safeguard water resources) and we support your plans to avoid areas of flood risk.

Councils Response:
The need to include a more explicit strategic policy for the achievement of renewable energy targets and the suggested policy wording will be seriously considered for submission. Support for the other aspects of PD8 is welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include a more explicit strategic policy for the achievement of renewable energy targets along the lines of the suggested policy wording within the submission Core Strategy.
Chapter 8 identifies five spatial sub regions or zones within the Borough. Whilst these may be legitimate in terms of perception they do not take account of any Strategic Housing Market Areas which have not yet been identified. The sub regions may also extend outside of the Borough into adjoining districts.

Councils Response:
Work on housing market areas has been carried out for the Regional Assembly for Yorkshire and the Humber. This work is not yet complete but has identified Sheffield and Rotherham as a single market area. At a smaller level Rotherham Strategic Housing Market Assessment will identify sub-markets within the Rotherham Area.

The information relating to housing market areas will need to be taken into account when allocating sites for housing and determining policy regarding housing type tenure and mix, within the context of the characteristics and issues identified within the five Spatial Planning Zones.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Take into account information relating to housing market areas when allocating sites for housing and determining policy regarding housing type tenure and mix.
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 515
PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5248
Name: Mr R.D. Butters
Organisation: Hallam Land Management Ltd

Representation Number: 515
Policy: PD8  Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph: Efficient use of Resources

Summary of Representation:
Efficient Use of Resources

CS-PO PD8 is ambiguous in terms of how it is proposed to deliver the target of 10.6mw of renewable energy by 2010 i.e. from macro sources or micro sources or a combination of the two. The policy should also be made clear that the target is not a ceiling and that to exceed the target is not unacceptable. The target is also limited to 2010 where the plan period is likely to be 2026 and therefore targets should also be considered for the post 2010 period up to 2026.

Councils Response:
PD8 is not ambiguous in relation to how the target will be delivered; it does not deal with this level of detail, this will be addressed in the Policies DPD. The period set for the target reflects that relating Table 15.12 of draft RSS, from which the figure is derived. There is nothing in the Policy Direction to suggest that this target is a ceiling.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
None

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 658
PD8 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5254
Name:  Mr Richard Frudd
Organisation:  Indigo Planning Ltd (for National  Grid Property Holdings)

Representation Number:  658
Policy:  PD8  Object/Support:  Support

Section / Paragraph:  Bullet point one

Summary of Representation:
Support the suggested course of action in bullet point one of PD8 (to secure the treatment and mitigation of ground instability and contamination and to give priority to developing previously developed land and the conversion of existing buildings within sustainable settlements and locations).

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Support for bullet point one of Policy Direction 8 will be taken into account in preparing efficient use of resources policies as part of the Core Strategy Submission Document.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 242
PD8 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  5258

Name:  Mrs Ann Roche

Organisation:  Wath Festival

Representation Number:  242

Policy:  PD8  Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:  last bullet point

Summary of Representation:
Support for renewable energy schemes and better insulated buildings to combat global warming

Councils Response:
Support noted

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change to plan
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 570
PD8 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5270
Name: Mr Keith Ellis
Organisation:

Representation Number: 570
Policy: PD8 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Development densities

Summary of Representation:
Higher density housing was questioned as previously it was felt to be a failure.

Councils Response:
Acknowledgement is made that it would not be appropriate for a high density figure to be applied across the whole of the Borough. As PD8 states an indicative range of densities for urban, suburban and rural locations will be defined in the Policies DPD. In establishing this range it is likely that the choice of appropriate levels for an area will be informed by issues including the characteristics of that area and its location and level of public transport accessibility. It is also important to note that the minimum 30 dwellings per hectare figure stated in the Core Strategy is in compliance with Central Government Guidance in the form of PPS3.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No amendments necessary.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 646
PD9 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 1565
Name: Mr Brian Davies
Organisation: Natural England

Representation Number: 646
Policy: PD9 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Natural England is pleased to see that PD9 considers the incorporation of SUDS into new developments to achieve positive benefits for both the management of surface water run off and for wider environmental and biodiversity enhancement. Expect more detailed measures in subsequent DPD or SPD.

Councils Response:
Support welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
More detailed measures of SUD’s to be incorporated in DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 647
PD9 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 1565
Name: Mr Brian Davies
Organisation: Natural England

Representation Number: 647
Policy: PD9 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Natural England believe that the policy direction should incorporate positive opportunities for accessibility and recreation enhancements by design such as cycleways and green spaces which provide a key contribution to human health and well being.

Councils Response:
Increased accessibility and recreational enhancements by cycleways and greenspaces is already included under Policy Direction 6 (Transportation) and Policy Direction 7 (Local Heritage). Since neither explicitly refers to health benefits, it is considered Policy Direction 9 should highlight these benefits.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Highlight the benefits to health and wellbeing that cycleways and greenspaces make.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 84
PD9 \ Comment

Respondent I.D.  1682

Name:  Mr Anthony Barber-Lomax FRICS

Organisation:  Fitzwilliam (Wentworth) Estates

Representation Number:  84

Policy:  PD9  Object/Support:  Comment

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
It is a sorry state of affairs when we have to design for security. This should not be allowed to compromise design for appearance.

Councils Response:
Comments accepted but the Council is required to include policies and measures in the LDF to assist reduction of crime and anti-social behaviour including promoting "secured by design" principles. However, this is only one aspect of a suite of design policies that will be developed to ensure the highest standards of building design.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments be noted.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 334
PD9 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  2413
Name:  Mr John Dunshea
Organisation:  Atisreal UK

Representation Number:  334
Policy:  PD9  Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
PD9 does not recognise the potential health and safety issues that could occur due to climate change.

Developments such as Waverley that are designed to be flexible and adapt to mitigate the effects of climate change should be promoted under this policy direction.

Councils Response:
The sustainability appraisal undertaken by independent consultants Arups highlighted the climate change issue. This is a matter that is growing in importance and there is increasing knowledge surrounding the climate change issue.

This issue will be more fully considered within the Core Strategy but any policy needs to be sufficiently flexible to take on board changing and improving information and advances in knowledge for dealing with the impact of climate change.

No evidence on detailed design principles regarding the adaptability and flexibility of new developments at Waverley has yet been submitted and this is inappropriate until the principle of a new community at Waverley has been established.

The potential future impact on climate change and of climate change will need to be considered for all potential new development opportunities.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
This issue will be more fully considered within the Core Strategy but any policy needs to be sufficiently flexible to take on board changing and improving information and advances in knowledge for dealing with the impact of climate change.
The potential future impact on climate change and of climate change will need to be considered for all potential new development opportunities.

Ensure that the Core Strategy and any subsequent detailed policy DPD's include sufficient and appropriate references to climate change.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 408
PD9 \ Object

Respondent I.D.  3207

Name:  Ms Janet Hodson

Organisation:  JVH Town Planning Consultants (for Ben Bailey Homes)

Representation Number:  408

Policy:  PD9               Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Given the importance of PPS 25 SFRA should be available before the key growth locations are decided.

Councils Response:
This point is accepted

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
PPS 25 SFRA should be completed and taken into account before the key growth locations are decided.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 134
PD9 \ Support

Respondent I.D.  3328
Name:  Ms Lucy Mitchell
Organisation:  Yorkshire Forward

Representation Number:  134
Policy:  PD9  Object/Support:  Support
Section / Paragraph:  PD9.3 3rd bullet

Summary of Representation:
The commitment to incorporate the principles of Secured by Design is supported.

Councils Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No further action.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 169
PD9 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 3418
Name: Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation: Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number: 169
Policy: PD9 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The issue of climate change has not featured as a key issue throughout the Core Strategy. While it is mentioned in Policy PD9, we feel it would be helpful if there were greater recognition of the impact of climate change in the core strategy. We would also expect the core strategy to include reference to the regional greenhouse gas reduction target of 20% by 2010 and 25% by 2015.

Councils Response:
The Council considers that the issue of climate change runs throughout the Core Strategy Preferred Options document as a common theme and is reflected in the Policy Directions set out. We feel that to separate out “climate change” as an explicit, freestanding policy would be an artificial split and would weaken the remaining policies. In a similar way to the promotion of sustainable development, we consider that the approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change is an overarching theme that has many facets in different policy areas. As such, the Submission Core Strategy will follow a similar approach.

The additional impetus and clarity engendered by inclusion of strategic, long-term targets in the Core Strategy is, however, accepted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Include appropriate targets for reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in the Submission Core Strategy. Give greater emphasis to climate change in the introductory sections of the document.

*******************************************************************************
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 168
PD9 \ Support

Respondent I.D. 3418
Name: Mrs Jenny Poxon
Organisation: Yorkshire & Humber (Regional) Assembly

Representation Number: 168
Policy: PD9 Object/Support: Support

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
The approach to flood risk and the Rotherham Flood Risk Assessment is also generally supported, although we would wish the policy to be clearer with regard to the location of development on flood prone land. We acknowledge that further detail is proposed in a future DPD, although we feel that the policy should provide more guidance than it currently does.

Councills Response:
Support noted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
The Submission Core Strategy will incorporate appropriate wording to clarify the policy stance on the location of development on land prone to flooding.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  3424
Name:  Mr Henryk Peterson
Organisation:  Sport England

Representation Number:  73
Policy:  PD9
Object/Support:  Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
It should be noted that strategic policy direction PD9 Community Safety and Well Being ought to be more than just matters about crime and flooding. It should, as a subject, be equally linked with the social inclusion/health/physical activity/and the increased participation in exercise agenda (see Appendix B; B2 Indicator Targets in the SA report), and linked to quality of life indices.

Councils Response:
Comments generally accepted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Expand PD9 prior to submission to include references to social inclusion and promoting better health through increased participation in exercise. Use the new Sport England Active People Survey (% of adult population that take part regularly in sport and active recreation) as an indicator in the Annual Monitoring Report.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 195
PD9 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 4183
Name: Mr G Blunn
Organisation:

Representation Number: 195
Policy: PD9 Object/Support: Object
Section / Paragraph: Community safety and well-being

Summary of Representation:
Since this policy is dealing with events or outcomes that have yet to happen the use of the word “ensure” in the first line is too definitive.

Councils Response:
The plan will deal with the period up to 2021, so is trying to guide future events for the benefit of Rotherham’s residents. The policies need to strongly worded to give direction to developers and enable council officials to impose necessary, strong conditions on development.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
No change of emphasis.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 492
PD9 \ Object

Respondent I.D. 5147
Name: Mr John King
Organisation: CPRE

Representation Number: 492
Policy: PD9 Object/Support: Object

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
This policy should also include anticipation and mitigation of the future impacts of increased heat. New developments must provide comfortable environments for users without resorting to air conditioning which would increase energy demand and carbon dioxide emissions.

Councils Response:
Policy Direction 8 seeks to “Promote the sustainable design and construction of new buildings (including the Code for Sustainable Homes) together with their layout, orientation, massing, density and mix to minimise energy consumption and to reduce carbon emissions.” This issue would fall under the above and will need to be considered when policies are developed. The detailed role of local planning policy with regard to this issue has to be considered carefully as some issues are covered by building regulations, and there is a national standard in the form of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Requirements in addition to these, though obviously desirable in many respects, would need to be justified and shown to be economically viable when added to the cost of the many other requirements placed on new buildings.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Comments should be noted in the production of the submission draft Core Strategy and the Policies DPD. This matter falls under the Code for Sustainable Homes and as such will be considered when developing policies, taking care not to duplicate other legislation dealing with this issue.
Respondent I.D.  5205
Name:  Mr Sam Kipling
Organisation:  Environment Agency

Representation Number:  66
Policy:  PD9  Object/Support:  Comment
Section / Paragraph:  Page 116, para "Provisional Monitoring Indicators"

Summary of Representation:
Page 116 – Provisional Monitoring Indicators – The following indicator should be included – “Number of properties in Flood Zones 2 and 3.”

Councils Response:
Consideration will be given to this suggested performance indicator subject to the availability/feasibility of data collection.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Consider the feasibility of including the suggested performance indicator under PD9 at submission and in subsequent AMRs. (see also Rep No 5205/57)
Assessment of Representations

Respondent I.D.  5205
Name:  Mr Sam Kipling
Organisation:  Environment Agency

Representation Number:  64
Policy:  PD9  Object/Support:  Comment
Section / Paragraph:  first bullet point

Summary of Representation:
The first bullet point should be worded as follows to account for the requirements of PPS25:-

“Mitigate and adapt to the likely impacts of climate change. This is particularly relevant in the areas of potential flooding identified in the Rotherham Flood Risk Assessment Study. Development will be discouraged in areas of potential flooding. Where there are no alternative lower risk sites available, developments must be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment to demonstrate that they will be safe. Incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) into new development is likely to achieve positive benefits for both the management of surface water run-off helping to reduce localised flash flooding and for wider ecological, amenity and recreational enhancement.”

Councils Response:
The need for more specific wording in PD9 and the appropriate policy in the Policies DPD taking account of PPS25 and the Rotherham SFRA is accepted.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Make more specific reference to the requirements of PPS25 and the Rotherham SFRA (particularly flood risk sequential test criteria) in both the submission version of PD9 and as appropriate in the Policies DPD.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 65
PD9 \ Comment

Respondent I.D. 5205
Name: Mr Sam Kipling
Organisation: Environment Agency

Representation Number: 65
Policy: PD9 Object/Support: Comment

Section / Paragraph: Page 116, para "Conformity"

Summary of Representation:
Page 116 – Conformity –
PPS25 should be included as a relevant national policy.

Councils Response:
Comment noted. Reference to PPS25 will be made under PD9 subject to no change in
the format of the submission document.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Refer to PPS25 under PD9 Conformity assuming no change to the policy format on
submission.
Representations Report.doc
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 48
PD9 \ Comment

Respondent I.D.  5230
Name: Mr Tim Hawkins
Organisation: RMBC

Representation Number: 48
Policy: PD9 Object/Support: Comment

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Can I suggest:
1. Strengthening para 3.31 on Community Safety and Well-being with something like:
"Through the borough's Community Safety Strategy, the Safer Rotherham Partnership
(Rotherham's statutory crime and disorder partnership) ensures effective work to address
crime and anti-social behaviour. Falls in most crime types have been achieved in recent
years and extensive measures introduced to address anti-social behaviour. Most
importantly, multi-agency Safer Neighbourhood Teams have been introduced across the
borough working with local communities. They are beginning to have a significant impact
but the Quality of Life Survey 2006 showed crime and anti-social behaviour to be still the
public's highest priority for action."
2. Also in Section 3 could "the need to design out/address crime and anti-social behaviour"
be added to the list of 'Sustainability Issues'?

On p116 under Community Safety and Well Being and Provisional Monitoring Indicators
could I suggest you add "Public Perceptions of anti-social behaviour as a problem" This is
measured by the annual Quality of Life survey and there is a target on it in the Local Area
Agreement.

Councils Response:
Comments noted. It is considered that the issue was adequately covered in Section 3 of
the Preferred Options Document. Although the format of the submission document is likely
to change opportunities will be taken to strengthen crime reduction where appropriate.
It is not appropriate to add to the Sustainability commentary which was provided by
independent consultants.
Consideration will be given to the including the most appropriate performance indicator for
submission and in subsequent AMRs.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Depending on reformatting, strengthen references to reducing crime and anti-social behaviour in the submission document. Agree with respondent the most appropriate performance indicator for submission with emphasis on continuing feasibility of data collection and continuity with other documents such as RSS and LAA. Review content of Quality of Life Survey 2006 concerning other more appropriate indicators for submission and AMR. Consider "secured by design" in future Design SPD.
Skin cancer remains a major health issue with a year on year increase in numbers affected within the UK. The Rotherham Skin Cancer Action Group has formulated a Skin Cancer Prevention Policy for Rotherham, which was designed as a useful working document to ensure that skin cancer prevention work was at the forefront of any council planning initiatives. The Skin Cancer Action group is a multi-agency partnership, which aims to help enable this work to be implemented across all of Rotherham.

The Skin Cancer Prevention Plan was designed as a useful tool for agencies to use as a guideline(s) to be able to prioritise their actions and for it to act as a focus for all possible preventative work to be consistent within this area. There are 3 of the action plans which we feel are particularly relevant to your proposed policy directives.

Policy Statement 1

Opportunities for providing shade will be taken into account by the Local Authority. Where possible and practical, existing shade structures will be utilised, and the need for additional shade in public places will be assessed. Special emphasis will be given to the need to provide shade in areas often used by children/young people.

Policy Statement 2
For the provision of new shade, planners and developers will be informed of the Skin Cancer Prevention policy guidelines for local authorities, and planning advice will be amended at the appropriate stage to advise on adequate shade provision.

Policy Statement 7

The use of ozone-depleting substances by the Local Authority and Health Services, or by its contractors, will be assessed and monitored with a view to phasing them out in 5 years.

We would like these policies to be considered within the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and would be happy to provide more information about the work or policies of the group if you feel this would be beneficial.

(full response)

_Councils Response:_
The need to combat skin cancer is an issue recognised in paragraph 3.35 and the need to include measures (particularly reducing carbon and other ozone-depleting emissions and the provision of shade related to buildings and open spaces) to combat skin cancer in the submission document is acknowledged.

_Recommendation / Proposed Action:_
Review the Rotherham Skin Cancer Prevention Plan and include specific reference to the need to combat skin cancer (along the lines suggested) in the submission version of PD9 and/or in strengthened policy content dealing with climate change.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 360

PD9 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  5243

Name:  PS Rachel Usher

Organisation:  South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number:  360

Policy:  PD9  Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:  Secured by design

Summary of Representation:
All developments made under the LDF should seek to obtain the official seal of approval from Secured By Design.

Councils Response:
The Council is committed to the principles of high quality and sustainable design and where practicable this will include Secured By Design. However there may be a clash for example with the principles of permeability throughout a development layout and the need to prioritise security in all new developments. Rigid adherence to the principles and rules of secured by design could inhibit truly creative design and approaches to site redevelopment and regeneration. It is essential therefore that constructive dialogue between the police, developers and the LPA are undertaken to consider issues as they arise and to reach the most appropriate response.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
A South Yorkshire Police Architectural Liaison officer is to be seconded to the LPA for two years from July 2007, to offer advice to developers and Development Control Officers, and to comment on the crime safety aspects of development proposals.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 366
PD9 \
Other

Respondent I.D.  5243

Name:  PS Rachel Usher

Organisation:  South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number:  366

Policy:  PD9  Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:  Community infrastructure

Summary of Representation:
Public access spaces need to have high standards of maintenance. Involvement of Safer Neighbourhood Teams in all community based projects to boost community involvement with a joint agenda of crime reduction.

Councils Response:
This is a laudable aim, however it is more relevant to other Services within the council such as Neighbourhood’s Programme Area than to the Spatial Strategy for the Borough. The Rotherham South Area Assembly should be seeking to promote this type of community based activity and ensuring that any maintenance issues are raised and dealt with quickly by appropriate partners. S106 Agreements with developers external to the Council, should in the future ensure that all public access spaces are well maintained and managed for the benefit of the communities nearby and the people who use them.

A willingness to engage the community and actively seek that community’s views on planning matters is welcomed.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Ensure S106 Agreements provide clear guidelines for management and maintenance of sites that meet the expectations of the local authority and communities.
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council  
CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS  

Assessment of Representations  

Rep No: 365  
PD9 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  5243

Name:  PS Rachel Usher

Organisation:  South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number:  365

Policy:  PD9  
Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:  Community infrastructure

Summary of Representation:  
SYP are keen to encourage development of youth centres, skate parks and similar.

Councils Response:  
This is a laudable aim, however other Services within the council such as Greenspaces Team and the Youth Service need to be inputting their view. The Local Development Framework can assist along with other Services, by identifying suitable sites for these types of activity. Has a need for this type of activity been identified by the Youth Service and Greenspace team? Is it included within the Community Plan?

Recommendation / Proposed Action:  
Support constructive dialogue between all parties and actively seek the views of young people in the preparation of the Rotherham LDF to identify suitable facilities within or on the edge of the town centre if required. At the early engagement (Regulation 25) stage of the Allocations DPD, ensure that the views of the police, youth service – and the people they represent, the Greenspaces Team and Area Assembly are fed into the document for formal consultation at the Statutory Preferred Options Stage (Regulation 26).
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 364
PD9 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  5243
Name:  PS Rachel Usher
Organisation:  South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number:  364
Policy:  PD9  Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:

Summary of Representation:
Ownership and community involvement:  Involving young people in design and voluntary work in regeneration areas can foster community spirit.

Councils Response:
This is a laudable aim, and there is much work to do to involve all sections of the community in the wider planning process. The Council will support appropriate initiatives to involve young people in the planning process such as the MBED scheme funded by Yorkshire Forward.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Promote constructive dialogue between all parties and support the work of the MBED facilitator. A South Yorkshire Police Architectural Liaison officer is to be seconded to the LPA for two years from July 2007. Actively seek the views of young people in the preparation of the Rotherham LDF.

........................................................................................................................................

..........................................................
Respondent I.D.  5243
Name:  PS Rachel Usher
Organisation:  South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number:  363
Policy:  PD9  
Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Secured by design

Summary of Representation:
Promote natural surveillance and good street lighting. Promote off road parking where possible. Install CCTV cabling where opportunities in new or regeneration areas arise. Consider re-siting cameras within renaissance areas.

Councils Response:
The Council is committed to the principles of high quality and sustainable design. The promotion of natural surveillance is a key concern for planners in promoting good design. The issues raised in this representation are however of a detailed nature and not of direct relevance to the drafting of the Core Strategy. Some of the proposals suggested whilst welcome in the aim of reducing crime, are beyond the responsibility of the LPA such as the inclusion of CCTV cabling in new or regeneration areas. However regeneration may lead to opportunities to raise these matters at the appropriate time in the development process. Therefore it is essential that constructive dialogue between the police, developers and the LPA is undertaken to consider issues as they arise and to reach the most appropriate response.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Be aware of and actively promote the principles of natural surveillance, good street lighting and the use of appropriately sited CCTV to reduce crime within the town centre, in future negotiations and discussions with local developers. Promote constructive dialogue between all parties. A South Yorkshire Police Architectural Liaison officer is to be seconded to the LPA for two years from July 2007.
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CORE STRATEGY: PREFERRED OPTIONS

Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 361
PD9 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  5243

Name:  PS Rachel Usher

Organisation:  South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number:  361

Policy:  PD9  Object/Support:  Other

Section / Paragraph:  Secured by design

Summary of Representation:
Adhere to the principle of designing out crime. Routes: no alleyways, gennels or cut-throughs to be incorporated into the design unless absolutely necessary. If it is unavoidable that cut-throughs are a necessary design feature then they should be well-lit and made to feel safe. Include A-frame entrances and make them wide, open plan and readily visible.

Councils Response:
The Council is committed to the principles of high quality and sustainable design and where practicable this will include designing out crime. The principles of permeability throughout a development layout will require particularly sensitive consideration. Rigid adherence to the principles and rules of, for example, "secured by design" could inhibit truly creative design and approaches to site redevelopment and regeneration. It is essential therefore that constructive dialogue between the police, developers and the LPA are undertaken to consider new development proposals and to reach the most appropriate response.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
A South Yorkshire Police Architectural Liaison officer is to be seconded to the LPA for two years from July 2007, to offer advice to developers and Development Control Officers, and to comment on the crime safety aspects of development proposals.
Assessment of Representations

Rep No: 362
PD9 \ Other

Respondent I.D.  5243
Name:  PS Rachel Usher
Organisation:  South Yorkshire Police

Representation Number:  362
Policy:  PD9 Object/Support:  Other
Section / Paragraph:  Secured by design

Summary of Representation:
Develop properties with active frontages over-looking the street and public spaces. Promote natural surveillance.

Councils Response:
The Council is committed to the principles of high quality and sustainable design. The promotion of natural surveillance is a key concern for planners in promoting good design, however the challenge is where there needs to be more than one active frontage. It is essential therefore that constructive dialogue between the police, developers and the LPA are undertaken to consider issues as they arise and to reach the most appropriate response.

Recommendation / Proposed Action:
Be aware of and actively promote the principles of active frontages and natural surveillance in any negotiations and discussions with local developers. Promote constructive dialogue between all parties. A South Yorkshire Police Architectural Liaison officer is to be seconded to the LPA for two years from July 2007.