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### POLICY DIRECTION ONE: SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES

**Meeting:** Wentworth North  
**Venue:** Brampton Parish Hall  
**Date:** 08/02/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Alan Bamforth, Andy Duncan, Michael Hill, Jill Ratcliffe

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- There is a need for green belt areas but not specifically where they currently are. If new green belt areas are designated then existing ones can be used. More flexibility is needed.
- Section 106 monies need to be site specific.
- There are enough executive type houses in the area. There is a huge need for more affordable housing. Need affordability and sustainability.

---

**Meeting:** Wentworth North  
**Venue:** Swinton Civic Hall  
**Date:** 05/02/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Alan Bamforth, David Edwards, Michael Hill, Jill Ratcliffe

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Green Belt release OK for local affordable housing / local benefit
- Definitions of Babtie categories would be helpful.
- Concern expressed regarding the building of residential properties on contaminated land at the former Croda site in Swinton.
- Green Belt Land – The net effect should be in favour green belt and benefit the local community.
- More and more homes are being built but more leisure facilities needs to be provided.
- When a new development is built the 106 monies should go back into the local community.
- Section 106 monies should be written into the development framework.
- There is a need for more affordable housing in the area.
- Need to look at more innovative methods of building.

---

**Meeting:** Wentworth South  
**Venue:** High Street Centre, Rawmarsh  
**Date:** 01/02/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Alan Bamforth, Andy Duncan, Julie Colley, Margaret Ball

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- The development of housing estates at distance from source of employment has led to excessive commuting which is not assisting sustainability.
- Rawmarsh / Parkgate has a high population of elderly people without access to relevant local facilities.
- Concerned that levels of traffic congestion entering Rawmarsh from Rotherham.
- There are too many takeaways on Rawmarsh High Street.
- Rawmarsh has missed out on the investment made in Dearne Valley and Retail World.
- Any increase in housing must be matched by investment in community infrastructure.
Concern expressed re recent announcement that St Mary’s School is to close.
Specific query re Clay Pit Lane – why has the development not secured a new wall along its frontage rather than a fence?
How will the Council ensure community participation at the pre-application stage?
Facilities for all the family (leisure and employment) – encourage people to stay in the area.
Green Belt – important to maintain current level
Section 106s should be ring-fenced to the area where development takes place.
Developers **must** be required to contribute to affordable housing etc.
Overall agreement with point 3 “Safeguarding and Improving Community Infrastructure”.
Need to look at the real picture. Listen to local needs/issues.
Overall view – fairly cynical that the policy’s good intentions will actually be secured.

**Meeting:** Wentworth South  
**Venue:** Thrybergh Church Hall  
**Date:** 07/02/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Alan Bamforth, David Edwards, Julie Colley, Margaret Ball

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Hellaby Industrial Estate should not be expanded towards Maltby (the brickworks site and land near police station).
- Hellaby Industrial Estates – requests received from developers to release Green Belt.
- What does the settlement hierarchy actually mean for settlements?
- Where is the pressure for new development coming from? From central Government, local employers etc or from RMBC?
- The Council should more actively seek s106 agreements from developers.
- General agreement to the Developer Contributions part of the Policy Direction.

- Others took a more optimistic view believing that the Town Centre still has a role to place as a central place.
- Maintain current level of Green Belt. Under-used Brown Field sites could be made better use of.
- General support for Waverley so long as developers contribute to the provision of adequate local services and that this agreement is then enforced.
- Ravenfield Parish Plan – no major developments – housing or industrial – needs to be taken account of in forward planning. Government guidance has to be adhered to.
- Impact of policy statement on area – Herringthorpe/Thrybergh “settlements as key focus for change” will have the most development, moving down the hierarchy.
- HMR Pathfinder identified areas for change – Rawmarsh – Bellows Road identified.
- Pressure for housing / industrial development is coming from combination of Government, developers and local people.
- Section 106 Agreements – facilities in local areas – Planners should ensure that they are acted upon
- Market forces determine how Town Centre evolves – transport links.
Meeting: Rotherham North
Venue: Oaks Lane Depot – Conference Room
Date: 14/04/07
Officers in attendance: Nick Ward, Andy Duncan / Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Greenbelt: The point was made of the need to consider cross boundary issues.
- The need for improved public transport was stated, so that people can move within settlements and around the Borough without having to drive. Also the need for joined up working to achieve sustainable communities.
- There was support for the statement of intent regarding “Safeguarding and improving community infrastructure.”
- Accessibility – concerns about meeting DDA requirements
- Provision for remote locality
- Contribution to minimising the impact on the climate e.g. creating a culture that does not rely so heavily on car usage and provision of public transport around community and Borough.

Meeting: Rother Valley West Area Assembly
Venue: Catcliffe Memorial Hall
Date: 05.02.07
Officers in attendance: Noel Bell, Helen Sleigh, Julie Barnett, Elaine Hale

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Biodiversity is a key consideration in assessing sites for development acknowledging that some areas have specific protection needs which would mean they should never be built upon
- Concerns raised over corridors of housing that could be created if green belt land is released
- Definition of Sustainable communities was questioned and required clarification. Most services e.g. shops, libraries, schools, health facilities were felt to be accessible by the majority of people
- There appears to be a contradiction between what is written in PD 1 for Aston, Aughton, Swallownest where they are described as settlements with ‘potential for limited change’, whereas in PD2 it has a ‘high potential for change’ notation
- Shouldn’t it be looked at as to how green/brownfield sites are viewed locally?
- The lack of a mainline railway station even though Rotherham is a commuter town was felt to be an issue
- Are changes to the green belt supported?
  - There appears to be lack of confidence in supporting the question because sometimes government or developers adversely affect plans etc. Concerns that developers would want to release a lot of green belt land therefore the group did not support this option.
  - Lack of confidence in agencies which don’t work together. Also will a change in government affect the decisions taken today?
- In looking at potential sites for development it is necessary to consider effects on education places
- With regard to Waverley would it be best to keep housing on one side of Orgreave and commercial & industrial activities on the other side?
- Where will the new workers live?
  - Pollution & transport problems in this area will need to be fully considered and
resolved. Development should not commence until these problems are solved. Otherwise this does not fulfil the ‘sustainable’ criteria. Medical evidence supports the need for full consideration of the impact on peoples health - with conditions such as reduced lung capacity highlighted.

- Concerns as to whether Waverley becomes a new area (Parish) in its own right. In future it would need to have it’s own school, shops - 3,700 new homes
  - What about sewage? - There are problems already at the sewage treatment works at Woodhouse Mill with the smell
  - Want planners to say that the infrastructure will be improved and it was felt to be important that infrastructure is put in place before new development commences
  - There are major concerns already about:
    o Transport gridlock
    o Rat runs
    o Length of journey times extending
    o Collapse of existing infrastructure
    o Adherence to S106 agreements & planning conditions
- Concerns of lack of investment in:
  o Public transport with a suggestion to renationalise the railways
  o Reliability of bus services
- Affordable housing should be provided within Waverley and all new housing developments

- Housing density – should the Local Planning Authority (LPA) request for new buildings to include conservation measures e.g. heat pumps and solar panels?
- Make houses more carbon neutral - is this being taken on board? This should be encouraged - not forced onto developers as the group thought this could deter new investors to the Borough
- Would like to see a policy guidance document which considers sustainable forms of building and renewable energy
- It is an opportunity for small businesses to develop new technologies and exploring recycling & reuse of waste products

Limited recognition of climate change – both developers & politicians need to ‘buy in’ to the increased significance of this issue in the creation of sustainable communities

---

Meeting: Rother Valley South Area Assembly
Venue: Dinnington Resource Centre        Date: 22.02.07
Officers in attendance: Noel Bell, David Edwards, Andrea Mason

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Green belt
- There should be a general presumption in favour of not altering Green Belt boundaries and wherever possible it should be retained
- Green Belt areas act as valuable buffers between settlements
- More detailed criteria and explanatory text should be provided to explain what would be considered as an ‘exceptional circumstance’ in the release of Green Belt
- Conversely what criteria would be used to move land into Green Belt?
- The paragraph refers to ‘exceptional circumstances’ twice which is confusing

Settlement hierarchy
- General support given to the settlement hierarchy with agreement that some areas are more in need of development than others
- No further housing development should be permitted in Wales/ Kiveton that would extend beyond the existing settlement boundaries
• There is a need to support local retail units and centres generally (including specific mention of Dinnington)
• Agreement was reached in principle that Dinnington/North Anston should be key areas for change but it was emphasised that the infrastructure needs to be put in place and fully considered from the outset

Safeguarding and improving community infrastructure
• General support given to intent
• There are severe parking problems arising from lack of parking provision at Kiveton Bridge and Kiveton Park railway stations. The potential for these stations to be used for park and ride is not being realised
• The Dinnington / Anston area is suffering from poor leisure and retail facilities. The closure of the swimming pool is of great concern. What remains should be safeguarded and improved
• There is a need to provide sufficient health facilities to meet the needs of new housing developments
• The aim of securing more sustainable communities must include adequate retail provision. For instance there is a need to protect local shops in villages e.g. protection of facility in Todwick
• Concern expressed regarding the poor state of roads in Dinnington caused by inadequate maintenance. The proper maintenance of roads should not be seen as separate from planning – utility companies should be made to repair the entire road as opposed to a patchwork of tarmac being created

Developer contributions
• Planning Gain should be secured from the YES! development at Rother Valley Country Park that is of benefit to Wales Parish Council residents only

Locally distinctive design
• General support given to intent

Meeting: Youth Cabinet
Venue: International Centre Date: 14.2.07
Officers in attendance: Rachel Overfield, Noel Bell, Clare Cope

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Settlement hierarchy
Opinion varied between the majority who supported the Town Centre as a borough shopping centre/leisure area and others who thought that the Town Centre could never compete with Meadowhall.

Retail World does not need to be any larger but it needs to have a different offer to the Town Centre so it is not in direct competition.

Linkages between existing communities and those created in new developments need to be fully considered.

Safeguarding and improving community infrastructure
A lack of local amenities can bring problems. A balance of green and urban areas is needed
and integration of buildings and landscaping. More community facilities for young people are wanted and young people want to be consulted on their location, type and use.

Locally distinctive design
The loss of character and the importance of housing design were noted. It was complained that there is a need for more individuality of housing, as everywhere is the same. Also schools seem the same such as those recently completed at Clifton, Thornhill and Wingfield. It is important that design fosters community. There is a need to reflect what is unique about the area in design.
Roads and trees need to be well placed and blended in rather than an afterthought. Consider cosmetic changes to old buildings such as sand blasting to make them look more attractive
Public art to celebrate local designs and traditions should be encouraged.

Meeting: Rotherham South  
Venue: Town Hall Date: 25/1/07  
Officers in attendance: Ryan Shepherd, Rachel Overfield, David Edwards, Kay Bacon, Lucy Reader  

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Urban Renaissance
- How is the ‘town centre’ boundary defined and what effect would policy have upon Conservation Area for town centre (concern that economic development could adversely affect conservation area).
- Concern raised that different RMBC departments should communicate / work better e.g. to encourage use of community facilities and noting conflict between parking policies and patronage of retail facilities in, for example, Bramley.
- RMBC lacks credibility as many of the aspirations given in the Documents are not being delivered through ‘Rotherham Renaissance’ to the extent that Rotherham’s residents will not believe that the Policy Directions will actually be delivered.
- Belief that the aspirations of Rotherham Renaissance won’t take account of LDF.

Protection of Green Belt
- General consensus that Green Belt should continue to be protected. Green Belt changes, however minor, could set dangerous precedent. Make use of vacant land rather than using Green Belt land
- If land was to be lost from Green Belt, would additional community benefits be derived from development beyond the type of benefits that would accrue from brownfield development?

Hierarchy of settlements
- Generally found it difficult to comment upon appropriateness of hierarchy without having read the Babtie document and what is meant by the different categories. However general agreement that Rotherham should be within top category.
- RMBC should demonstrate greater joined up working between departments to ensure provision of, for example, appropriate health facilities related to settlement hierarchy.
- Stressed need to protect Rotherham’s important areas and buildings and for ongoing and properly financed maintenance programme for heritage areas and buildings.
• Does the hierarchy assume that settlements lower down don’t need new facilities etc of the type mentioned in the third part of the Policy Direction (i.e. safeguarding and improving community infrastructure).

Distinctive communities
• How is ‘affordable housing’ defined, and who defines what is good design?
• How will design be practically considered at pre-application stage?
• Will locally produced design guides and villages statements be adopted by RMBC?
• Old buildings should be preserved not just replaced by new developments
• A maintenance budget is needed for any new developments.
• New developments will be a waste of time if they are not maintained.

Meeting: Wentworth Valley
Venue: Full Life Church, Maltby
Date: 12/2/07
Officers in attendance: Ryan Shepherd, Noel Bell, Mick Stowe, Sue Weatherley

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):
- Green Belt release – not wanted as stated in previous Reg. 25 consultation. Need to ensure all potential brownfield sites considered first.
- Transport links – can the existing road network cope?
- What does improving the links between Bramley/Wickersley and Maltby really mean?
- How was the settlement hierarchy established? - it appears to be very prescriptive
- Comment was made agreeing that Maltby should be higher up the settlement hierarchy than Bramley & Wickersley. However it was also raised that should a more radical approach for Bramley & Wickersley be considered i.e. contrary to what the settlement hierarchy is suggesting? Is the approach of not providing for more employment land in Wickersley & Bramley appropriate?
- Ensure developer contributions are for the benefit of local people. For example explore using S106 monies to support environmental projects
- Environmental issues - we need to explore those sites that shouldn’t be developed – do the Council research this?
- Consultations on applications – need to fully consider impact of development e.g. removal/damage to woodland. Important to involve people in designing out crime
- Timescales for regeneration in Rotherham seem to take far longer than elsewhere, such as Doncaster – emphasis on bringing people into the town centre was acknowledged
- Emphasis on bringing people into the Town Centre
- Questions asked regarding integration of Maltby masterplanning work and the Maltby Community Plan with the LDF. Creation of so many Masterplans was also questioned as was a lack of consultation over the possible civic centre moves

Meeting: Access Liaison / Rotherham-4-All
Venue: Meeting Room Arts Centre
Date: 08/03/07
Officers in attendance: Helen Sleigh / Eric Stowe / Neil Finney

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Green Belt
People generally accepted the need to make slight alterations to the greenbelt boundaries, but were against large and wholesale changes to protected areas.
Everyone was generally in favour of the Policy Wording and acknowledged there may be necessary adjustments to the greenbelt.

**Settlement hierarchy**

Questions were asked by participants about whether the “Key Settlements for change” was just about housing development.
Advised that this Policy Direction included all categories of development, e.g. housing, employment, leisure facilities.

People were very much in favour of keeping development of employment land, facilities and services (health services and amenities) all within urban areas and close to where people live.

Building at Waverley will be just on the border with Sheffield and could cause conflicts of interest with Sheffield Council.

**Locally distinctive design**

The idea behind this statement was a valid one, but it will be very difficult to enforce. We need to do more about ensuring the community involvement in the whole design process, from start to finish. Suggested we need to use the words “Involve community in design”

At present, developers are not putting in the correct Design and Access Statements and the Council are not enforcing this. We need to enforce the involvement of bodies such as the Access Liaison Group or other Council Officers in the continuous process of building, all the way from initial plans to completion of building, in the same way as used to happen with the Clerk of Works.

Agrees with the principle of design being included in the wording of the policy, but feels that this is just not happening at the moment.
Area Assemblies could be involved in promoting good design in new developments.

---

**Meeting:** Chamber of Commerce  
**Venue:** Genesis Business Park  
**Date:** 24/01/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Mike Smith (Chamber of Commerce) Phil Turnidge / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Urban Renaissance in main urban areas – Rotherham Urban Centre, Wath, Dinnington and Maltby. Green - Policy Supported. Chamber suggested opening up Rotherham Town Centre to cars and improved parking facilities. Mainly a transport issue.
- Protection of Green Belt with some additions/deletions to achieve sustainable developments and continuity of long term housing supply. Amber - To some people the Green Belt is very important, but the Chamber view is that it should never be sacrosanct.
- A hierarchy of settlements with development opportunities and adequate service infrastructure to support sustainable communities. Green - Policy Supported
- Distinctive communities through better urban design and developer contributions to enhance local facilities. Green - Policy Supported by the Chamber, in that better urban design is a good concept, but planning regulations should not be too prescriptive, as this would tend to prevent development.
### Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Poor Community facilities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for leisure facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lack of leisure</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities and people are travelling to Sheffield. St Ann’s development of leisure centre will attract people into the Town Centre to a more centralised leisure provision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Community venues</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic need for community centres should be recognised in Core Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community need to have community venues e.g. for weddings / social events and community family venues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs to accommodate a large number of people attending (1,000’s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema – nearest are in Sheffield / Meadowhall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These facilities are for 20-30 year age group – people going elsewhere – economic driver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend activities – lacking in Rotherham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sustainable communities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To achieve sustainable communities requires facilities, shops, and places to go.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Town Centre</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre – only charity shops and banks and not attractive place to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly used centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big screen area looks nice but not much else in the town centre, there are few reasons to go there and it only appeals to certain people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs co-located activities – sort out parking and related issues – to unite people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Design locally</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for local architecture – to reflect the people living in the area. Need identifiable landmarks and architecture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need places to have local identity – Rotherham does not have a clear identity for people viewing from outside / first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy direction can send signal for changes that people want to see.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area is run down / not received regeneration of housing. Housing in very poor conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need active community consultation / a local forum could look at planning issues e.g. parish councils do this in other areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local people need to be informed e.g. did not hear about HMR and Local Development Framework.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Workshop 2</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need consultation in a place used by the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a large centre (desperate need)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools not happy with large groups (300+) hiring their venues. Schools have said no to Asian weddings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magna is not in the community and not welcoming for large social events such as weddings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Need somewhere so that folks can walk there, a central location in or near to the Town Centre would be ideal.
Need not be Council organised
Have used Bailey Suite in the past
Community facilities with kitchen / crèche
Would like purpose built venue
Need conference venue
Weddings have to be in Sheffield as no appropriate venue in Rotherham
People can’t travel long distances so need a centre in Town Centre. How about a hall in St Ann’s leisure centre.
Hotels too expensive and accessed by car (transport problems)
Can’t have event at Unity centre as it is too small and predominantly provides training opportunities for local people.
Women feel confident in centre of Rotherham and near to schools etc they are familiar with these areas.

| Meeting: | BME Community Workshops – Arabic Speaking Women’s event |
| Venue:   | Unity Centre                     | Date: | 28/03/07 |
| Officers in attendance: | Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA) |

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

**General Community Issues**

- Shortage of large meeting places for local communities.
- Don’t want a separate religious school want more respect of different religions within schools.
- Need more street lighting.

**Places for Worship**

- Need a separate Arabic Mosque with facilities to teach religion in Arabic.
- Location: New Mosque should be located in Eastwood.
- Need a mosque, or just a space, in the college/schools for Arabic Children to pray.
**Meeting: BME Community Workshops – Rema Board Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue:</th>
<th>Unity Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Kay Bacon/ Lucy Reader / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

**Sustainable communities**
- It would be beneficial if all services were in one place e.g. court, social services, youth offending team, all to be located together with different access points and underground parking.
- Desire for a swimming pool gym classes and gym with proper car parking.

**Education**
- Schools would be a priority. They need to have safe boundaries and crossing areas for children’s safety.
- School use for community use needs to be looked at. School opening hours are limited.
- Need to look at multi use buildings e.g. leisure centre with doctor’s surgery.

**Social**
- Need a wedding/funeral hall that can be hired for functions. This could be a community centre as well. It needs to be located near the town centre e.g. St Ann’s or East wood.
- Provision of elderly care homes is supported. Currently they are dotted here and there. (Do we need one just for elderly Asian /BME folk? This would need to be located close to amenities and town centre). Provision of a children’s home would have similar location issues.

---

**Meeting: BME Community Workshops – Tassibee (Urdu / Gujurati speaking Women’s event)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Venue:</th>
<th>Unity Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

**Multi Cultural and Community Facilities**
- Community facilities are required especially for children e.g. local play areas / space for children.
- The men have the Mosque to go to but women would like space for religious activities and learning and to come together as a group not just to learn. The Unity Centre does provide space for learning activities Tassibee has undertaken faith based activities.
- A new multi-cultural centre for weddings, funerals and other events and activities is required.
- A sufficiently large space for cultural events is not available in Rotherham. Also sufficient space for parking for this type of centre is required.
- A venue for “bereavement” where people can visit members of the bereaved family is also desired.
- Mosques are too small for cultural events. There is insufficient space giving rise to Health and Safety issues when 300-400 hundred people attend. There also needs to be a kitchen for food preparation.
• Unity Centre is good for training events, but can not be used for other cultural events and activities.
• Different courses are made available at different venues but Tassibee needs new accommodation from which to base their activities and workers.
• Support for the provision of larger venue(s) is needed from RMBC, support to BME communities is essential.
• Want affordable local gym, swimming, and keep fit.
• There is a need for somewhere for young people to play, as well as youth facilities in youth centres.
POLICY DIRECTION ....... ONE
COUNCIL’S RESPONSE

Various points, at both the strategic and detailed level, were made at the workshops and these are summarised above. Where necessary general concerns not within the remit of the LDF have been forwarded onto the appropriate department. The issues relating to the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation document are included within the following assessment with recommendations for further action in preparing the final Core Strategy for Submission for Examination in Public. The Core Strategy will again be subject to further community consultation at the submission stage.

1. Green Belt
There was some support for considering the boundaries of the Green Belt although concern was expressed that the development industry would take advantage of any loosening and we would get ribbon development in the Green Belt. On the whole the majority of people supported the protection of the Green Belt and the inclusion of sites within the Green Belt that had in the past been allocated for future development. Communities wanted to understand the terminology / concepts used such as “exceptional circumstances” when and where would these apply? Generally people felt that the countryside should be protected.

Specifically there was no support for the loss of Green Belt between Hellaby and Maltby. Consideration will be given to examining the potential to release Green Belt land in appropriate and sustainable locations subject to need and to including land within the green belt in the settlement review work and the subsequent Allocations DPD and Submission Core Strategy.

2. Settlement Hierarchy
What does it mean? There was confusion regarding the settlement hierarchy proposed particularly as it appeared to differ with the hierarchy proposed in Policy Direction 2 Housing. Concern that without having read and understood the South Yorkshire Settlement Study that participants couldn’t comment on the hierarchy in PD1. Clarification is required about what the settlement hierarchy will mean in practice.

Specifically support was given for focussing new residential development in Rotherham urban area, although within the locally based area assembly workshops geographically specific debate was held regarding the Dearne, Waverley, Maltby, Dinnington, and Kiveton Park and Wales. Apart from Ravenfield Parish there were no serious objections to appropriate levels of development in local communities. Also some residents opposed further development at Dinnington and Anston as this community was not programmed to have a swimming pool.

In preparing the settlement hierarchy for policy direction 1 the Council will consider all site allocations for new development and these 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 in 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. This further work may promote the expansion of town, district and local centres to meet the needs and function of the community they serve and to promote their sustainability. Consideration also needs to be given to the potential location of new community venues / the need for places of worship / medical facilities / parks and greenspaces etc. at this next stage in the LDF process. Criteria based policies should be developed to guide all potential future community development needs and opportunities.
3. Safeguarding and improving community infrastructure
Sufficient investment in local community infrastructure is required to meet any planned growth in population. Of particular note is the need to provide appropriate public transport services that enable the movement within settlements as well as around the Borough without needing to drive. This is implicit in Policy Direction 6 Transport which is encouraging more sustainable transport choices and better integration between all forms of transport to utilise available network capacity within the principal corridors connecting the Borough’s communities and destinations beyond.

Specifically some concern was expressed by South Yorkshire Police regarding the development of new residential apartments in close proximity to Rotherham’s local night life. Policy Direction 6 Transport is seeking to use parking policies alongside other measures designed to encourage sustainable transport choices to help reduce reliance on the car. In developing the policy direction there needs to be recognition that managing car parking capacity should be related to the availability of good and reasonably priced public transport.

Concern was also raised regarding the lack of Park and Ride facilities at the two Kiveton Park stations. The community acknowledged that Kiveton Park and Wales perform as commuter settlements for the wider south Yorkshire area / North Derbys / Notts area.

Reassurance is required that there is sufficient capacity within utility and community infrastructure (such as health facilities and services) to meet new development requirements such as at Waverley. If support for the principle of a new mixed community at Waverley is forthcoming through the LDF process then these issues will also be considered and potential developers and other appropriate service providers will need to ensure this infrastructure is provided through either agreement / obligations or planning conditions. Policy direction 1 “developer contributions” and “safeguarding and improving community infrastructure” seeks to achieve an identified requirement.

Within the black and minority ethnic community workshops there was a clear message for a community facility to enable Asian weddings to be held in Rotherham with associated kitchen and meeting facilities. There was also an identified need for a meeting place for Muslim women and children who tend not to use the mosques. A requirement for a mosque for Arabic speaking peoples was also identified. See response above to this matter.

The Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) will identify likely development sites for all uses together with appropriate criteria based policies to guide new development in the future. Consideration will need to be given to the need for new places of worship and suitable sized community venues to enable a variety of activities to be undertaken.

There was a request for play facilities for children and young people living in the inner urban areas of Rotherham. This is an issue that will need to be considered as part of the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder initiative and has been referred on to the team.

4. Developer contributions
If Green Belt land is developed there should be a higher proportion of developer contributions from these sites when compared to contributions from previously developed land. Support generally for seeking developer contributions commensurate with the Greenfield / brownfield status of the site.

5. Locally Distinctive Design
The participants highlighted the need for sustainable construction and the use of renewable energy. Integration of (old and new) buildings with landscaping not an “add-on”, need for a
balance between old and new areas. Importance of design in creating unique areas with character was highlighted. Needs to be greater community involvement in design and the designs of different ethnic communities should be reflected in Rotherham. This support for the policy direction is welcomed.

Other comments
Increasing levels of new development and the associated impact of increases in transport (public and private) on the environment and on the health of the local communities should be recognised. For example poor air quality can lead to respiratory problems. The links between spatial planning (the LDF) and health are considered in the sustainability appraisal (Sa indicator 7 “improve the health of people of Rotherham, reduce disparities in health and encourage healthy living for all” Appendix 2 of the CSPO). Policy Direction 9 considers that pollution (including air pollution) arising from future development should be suitably mitigated against. However the Sustainability Appraisal identifies one of the weaknesses of policy direction 9 is the lack of recognition that climate change could have on safety or health issues for people in the future. Further consideration will need to be given to this issue in preparing the Submission Core Strategy and any subsequent DPD’s.

Lack of confidence in agencies working together to deliver the projects identified in the spatial plan. Will the Rotherham Renaissance take account of the local development framework and the requirement to involve local communities? The LDF will aim to capture the opportunities within the town centre and undertake sustainability appraisals and consult on these development opportunities where feasible. Consideration is being given to updating the Strategic Development Framework for Rotherham town centre, (funded through the Yorkshire Forward Renaissance Towns Initiative) a draft of this refreshed document will be consulted on later in the year and as the intention is to include the land use allocations from this refreshed document in the Allocations DPD next year this will provide a further opportunity for the community and wider stakeholders to engage in this process and comment on the proposals put forward.

Whilst the Council and its partners through the Rotherham Renaissance initiative are committed to the rejuvenation of the town centre some actions have inevitably resulted in the loss of small independent retailers and this has caused considerable frustration.

How do the community plans, other masterplans and the LDF all link together? At the moment and given the early stages of LDF preparation the masterplans and community plans do not link together however it is the Council’s intention to include any spatial proposals and opportunities identified in masterplans and community plans within the Allocations DPD for consultation purposes early next year. At that stage consultation will be informal in nature and will look at all issues and options. Some proposals included within masterplans and community plans may not find their way into the statutory development plan – the LDF and delivery of these proposals will therefore be questionable as community / stakeholder support may not be forthcoming, or the proposals may be unsustainable and the Council unable to support its development in the future.

Recommendations / Proposed Action

The responses to the policy direction highlight key areas of concern for many stakeholders specifically the need to prepare a clear spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy for the Borough. It is our intention to proceed with the further development of the settlement hierarchy proposed in policy direction 1 to the submission stage of the Core Strategy. The refinement and clarification of the settlement hierarchy will be informed by the settlement capacity work underway for the Allocations DPD, the refresh of the Rotherham Strategic Development Framework and the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy. Greater integration between the
settlement and retail centre hierarchy is required.

All site allocations for new development will be consulted later in the year /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.

1. Proceed with the further development of PD1 to the submission stage of the Core Strategy.
2. The Submission Core Strategy to identify broad locations for new development together with appropriate criteria based policies to guide strategic new development in the future.
3. The Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) to identify specific development sites together with criteria to guide new proposals in the future.
4. The Policies Development Plan Document to include policies to guide all future development proposals.
5. Supplementary Planning Documents and Area Action Plans will be prepared for sites / localities where required.
6. Issues that are beyond the remit of the LDF be referred on to appropriate Council services for consideration.
Core Strategy Preferred Options July 2007 –
Summary of comments from facilitated workshops / internal / external consultation

**POLICY DIRECTION TWO: HOUSING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Wentworth South</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Street Centre, Rawmarsh</td>
<td>01/02/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, Andy Duncan, Julie Colley, Margaret Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Primary Care Trust expressed desire for greater co-ordination between the provision of new development with health facilities and provision of housing for elderly people.
- Upper Haugh / Manor Farm site shouldn’t be allocated for housing. As such the Haugh Road area should be put into Green Belt and not developed.
- Different housing types to suit needs of community
- Developers should adhere to policies and procedures regarding affordable housing/community facilities.
- Bungalows for older people – not popular with developers because of density of development.
- Transport infrastructure needs to be in place before development takes place.
- Support for mixed use settlements.
- Waverley – the workshop attendees expressed no particular interest in discussing Waverley proposals … more concerned about local Rawmarsh issues.
- Concerned that too many residential developments are of too high density.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Wentworth South</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thrybergh Church Hall</td>
<td>07/02/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, David Edwards, Julie Colley, Margaret Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- 19,500 new dwellings – how does it match up with population of Rotherham? Forecast for population, people living longer, single person dwellings.
- Who has derived the 19,500 housing requirement to 2021? Concern that this figures is dictated to Rotherham from above and particularly from a Government quango (Regional Assembly).
- Figure has come from Regional Assembly. Set by Government in conjunction with local council
- Concern expressed that 800+ new dwellings required per year over the plan period was
too high.
• Woodlaithes Village – 800 houses – need to build that amount of houses each year until 2026 throughout the Borough.
• Development that is best for Rotherham – looking at whole picture – sustaining communities/transport etc.
• Next stage of consultation Allocations Document – this will identify sites which could be developed for housing/industrial.
• Crime figures in Rotherham Town Centre important – Secured by Design is supported.
• Different types of houses/tenure to meet needs of people.
• What is the definition of affordable housing?
• How will affordable housing figures be derived?
• Affordable housing/special needs/gypsies and travellers - got to identify needs (established via the Housing Needs Survey) and sites.
• Local estate agents could help identify market and needs.
• Housing Market Assessment – look wider than Rotherham.
• Local people need to get involved earlier in the planning process.
• Developers need to consult with local community before submitting an application.
• Housing for older people – ageing population.
• Provision of service – house building – schools, medical centres.
• Waverley – large Brown Field site – possibly 3,500 houses – services needed.
• Windfalls – areas of land that come up for development that had not previously come through for housing.
• Past developments have not provided enough affordable housing.
• Parish Councils would prefer much earlier involvement in planning applications.
• Will the need for elderly persons housing be assessed and used to influence the housing requirement?
• Concern that bungalows are not as secure as other forms of housing for the elderly.
• Are local people to be consulted on the level of services to be provided as part of new development?
• Regarding Map 7 (Potential housing land available at June 2006) – why is the Core
Strategy promoting such a high proportion of new housing development on Greenfield land in the Rotherham Main Urban Area particularly given the brownfield/ greenfield targets stated elsewhere?

- Encouraging residential uses in the town centre should assist plans to rejuvenate the centre.

### Meeting: Wentworth North
Venue: Brampton Parish Hall  Date: 08/02/07
Officers in attendance: Alan Bamforth, Andy Duncan, Michael Hill, Jill Ratcliffe

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Supply and demand on new properties are driven by interest rates.
- The test with HMR is not if it will be working in 5yrs time but if it will be working in 20yrs time.
- New builds – the design and materials have to be right for the location.
- There is a need for better quality, low density accommodation.
- The Plan must consider local young people getting a step on the property ladder.
- There are enough executive type houses in the area. There is a huge need for more affordable housing. Need affordability and sustainability.

### Meeting: Rother Valley West Area Assembly
Venue: Catcliffe Memorial Hall  Date: 05.02.07
Officers in attendance: Noel Bell, Helen Sleigh, Julie Barnett, Elaine Hale

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- If Waverley isn't used for new residential development then the same amount of land must be found elsewhere in the Borough to meet need
- Possible development of Waverley in longer term – (up to 2021 & beyond), at the moment there appears enough space to meet need in other areas without using Waverley
- Would people with large plots of land be forced by the council to give up land for development? No – but people may be tempted to release their gardens for new development
- Is the idea to reduce density? Or increase? - Much concern around this issue – question raised of whether the Council is proposing to advocate building upwards to increase the density of sites?
- Gypsies & Travellers - RMBC is looking at potential sites. This could be on green belt but ideally should look at using the same criteria to assess sites as for other residential developments. Government will require LA’s to provide sites & may prescribe where they will be
- Is the figure of 15% for affordable housing made by RMBC? Could it be changed if needed? How is it calculated?
- Could some of the commercial sites be used for different activities including satisfying the housing requirement?
- Concerns reference significant development of Waverley taking place without proper consideration being given to provision of facilities e.g. schools, doctors etc creating a community that is not sustainable. Therefore better to plan for a sustainable community at the start rather than waiting say 10 years for the number of dwellings to be reached before a school (for example) is built – phasing of development was seen to be vital to
the creation of a sustainable community. To this end a suggestion was made to alter the wording of PD2 sub-section 5 which seeks to recognise that significant improvements to public transport and mitigation of congestion will need to take place within the local road network in addition to improvement to the Parkway and M1 J33. To this end the workshop wanted developers to be tasked with putting in appropriate new infrastructure for 3000+ houses i.e. acknowledge they are building a new settlement.

### Meeting: Rother Valley South Area Assembly

**Venue:** Dinnington Resource Centre  
**Date:** 22.02.07  
**Officers in attendance:** Noel Bell, David Edwards, Andrea Mason

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

**Housing requirement and managing supply**
- Concern expressed that the housing figures are given as a ‘done deal’ which can’t be challenged

**Housing choice**
- General support given to intent. However, concern was raised that there is not a proper choice in whether to provide facilities for travellers and gypsies
- What kind of housing will we need in the future?
- Provision of housing choice should include that for the elderly

**Location of housing development**
- General support given to intent

**Windfalls**
- General support given to intent

**Urban extensions**
- General support given to the possible need to extend Dinnington
- Regarding Waverley – the proposed types of employment envisaged was queried. Support given to the need for proper phasing of the development. Concern that facilities should match the housing provided. Has potential to be successfully planned as a sustainable community
- Opinion expressed that the provision of Waverley could usefully serve to reduce pressure for extensions to Wales and Kiveton Park

### Meeting: Rotherham North

**Venue:** Oaks Lane Depot – Conference Room  
**Date:** 14/04/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Nick Ward, Andy Duncan, Pat Michael, Paul Rollinson

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- There were arguments for providing the right mix of land to meet housing needs. There were discussions about the process and the use of consultation.
- There is a need for affordable housing shown in rural communities e.g. for elderly and young people.
- There was a general feeling that families would want to live in the town centre. It was felt
that housing was key to economic regeneration in the town centre and a way of supporting the shops in the Town Centre.

- There is a need for bungalow provision for elderly residents in Blackburn.
- Town centre living is favoured and seen as achievable and the key to regeneration but need local shops to service this, not just pubs and bars.

### Meeting: Wentworth Valley Co-ordinators
**Venue:** Hellaby Hall Hotel
**Date:** 19/01/07

**Officers in attendance:** Nick Ward

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Need to ensure that certain things are properly defined e.g. “rural” and “affordable” (as in affordable housing).
- Need to consult early.

### Meeting: Youth Cabinet Workshop
**Venue:** International Centre
**Date:** 14/02/07

**Officers in attendance:** Rachel Overfield, Noel Bell, Clare Cope

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

The affordability of housing in the area is a problem.

### Meeting: Access Liaison / Rotherham-4-All
**Venue:** Meeting Room Arts Centre
**Date:** 08/03/07

**Officers in attendance:** Helen Sleigh / Eric Stowe / Neil Finney

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

An initial question was asked about Brownfield Sites, and about the clearance of contamination being effective. There was a lack of confidence that the authorities would ensure that all sites were clean before building of houses began, particularly in old industrial areas.

Both Helen Sleigh and Eric Stowe responded by saying the authorities had to be very strict about environmental safety of sites and would not allow development on land which was not clear of contamination.

Helen Sleigh introduced this policy and described the issues of housing requirement and managing supply, choice and location. Then, as an example, talked about the potential development at Waverley, which is favoured because it is brownfield.

Someone raised the issue of the plan looking 15 to 20 years into the future, and felt this was too long a timescale, as things could change dramatically within a short time. The response given was that this was an estimate of housing needs based on current evidence, and as things develop the figures will be monitored and adapted as necessary.
It was suggested that we include something about “Lifetime Homes” (These are houses which are designed so they can be adapted for anyone with a disability to live in, and cost very little more to build.)

Eric Stowe suggested that we need to specify in the Policy the requirement for “Lifetime Homes” and set a percentage for inclusion in developments.

Eric also stated there was a lack of any mention of design in the Housing Policy and it should be included in this Policy about house-building, so that the accessibility issues for disabled people are clearly made.

---

**Meeting:** Speak Up  
**Venue:** At Speak Up premises, Parkgate  
**Date:** 17/04/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Helen Sleigh / Eric Stowe / Neil Finney / Charlotte Bailey

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

**Housing**

*Think about where you live…*  
*(What about the type of house you live in is it sheltered or are you living independently? Is it in the right place? Where would you like to live?)*

Several people responded that they felt flats were a good place to live as they supported independent living. Some people lived in residential homes and were satisfied with the places they lived in, such as the old vicarage, joined onto the coach house. People were very positive and enthusiastic in their responses, and the majority were satisfied with the actual inside of their homes.

Some people didn’t like respite places and hostels as they were unfamiliar to them.

A few people expressed a preference for living together in supported homes which gave them a level of independence.

*There are problems with cars parking outside some of the homes. People assume that no-one in the home uses a car, and they sometimes park inside the entrance to the home, causing a hazard and preventing access. For example, the home in the Stag and Broom area is often used for parking by teachers from local schools.*

*There are problems with teenagers throwing stones at windows and shouting abuse at the residents.*

*Safety is a big concern. Homes should not be situated near shops and places where youths congregate.*

*Some places where people live are in poor housing in problem areas, and there isn’t enough housing choice.*

One person lives in a bungalow in Barbers Avenue and is satisfied with where he lives.

People want to live independently, perhaps with support.

One person lived for a time in a private group of flats, known as a “keyring” project. There were
problems with vandals and abuse.

Wingfield residence. - Was reasonable, but too close to school.

Need to try to locate homes for people in safer areas. Would like to see more police walking around to make area feel safer.

---

**Meeting:** Chamber of Commerce  
**Venue:** Genesis Business Park  
**Date:** 24/01/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Mike Smith (Chamber of Commerce) Phil Turnidge / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Improved housing choice and affordability. Green - Policy Supported and viewed by Chamber as the most important issue under this heading.

---

**Meeting:** BME Community Workshops Arabic Speaking Women’s event  
**Venue:** Unity Centre  
**Date:** 28/03/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

### Housing - Quality, Choice and Location

- **Quality:** Poor
  - Communication: Group had no knowledge of “2010” decent homes, felt need for translation of communications about decent homes into their language.
  - Size: Problems with finding properties of sufficient size. Alternative locations are limited
  - Lack of availability of appropriate family housing.

### Housing - Issues and Problems

- Need bigger houses with smaller gardens
- Location - Not enough houses in this local area (Eastwood/near Town Centre)
- Need more social houses with higher standards: Larger kitchens and bedrooms; better maintenance; bidding system for council housing
- Interested to know more about home improvement and housing renewal schemes.
- Street cleaning and maintenance
- Safety issue
• Poor environment and want improvement, in particular children’s playing facilities.
• Need more and better quality asylum seekers housing
• Need better maintenance

Meeting: BME Community Workshops – REMA Members
Venue: Unity Centre Date: 28/03/07
Officers in attendance: Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Kay Bacon / Lucy Reader / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- There is some vacant accommodation above shops and there is an opportunity to develop along the canal / river side. Support for housing in the town centre.
- There is a problem with the time taken in granting planning permission for house extensions. Houses are not big enough they need to accommodate 6/7 people (4 children and grandparents).
- Larger housing needs to be scattered around the district.
- Herringthorpe Valley Road housing and gardens needs further consideration.

Social
- Provision of elderly care homes is supported. Currently they are dotted here and there. (Do we need one just for elderly Asian /BME folk? This would need to be located close to amenities and town centre). Need for strategy re: access for visitors.
- Provision of children’s home would have similar location issues

Meeting: BME Community Workshops – Tassibee (Urdu / Gujurati speaking Women’s event)
Venue: Unity Centre Date: 28/03/07
Officers in attendance: Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- Council housing maintenance problems, people ring and no one comes.
- Council service regarding housing is poor.
- Housing size is too small.
- Poor housing choice in Eastwood.
Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

**Poor quality of housing**
Community raised poor quality of housing
Big problem with litter
Housing for eastern European population in area
Problem with extent of private rented housing and number of people in this type of housing.
Need affordable housing here and access to better housing in better areas.
Parking a problem due to extent of vehicles on street.
Lack of parking in the Town Centre leading to problems related with Ferham e.g. commuting workers.
BME Families tend to be larger and housing stock needs to reflect this.

---

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

**Housing**
Is a big issue
Not enough accommodation for large families
Problem for young people getting housing
Need range of housing
Private rented accommodation is mainly bed sits but these are often of poor quality.
Need old people’s homes and independent housing
Ageing population – people busy, times changing regarding looking after older people. There will be a need for further community care in the future.
The community want integrated housing.

---

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Forward Planning was invited to inform Thorpe Hesley residents about LDF and current consultation on Preferred Option.
LDF Manager gave a powerpoint presentation to approx 15 representatives of the Scholes and Thorpe Action Group and the Scholes and Thorpe Community Forum. Cllrs Walker and Kaye and Community Development staff (Pat Michael and Paul Rollinson) were also present.

Main concerns were:

- Gypsy and Traveller sites.
- Need for better housing choice – particularly better quality homes to attract key people to assist local economy.
- Support to abandon previous major greenfield housing development in favour of putting land into the Green Belt
- Concerns about current planning application to redevelop barn/agricultural buildings off Thorpe Street – support to improving quality of design/renovation and maintaining local distinctiveness.
POLICY DIRECTION .......... TWO

COUNCIL’S RESPONSE

Various points, at both the detailed and strategic level, have been raised within the workshops and these are summarised above. Where necessary, concerns not within the remit of the LDF have been forwarded onto the appropriate department. The issues relating to the strategic policy directions of the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation document are included in the following assessment with recommendations for further action in preparing the final Core Strategy for submission for Examination in Public. The Core Strategy will again be subject to further community consultation at the submission stage.

Housing Requirements and Managing Supply
A number of those within the workshops were concerned at the extent of new housing development that was suggested to be needed within Rotherham and the degree of influence to which the Council has had in setting this figure. In responding to this it is important to note that ultimately the number of dwellings is set by the Regional Planning Body (the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly) which is reflected in a document called the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). This itself goes through various stages of production, each giving an opportunity for comment before eventually being finalised by the government. Under the new planning system the RSS is now part of the development plan for Rotherham which means that in practice that we must consider it when preparing our new Local Development Framework and build on the strategy and policies of the RSS. Rotherham’s LDF will not restate national and regional planning policy.

Justification for the Rotherham position can be found by exploring the changing face of Rotherham with the number of households in Rotherham predicted to increase by approximately 20,000 over the next twenty years. Rotherham is also following the national trend with an increasing number of one person households, with a decreasing average household size. This will have implications for future housing requirements in the Borough as average household sizes continue to fall, the types of property that will be required and the availability of suitable building land. From the planning perspective the response to these challenges is evident within the Core Strategy as it seeks to set the quantum of new housing provision and its broad distribution focused on existing sustainable communities or where they can be created by localised changes to the green belt or urban extensions. Reflecting the principles of ‘Plan, Monitor, Manage’, policies and implementation strategies will be set in place to ensure that sufficient, suitable land is available to achieve our housing objectives over the plan period.

Housing Choice
Perhaps predictably given the recent housing market boom, a recurring theme that emerged was the need to create more affordable housing in particular for first-time buyers. The type and tenure of housing available also raised concerns, in particular private rented sector accommodation was generally felt to be of a poor standard. The size of the properties and overcrowding that occurs was felt to be due to the availability of homes of insufficient size to cater for extended families. The accommodation needs of disabled people and the opportunities for creating ‘Lifetime Homes’ should also be fully considered. In responding to these challenges the Council is mindful of the need to create a choice of decent homes in terms of type, tenure and affordability within sustainable, inclusive, safe and well designed communities. To this end, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment will form an important part of the policy process as it will provide information on the level of need and demand for housing within Rotherham. A key element of this work will include consideration of future population trends and identifying the accommodation requirements of specific groups such as first time buyers, black and minority ethnic groups and Gypsies and Travellers.
Location of Housing Development
A general consensus that emerged was of support in principle for brownfield developments as opposed to alternative sources of supply. Some respondents were however reluctant to fully endorse this as they were wary of the extent to which it would be exploited by developers perceived to be hungry to build within back gardens and possible contamination problems that may exist on industrial sites that could be considered suitable in the future for residential development. Town centre living was seen to be a positive step forward and additional opportunities above shops and along canals and the riverside should be looked at. Furthermore whatever the location of development an emphasis on design should be achieved which recognises local distinctiveness. The Council supports many of the points raised but it is emphasised that any development potential that exists within a particular site needs to be balanced against the accessibility to local community facilities, infrastructure and services including public transport. Promoting urban renaissance and requiring good design and inclusive accessible environments are seen to be crucial in achieving sustainable communities.

Urban Extensions
Unsurprisingly the potential urban extension at Waverley dominated the debate (although one workshop did provide their general support for the possible need to extend Dinnington) with discussion largely revolving around whether the new community is necessary to satisfy the housing need within Rotherham, the importance of supporting infrastructure (e.g. schools, health facilities and significant improvements to public transport and mitigation of congestion) being provided in co-ordination with creating large numbers of new homes, together with how the scheme is phased which is seen to be crucial in attaining its longer term sustainability. It is accepted that large scale housing at Waverley, if not planned properly could be unsustainable and could have adverse impacts on town centre living. However, the large scale site presents a potential opportunity for mixed use development, supporting community infrastructure and enhanced public transport systems. This proposal 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 and other local road networks. Any housing development at Waverley would need to be of an appropriate scale and type with phasing 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 and supporting Allocations and Policies DPDs.

Consultation
A common theme emerged of the public’s desire to be involved from the outset in shaping planning proposals and the need for developers to fully recognise the benefits of this early engagement. These comments are in line with the Councils procedures and practice established in the Statement of Community Involvement (adopted in June 2006). It is intended to ensure the active, meaningful and continued involvement of individuals, local communities and stakeholders in the planning process.

Density
The extent to which developments coming forward at high density, with individual dwellings crammed in to accommodate greater numbers, emerged as a significant issue within many of the workshops. Policy Direction 8 promotes the efficient use of resources and establishes a target in line with government guidance to achieve a minimum net density of 30 dwellings per hectare. Density, like design needs to stem from and be sympathetic to its local context. As such, an indicative range of densities for urban, suburban, and rural locations is proposed to be defined in the Policies DPD.
The Council recognise that more intensive development is not always appropriate. However, when well designed and built in the right location, it can enhance the character and quality of an area. Successful intensification need not mean high rise development or low quality accommodation with inappropriate space. Similarly, in Conservation Areas and other local areas of special character new opportunities can be developed without adverse impacts on their character and appearance, as long as these opportunities are well-designed and in-keeping with the locality.

The density of existing development should not always dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring replication of existing style or form. If done well, imaginative design and layout of new development can lead to a more efficient use of land without compromising the quality of the local environment.

Parking
There was general concern amongst the groups about adequate residential parking where multiple car ownership is now the norm. A particular point was made that near to the town centre where people working/visiting are exploiting the free car parking available in nearby residential areas, this in turn creates additional congestion for local residents. These comments, while not directly linked with PD2, obviously have a significant impact upon residential amenity and are considered in more detail within PD6. In developing this issue the need for the management of parking to encourage more sustainable travel choices balanced against residential amenity and town centre considerations, will be fully addressed.

Recommendations/proposed action

Proceed with the further development of PD2 to the submission stage.
The Submission Core Strategy to:

Set the quantum of new housing provision and its broad distribution focused on existing sustainable communities or where they can be created by localised changes to the green belt or urban extensions including the potential development of Waverley as a new mixed-use community.

Ensure that sufficient and appropriate references are made to the inclusion of sustainable design in new development schemes.

Reflect importance of giving residential developments access to gardens, green spaces, allotments and good quality public realm to create desirable and useable housing. The importance of public spaces to quality of life and health should not be overlooked.

Highlight the importance of ensuring there is a mix of housing type to meet lifelong housing needs in the Borough.

The Allocations DPD to identify sufficient land for the first 5 years supply along with sites for special needs housing and provision for Gypsies and Travellers. As part of this process consideration will be had to the comment that the Upper Haugh/Manor Farm site should not be allocated for housing and instead placed within the green belt.

The Policies DPD to contain criteria for new housing sites and windfalls; the threshold, scale and type of affordable housing provision; measures to support housing market renewal; and the phasing and managed release of sites. In addition an indicative range of densities for urban, suburban and rural locations will be defined.
Future Supplementary Planning Document’s to include guidance on Planning Obligations for affordable housing and updated residential layout and design.

Continue efforts to engage individuals, local communities and stakeholders in the earliest stages of developing proposals as detailed within the adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

Take account within PD6 of the need for the management of parking to encourage more sustainable travel choices to be balanced against residential amenity and town centre viability considerations.

The following issues which are not within the remit of the LDF be referred onto the appropriate services for consideration:

**Rotherham 2010 & Rotherham Housing Market Renewal Team**
BME communities wish to know more about home improvement and housing renewal schemes including improved translation of communications about decent homes into different languages including Arabic.
Council housing maintenance problems remain whereby faults are reported but no action is taken in response.

**Neighbourhoods**
There is a need for bungalow provision for elderly residents in Blackburn
Within residential homes there are problems with cars parking outside causing a hazard and preventing access. For instance the home in the Stag and Broom area is often used for parking by teachers from local schools. Safety is a big concern and particularly problems with youths congregating and in some instances shouting abuse and throwing stones. This issue is also a problem within a “Keyring” project.
Could/should an elderly care home be provided specifically for Asian/BME persons?
### POLICY DIRECTION THREE: INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>Brampton Parish Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>08/02/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, Andy Duncan Michael Hill, Jill Ratcliffe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- Manvers spine road needs widening to accommodate Next development and all new housing at Manvers to prevent traffic congestion.
- Should encourage re-use of redundant rural buildings for employment/commerce / tourism.
- Control of advertisements supported some adverts/street furniture distracting for motorists – add in some text on controlling excessive street furniture?
- Many large lorries still go through Wath town centre rather than negotiate all the roundabouts on the bypass.
- Small local craft workshops would improve tourism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>Swinton Civic Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>05/02/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, David Edwards, Michael Hill, Jill Ratcliffe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- Problem of HGV movements to/from Manvers to A1, rat runs through Wentworth and Harley.
- Need for small manufacturing units as well as large distribution centres / service industry buildings.
- RMBC should provide a safe walking trail to the Wentworth Follies. RMBC promote Wentworth Tourism but do not put anything into Wentworth.
- RMBC should consider the production of Biomass Crops.
- Long term visions are ok but people need short term objectives.
- RMBC should put down markers stating that they will do ----- within the next five years. Then we will do ----- within the following five years. A year by year milestone plan should be drawn up and measurable by criteria laid out in the development plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>High Street Centre, Rawmarsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>01/02/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, Andy Duncan Julie Colley, Margaret Ball</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- Inward Investment – Industrial development/employment opportunities.
- Corus – possible closure.
- Needs site for industrial development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>Thrybergh Church Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>07/02/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, David Edwards, Julie Colley, Jill Ratcliffe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Industrial land – needs to be released throughout the Borough.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth Valley Co-ordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>Hellaby Hall Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>19/01/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Nick Ward</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Hellaby is a prime area for employment

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Youth Cabinet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>International Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>14.2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Rachel Overfield Noel Bell, Clare cope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

**Town Centre Employment**
- Opinion varied between the majority who supported the Town Centre as a borough shopping centre/leisure area and others who thought that the Town Centre could never compete with Meadowhall (comment repeated in PD1).
- The Town centre should have smaller more old fashioned types of business to make it different to Meadowhall and Parkgate. A better balance of the shops in Rotherham town centre is needed.
- Consider creating a more continental feel eg coffee bars on the street and foster more quality shopping.
- Ensure shop fronts are in keeping with the area. Link and create points of interest between shops to make it feel more connected/one big place.

**Tourism**
- The Heritage side of Rotherham town centre needs to be promoted eg the proximity of the town centre to Clifton Park. Heritage sites such as Clifton Park and the Chapel on the Bridge should be marketed more to help bring people back to the town centre (see also PD7).
- The town needs an entertainment provision.
Meeting: Chamber of Commerce
Venue: Genesis Business Park
Date: 24/01/07
Officers in attendance: Mike Smith (Chamber of Commerce) Phil Turnidge / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Rotherham Town Centre and the larger outlying centres as the principal focus for retail, office, leisure and public service employment. Green - Policy supported. Needs to be part of joined-up thinking, to link development of large urban centres with development in other areas.

- Strategic locations for modern innovative industries and businesses at Waverley, Manvers, Templeborough, Dinnington, Aldwarke and Maltby/Hellaby. Green - Policy Supported as an important issue from commercial viewpoint.
- Safeguarding existing firms and encouraging new business formation in sustainable communities and areas of greatest job need. Green - Policy supported by Chamber as first priority in this section.

Meeting: BME Community Workshops
Venue: Reach Building, Ferham
Date: 27/03/07
Officers in attendance: Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

There is employment land close-by – but need a balanced approach to be able to access employment, housing and other community facilities.

Town Centre is a key employment location – addressing disadvantaged areas.

Compare with Doncaster / Barnsley
Rotherham falls behind Doncaster and Barnsley developments
Regeneration of the Town Centre and economic regeneration is ongoing but benefits to wider community are lagging behind

Job opportunities
Keeping people in Rotherham – attracting people to Rotherham to live and spend money in Rotherham is a key issue.

Employment / Economy
RMBC - reliant on market / making attractive locations.
Local charity shop closures – will result in fewer training opportunities.
Town Centre needs to offer something different.
Area has suffered a downturn.
Development of Manvers – recognise need for good quality jobs for the people that live here.
The Borough has still got a manufacturing base / specialised opportunities at Waverley could assist in retaining graduates and qualified people.
Develop skills of local people – improve skills base.
Encourage diversity in employment / training provision to meet labour market.
Live work centres – lacking within the local environment.
Not tradition of working from home / related to the need to restructure housing space.
**Meeting: BME Community Workshops Arabic Speaking Women’s event**

**Venue:** Unity Centre  
**Date:** 28/03/07

**Officers in attendance:** Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**
- Difficult to access decent jobs due to language barrier and religious belief (women wearing scarves were believed not to be welcomed in workplaces).

---

**Meeting: BME Community Workshops Rema Board Members**

**Venue:** Unity Centre  
**Date:** 28/03/07

**Officers in attendance:** Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Kay Bacon / Lucy Reader / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

**Employment**
- There are no jobs in Rotherham. There is not much opportunity. More training is needed. More vocational training is required. New business’ can encourage the training of a percentage of the local community. This would be good.
- Role models are needed for ethnic communities in different professional jobs.

---

**Meeting: BME Community Workshops - Tassibee (Urdu / Gujurati speaking Women’s event)**

**Venue:** Unity Centre  
**Date:** 28/03/07

**Officers in attendance:** Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**
- Positive discrimination for employment needed.
- Training needed for local people.
- Lack of opportunity, even for degree level young people.

---

**Meeting: Wentworth Valley**

**Venue:** Full Life Church, Maltby  
**Date:** 12/2/07

**Officers in attendance:** Ryan Shepherd, Noel Bell, Mick Stowe, Sue Weatherley

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**
- Ensuring job opportunities and new industrial development are for the benefit of Rotherham people as opposed to those who are commuting into the area
- Can we actively target local people for these jobs such as has already occurred in the Dearne Valley with the call centres – undertake a skills audit to try and match up with employers specific needs
POLICY DIRECTION .......... THREE

COUNCIL’S RESPONSE

Various points, at both the detailed and strategic level, have been raised within the workshops and these have been summarised above. Where necessary, concerns not within the remit of the LDF have been forwarded onto the appropriate department. The issues relating to the strategic policy directions of the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation document are included in the following assessment with recommendations for further action in preparing the final Core Strategy for submission for Examination in Public. The Core Strategy will again be subject to further community consultation at the submission stage.

Employment Requirements

Much debate surrounded the key issues of ensuring that the skills that are necessary for successfully taking advantage of new employment opportunities are being attained by making available appropriate training opportunities. This issue extended particularly to those who have perhaps not been active previously within the labour market such as women from within ethnic minority communities. Equally it was felt to be crucial to the future prosperity of the Borough that those individuals from Rotherham who have achieved higher education qualifications are able to find opportunities that can match their own career ambitions as opposed to having to commute elsewhere or leave the area altogether.

Perhaps it is not surprising given the complexity of establishing the employment land requirements that few of the workshops chose to dwell on the detail of this, but a point was made that industrial land needs to be made available throughout the Borough. A first step in identifying exactly where this may occur involved the Council undertaking an Employment Land Review which 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. However, we do recognise that 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.

Town Centre Employment

The wide ranging regeneration of the town centre was felt within many of the workshops to be a positive step forward. This support was given a caveat in some discussions however with it stated that the developments that come forward and the benefits that these bring should be shared amongst the wider community. To achieve the long term sustainability of the town centre as particularly a central focus for retail it was considered crucial that it does not try to compete (as the battle may already be lost) with the offer available from Meadowhall and Retail World, with the best way forward thought to be niche shopping and effective marketing of the alternative benefits that the town centre brings such as being nearby to Clifton Park.

Suggestions were also made of improved public realm ensuring that shop-fronts are more in-keeping with the area and the need to create links and points of interest between shops to make it feel more connected.

Consideration is being given to updating the Strategic Development Framework for Rotherham town centre, (funded through the Yorkshire Forward Renaissance Towns Initiative) a draft of this refreshed document will be consulted on later in the year. The intention is to include the land use allocations from this refreshed document in the Allocations DPD next year 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.

There is ongoing work to prepare a Public Realm Strategy for Rotherham Town Centre and consultation is ongoing with respect to this document - it is intended that this Strategy will be approved as an Interim Planning Statement (hence the ongoing consultation). These activities including those of the Housing Market Renewal Team to develop more houses within the town centre (the Westgate Demonstrator Project at the southern end of Corporation Street / Market Street) and the Rotherham Renaissance Initiative to regenerate the town centre will all contribute in due course to the rejuvenation of the town centre. The LDF will aim to capture the opportunities within the town centre and undertake sustainability appraisals and consult on these development opportunities where feasible. Given the timescale for the completion of the LDF it is highly likely that planning permissions may have been granted for the development of specific sites without being included within the LDF. However where there are choices on sites for a mix / variety of different uses then the views of the local community and wider stakeholders will be sought in preparing the appropriate DPD.

Detailed consideration of the Rotherham Urban area including Rotherham Town centre and its periphery will be undertaken as part of the Allocations DPD work. Dependent upon the outcome of further work the Submission Core Strategy may promote the expansion of Rotherham Town Centre if this is considered appropriate.

Strategic Employment Sites
The Policy Direction for Industry and Commerce sets out a strategy which supports the settlement hierarchy detailed in part 2 of Policy Direction 1 (Sustainable Communities) and as such identifies town centres which have been discussed above and strategic employment sites across the borough as the primary locations for new employment. Nothing that emerged within the workshops sought to contradict this stance as it was felt that such areas were important from a commercial viewpoint but also crucial in addressing the employment requirements of an enterprising, dynamic, competitive economy. It was acknowledged that there does need to be a balanced approach to be able to access employment, housing and other community facilities, with a point made that the Manvers spine road may need widening to prevent congestion that may occur as a result of all the development that has taken place. Whilst it is not likely to be sustainable to attempt to escalate road building to combat congestion, specific road schemes (not related to Manvers however) to assist regeneration and to optimise existing road capacity are envisaged under PD6 and subject to technical assessments and funding arrangements will be included, as appropriate in the Core Strategy or supporting Allocations DPD.

Local Businesses
The availability of suitable, affordable premises was forefront in people’s minds when discussing the needs of local businesses. The importance of protecting businesses once they are established and encouraging the formation of new ones were also seen to be important issues that need to be fully considered. It was interesting to note that live/work facilities were regarded as a positive step forward but because of constraints regarding the available space within existing residential developments it was felt that this could only be fully established as part of new schemes that come forward in the future. These issues are also heavily-interlinked to the development of telecommunications and IT networks in helping to reduce the need for travel which itself forms a key element of the policy direction. Again a recurring theme that emerged was the hope that new industrial development would be of benefit to Rotherham people as opposed to those who are commuting into the area.

The Employment Land Review referred to above 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 the creation of new local businesses and safeguarding local employment facilities where these contribute towards the continuing sustainability of communities. The ongoing South Yorkshire Office Market Study whose objective is to analyse the past, present and future demand and supply for offices in the towns of Rotherham, Barnsley, Doncaster and out of town Sheffield will also form a useful part of the evidence base in considering these issues.

**Tourism**

Given the growth over recent years of the tourism industry, it is not unreasonable to expect that Rotherham should be wanting to take advantage of the opportunities this brings. Indeed a suggestion was made in one workshop of small local craft workshops being a positive step forward. However the demands of visitors are ever greater as people’s awareness of what is available elsewhere heightens. This in turn means that Rotherham is presented with a number of challenges in terms of providing entertainment provision and more effectively promoting its natural and built environmental assets. In responding to this it is emphasised within PD7 that the quality, character and amenity value of the countryside whilst acknowledging the sensitive promotion of its heritage assets can bring cultural and leisure benefits to the Borough’s residents and visitors. PD3 itself also states that opportunities for business and leisure based tourism and hotel development are to be promoted within the main town centres and adjacent to Magna and YES/Rother Valley Country Park. The work of the Tourism Service in establishing events such as continental markets and the Walking Festival are also significant contributors in developing Rotherham as a visitor destination.

**Advertisements**

Whilst everyone recognises the power of advertising and the positive effect it can have on businesses, it must be acknowledged that the need for control of advertisements is important from a public realm perspective to minimise clutter and adverse visual amenity impacts that may occur, in addition to ensuring that they do not prove to be a dangerous distraction to motorists. It is reassuring that the policy direction reflects these sentiments although consideration will be given within a future SPD on design as to how public realm issues can be fully addressed in achieving local distinctiveness and inclusive accessible environments in accordance with PD1.

**Rural Economy**

Attendees at the workshops made the point that re-use of redundant rural buildings for employment/commercial/tourist purposes should be encouraged. This is in line with the Council’s policy which supports such actions within appropriately located and suitably constructed existing buildings where this would meet sustainable development objectives. Re-use for economic development purposes will usually be preferable (it is worth noting at this point that from a policy perspective appropriate development for such uses in non-redundant buildings is also capable of being acceptable), but residential conversions may be more appropriate in some locations, and for some types of building. It is also likely that the Council will be particularly supportive of the re-use of existing buildings that are adjacent or closely related to country towns and villages, for economic or community uses, or to provide housing in accordance with PD2. The Policies DPD will set out the policy criteria for permitting the conversion and re-use of buildings in rural areas for economic, residential and any other purposes, including mixed-use.
**Recommendations/Proposed Action**

Proceed with the further development of PD3 to the submission stage.

The Submission Core Strategy to:
- Set the quantum of employment land together with distributional principles
- The Allocations DPD to identify specific sites for employment and mixed use development.
- The Policies DPD to contain criteria for assessing proposals for tourist development, rural employment (including the conversion and re-use of buildings in rural areas), alternative use of employment land, mixed use developments, advertisements and telecoms/information & communications technology apparatus.

Future Supplementary Planning Documents to consider including updated design guidance for employment sites and buildings (including mitigation and adaptation to climate change and consideration of public realm issues particularly in relation to advertising), and local employment and training requirements.

The following issues which are not within the remit of the LDF be referred on to the appropriate services for consideration:

**Rotherham Highway Authority**
- Continued use of roads by lorries through Wath town centre rather than negotiate the roundabouts on the bypass.
- Problem of HGV movements to/from Manvers to the A1, with rat runs through Wentworth and Harley.

**Rights of Way**
- Request for RMBC to promote a safe walking trail to the Wentworth Follies.

**Rotherham Chamber of Commerce**
- Encourage businesses to target and train for employment a percentage of the local community, such as has occurred within the Dearne Valley call centres
- Increase awareness amongst ethnic minority communities of positive role models in different professional jobs.
### Policy Direction Four: Retail and Leisure

**Meeting: Rotherham North**  
**Venue:** Oaks Lane Depot – Conference Room  
**Date:** 14/04/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Nick Ward, Andy Duncan / Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson

#### Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- There was a need to support the Rotherham Town Centre to provide a new lease of life and to nurture small business and develop niche markets. There was recognition of the environment faced by Rotherham Town Centre with Parkgate and Meadowhall sites close by.
- The issue of parking and offer from shops were highlighted as important, competition with free parking at Meadowhall.
- The Rotherham market was recognised to be struggling to continue at the same capacity.
- Public transport is the key to tackling the problems of Rotherham town centre.

---

**Meeting: Rotherham South**  
**Venue:** Town Hall  
**Date:** 25/1/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Ryan Shepherd, Rachel Overfield, David Edwards / Kay Bacon / Lucy Reader

#### Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- Document should recognise that the role of the town centre has fundamentally changed – larger shops have been lost elsewhere.
- Desire expressed for moves to encourage smaller scale retail businesses and smaller scale versions of major retailers such as Marks and Spencer and Tesco. Need to encourage small specialists / niche retail users. Opposing view given that specialist shops are facing increasing competition from internet and may therefore be increasingly uneconomic.
- Independent retailers should be given more encouragement and support to stay. Have studies been made to examine why independent retailers have been lost?
- Concern that Rotherham Renaissance, the Council’s actions at All Saints Buildings and lack of adequate car parking provision has resulted in loss of long established local tenants and businesses.
- Should use business rates to encourage smaller retail users.
- Pressure noted in rise of drinking and eating establishments.
- An opportunity could be missed to provide a stadium within the town centre as is being pursued in Barnsley and Doncaster.
- Out of town centres are ‘killing-off’ the town centre.
Meeting: Speak Up  
Venue: Speak Up premises at Parkgate  
Date: 17/04/07  
Officers in attendance: Helen Sleigh / Eric Stowe / Neil Finney / Charlotte Bailey

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Leisure

_Do you like doing other things / activities in your own time such as shopping, going to the gym? Do you have any problems doing these things, if so what are they?_

Rawmarsh: Not enough leisure facilities. Swimming pool closed.  
Herringthorpe Leisure Centre pool closed. Not replaced. Not as many facilities there.  
Dinnington pool is being closed. Nothing else in Dinnington!

New pools and leisure centres planned, but some people will find it difficult to get to these new places. St Ann’s - Sounds good as it is near to town centre.  
Maltby - Will replace the one that is already there.

Thorpe Hesley. Not enough football goal posts for people who are not playing in organised games. Would like more of these just for casual kick-abouts.

Rawmarsh - Near Fighting Cocks Pub. There are no play areas in the park. Would like to see one established.

Basketball - Would like to see more outside courts for leisure use.

Information relating to Sport and Leisure Facilities is pretty good, as people use the internet and leaflets provided to find out about the provision of them.

---

Meeting: Chamber of Commerce  
Venue: Genesis Business Park  
Date: 24/01/07  
Officers in attendance: Mike Smith (Chamber of Commerce) Phil Turnidge / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- Enhance Rotherham Town Centre as a sub regional centre for shopping, commerce, culture and leisure. Green. Policy Supported. Chamber suggested that Rotherham would be better as a niche operator, developing uniqueness as a shopping centre that distinguishes it from other centres.

- Further retail, leisure and service facilities to be provided in keeping with a hierarchy of outlying town, district and local centres. Green - Policy Supported.

- Containment of retail and leisure development outside designated centres. Green - Policy Supported. Chamber suggested that Parkgate Retail Centre should be linked with Town Centre. For example by using innovative transport links such as monorail.

- Retention of neighbourhood retail and service facilities. Green - Policy Supported
Meeting: BME Community Workshops
Venue: Reach Building, Ferham
Date: 27/03/07

Officers in attendance: Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor Community facilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for leisure facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of leisure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities and people are travelling to Sheffield. St Ann’s development of leisure centre will attract people into the Town Centre to a more centralised leisure provision. Cinema – nearest are in Sheffield / Meadowhall. These facilities are for 20-30 year age group – people going elsewhere – economic driver. Weekend activities – lacking in Rotherham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable communities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve sustainable communities requires facilities, shops, and places to go. Compared with surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Centre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Centre – only charity shops and banks and not attractive place to go. Poorly used centre Big screen – area looks nice but not much else in the town centre, there are few reasons to go there and it only appeals to certain people. Needs co-located activities – sort out parking and related issues – to unite people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting: BME Community Workshops Arabic Speaking Women’s event
Venue: Unity Centre
Date: 28/03/07

Officers in attendance: Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shops</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No local supermarkets available, in particular in Masbrough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support for more Asian Shops at Fitzwilliam St.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Meeting: BME Community Workshops Rema Board Members

**Venue:** Unity Centre  
**Date:** 28/03/07

**Officers in attendance:** Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Kay Bacon / Lucy Reader / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

#### Town Centre
- People prefer Meadowhall to the town centre. There are no good shops in Rotherham.
- Rotherham should be an entertainment centre with cinema and bowling alley – this was planned for Parkgate and has not happened.
- People are looking for places to go and there are limited things to do in Rotherham.
- There are no Halal shops in the town centre you have to go elsewhere. There are no Asian jewellery shops in the town centre. People go shopping in London, Leeds and Leicester to buy these things.
- An Asian shopping area in the town centre will be an attractive idea. It is a point of reference and can be utilised by the wider community.
- Locally distinctive design this would not be positive – it could be stereotyping the area as being rough.
- Different street signs for different areas are good.

### Meeting: BME Community Workshops Tassibee (Urdu / Gujurati speaking Women’s event)

**Venue:** Unity Centre  
**Date:** 28/03/07

**Officers in attendance:** Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

#### Access to Services and Facilities
- Car parking in Town Centre is very expensive and when shopping at the market and looking after children at the same time this is an issue if also trying to travel by public transport.
- Concern that parking charges will drive people to Parkgate where there is free car parking - we are pushing people out of the Town Centre.
- Lack of facilities in the Town Centre to meet local needs.
- Halal locally accessible but no big Halal stores in Rotherham.
- No Ready Made clothing available locally.
Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- Successful businesses have free car parking. Town Centre parking charges discourage people from using Town Centre.

- Bus Services – not reliable – money needs putting in to make buses go to outlying area. Prices too high.

  Rotherham Town Centre – Sub-Regional Centre.

- Major leisure complex adjacent to Town centre - St. Ann’s Swimming Pool, should regenerate area.

- Statistics from local shop keepers? Numbers using shops?

- Market forces determine how Town Centre evolves – transport links.

- Rotherham Town Centre – concerned that town centre improvements would not occur if retail development is also directed to district centres and other locations which would compete with the town centre.

- Some of those present felt that Rotherham Town Centre is unlikely to be able to recover from its recent decline and attract new retail uses.

- Others took a more optimistic view believing that the Town Centre still has a role to place as a central place.

- Encouraging residential uses in the town centre should assist plans to rejuvenate the centre.

- Queried why Rotherham is only to be enhanced as a ‘sub-regional centre’. Confusion over what the retail hierarchy categories actually mean in practice.
Various points, at both the strategic and detailed level, were made at the workshops and these are summarised above. Where necessary general concerns not within the remit of the LDF have been forwarded onto the appropriate department. The issues relating to the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation document are included within the following assessment with recommendations for further action in preparing the final Core Strategy for Submission for Examination in Public. The Core Strategy will again be subject to further community consultation at the submission stage.

Rotherham Town Centre
Support for Rotherham as a sub-regional centre; the creation of niche markets and nurturing of small businesses that will encourage the uniqueness of the town centre. Recognition that larger department stores have developed elsewhere such as at Retail World Parkgate and Meadowhall. The role of the town centre has changed over recent years and some concern was raised as to whether the town centre could ever recover from its recent decline. There was support in some quarters for town centre living that could assist in rejuvenating the town centre, however the closure and ongoing refurbishment of Imperial Building and subsequently All Saints building to further the Rotherham Renaissance initiative and enable town centre living has forced out long established retailers and businesses. There needs to be greater support to enable independent retailers to remain in the town centre.

Concern was also raised that niche / specialist shops are facing increased competition from web based businesses.

Rotherham Town centre is not an attractive area. Concern was raised that the quality and variety of shops available in the town centre is poor and that Rotherham cannot compete with Meadowhall or Retail World.

There was however support by the BME community for more Asian shops selling ready made clothes, jewellery and food – there is no Halal food store of any size within Rotherham.

Consider use of “street” signage to distinguish between different (character) areas.

Can statistics be provided by shopkeepers regarding the numbers of people using their shop?

Should a new Stadium be provided within or immediately on the edge of Rotherham town centre as is happening in Barnsley and Doncaster?

Consideration is being given to updating the Strategic Development Framework for Rotherham town centre, (funded through the Yorkshire Forward Renaissance Towns Initiative) a draft of this refreshed document will be consulted on later in the year and as the intention is to include the land use allocations from this refreshed document in the Allocations DPD next year this will provide a further opportunity for the community and wider stakeholders to engage in this process and comment on the proposals put forward.

There is ongoing work to prepare a Public Realm Strategy for Rotherham Town Centre and consultation is ongoing with respect to this document - it is intended that this Strategy will be approved as an Interim Planning Statement (hence the ongoing consultation). These activities:
including those of the Housing Market Renewal Team to develop more houses within the town centre (the Westgate Demonstrator Project at the southern end of Corporation Street / Market Street) and the Rotherham Renaissance Initiative to regenerate the town centre will all contribute in due course to the rejuvenation of the town centre. The LDF will aim to capture the opportunities within the town centre and undertake sustainability appraisals and consult on these development opportunities where feasible. Given the timescale for the completion of the LDF it is highly likely that planning permissions may have been granted for the development of specific sites without being included within the LDF. However where there are choices on sites for a mix / variety of different uses then the views of the local community and wider stakeholders will be sought in preparing the appropriate LDF DPD.

Detailed consideration of the Rotherham Urban area including Rotherham Town centre and its periphery will be undertaken as part of the allocations DPD work. Dependent upon the outcome of further work the Submission Core strategy may promote the expansion of Rotherham Town Centre if this is considered appropriate.

**Transport Accessibility and Car Parking in Rotherham Town Centre**

Car parking issue is forcing people out of the town to those areas parking is free and accessible to the retail shops. It is difficult to shop at the market when you have young children if you haven't got accessible car parking. There is a perception that buses and trains are unreliable. There is a need for co-located activities and to sort out parking issues and public transport - this will unite people.

Policy Direction 6 Transport is seeking to use parking policies alongside other measures designed to encourage sustainable transport choices to help reduce reliance on the car. In developing the policy direction there needs to be recognition that managing car parking capacity should be related to the availability of good and reasonably priced public transport. Car parking management aiming to promote sustainable transport choices also needs to be balanced with the pricing and adequate provision of parking to support the viability of town centres.

**Retail Centre Hierarchy**

The hierarchy categories are confusing. Support for the retention of neighbourhood retail and service facilities. There are no local supermarkets in the Masbrough / Ferham areas. In preparing the settlement hierarchy for policy direction 1 the Council will consider all site allocations for new development and these 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 in 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 that the retail centre hierarchy will be clarified. This further work may promote the expansion of town, district and local centres to meet the needs and function of the community they serve and to promote their sustainability.

**Out of Centre Developments**

Out of town centre developments are killing off Rotherham town centre. The Council is aware of this issue and will use national planning policy provided in Planning Policy Statement 6 Planning For Town Centres, as the basis for any future decision-making.

**Leisure**

There is a lack of leisure facilities / swimming pools (in particular in the town centre) and the council is promoting the closure of a number of pools throughout the Borough and their replacement with four pools on the edge of Rotherham town centre, and in Wath, Maltby, Aston. How easy will these new facilities be to get to for the majority of residents in the Borough?
There is a need for more informal facilities such as goal posts where people can just kick a ball about. Concern was raised specifically about the Clay Pit lane recreation ground where old play equipment has been removed but not yet replaced. A small sum of money has been negotiated with the developer of a nearby housing site to provide improvements to this equipment.

There are no cinemas within Rotherham (and one bowling alley at Kimberworth), the nearest cinemas are at Meadowhall or Centertainment, Attercliffe, Sheffield. There are limited activities within Rotherham Town Centre that make the area unattractive.

Policy Direction 4 Retail and Leisure needs to give greater consideration to planning for leisure activities in any future policy or policies. The contribution that leisure facilities make to quality of life and the creation of sustainable communities. This matter is not currently explored in policy direction 4 and this aspect needs to be considered fully as part of any policy or policies and explanatory text in future DPD’s.

**Recommendations / Proposed Action**

The responses to the policy direction highlight key areas of concern for many stakeholders particularly the activities of the Rotherham Renaissance initiative that has seen the loss of a number of small independent retailers, closure of swimming pools and the lack of attractive alternatives particularly within or immediately adjacent to Rotherham town centre; the issue of car parking and associated charges and the confusion arising out of the retail hierarchy. Whilst the Council and its partners through the Rotherham Renaissance initiative are committed to the rejuvenation of the town centre some actions have inevitably resulted in the loss of these small independent retailers and this has caused considerable frustration.

It is our intention to proceed with the further development of this policy area to the submission stage of the Core Strategy.

1. Proceed with further development of PD4 to the submissions stage of the Core Strategy.
2. The Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) will identify likely development sites for further retail, leisure activities and other appropriate town centre uses together with appropriate criteria based policies to guide new development in the future.
3. The Policies Development Plan Document to include policies to guide all future development proposals.
4. The Strategic Development Framework for Rotherham Town Centre is currently being refreshed and it is intended that the Council will approve the content of this document as an Interim Planning Statement to guide future major development proposals in the town centre early in 2008. The Council will undertake consultation on this document and a sustainability appraisal prior to its approval.
5. Further Supplementary Planning Documents and Area Action Plans will be prepared for sites / localities throughout the Rotherham Urban Area and the rest of the Borough when and where required.
**POLICY DIRECTION FIVE: WASTE MANAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>High Street Centre, Rawmarsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>01/02/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, Andy Duncan, Julie Colley, Margaret Ball</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Design Guides need to take account of recycling needs of new development e.g. bin storage, disposal chutes, etc.
- Should be more opportunities to recycle plastic.
- Need to co-ordinate recycling better.
- Needs to be adequate /fit for use – different types of housing require different recycling methods.
- Needs to be integrated through housing and transport.
- Fines for not recycling?
- Possible role of incinerators to use residual waste as source of combined heat and power generation for new developments was raised. Potential concerns regarding incinerators also noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>Thrybergh Church Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>07/02/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, David Edwards, Julie Colley, Margaret Ball</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Waste is a key problem in South Yorkshire as landfill sites are running out of spare capacity.
- Waste recycling must be taken more seriously by RMBC, particularly for plastics.
- House building – need to develop methods of get rid of waste.
- Identify sites in South Yorkshire (Rotherham/Doncaster/Barnsley) to use for waste disposal.
- Reduce waste/re-use/recycle.
- Combined heat/power – incinerator. Where would it go?
- No facilities to dispose of plastic. Batteries – storage/transportation.
- Lot of work needed on recycling. Sufficient space for bins for recycling – recycling chutes in high rise buildings.
- Council needs to take a lead.
- Fines for not recycling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Rotherham North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>Oaks Lane Depot – Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>14/04/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance</td>
<td>Nick Ward, Andy Duncan / Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Need to look at environment as part of the economy.
- The need for schemes e.g. supermarket recycling and the provision of more recycling points.
- There were comments made about study for effective ways for waste management by residents. Reference was made to the blue box scheme and the need to drastically improve the recycling of plastics.
- Incinerating waste was mentioned and this was done historically to generate electricity.
- There is a need to reduce the distance that waste travels to be recycled and the canal was suggested to be restored and used more to transport materials.
- The South Yorkshire region will face penalty fines from the EU for failing to reduce the amounts going to landfill sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Rother Valley South Area Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>Dinnington Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>22.02.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance</td>
<td>Noel Bell, David Edwards, Andrea Mason</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Concern expressed about the operational management of existing facilities at the Park Farm site in South Anston
- General opinion expressed that there should be more effective and widespread recycling in the Borough particularly for plastic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Youth Cabinet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>International Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>14.2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance</td>
<td>Rachel Overfield, Noel Bell, Clare Cope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Recycling needs to be integral to the design of new developments.
### Meeting: Rotherham Chamber of Commerce

**Venue:** Genesis Business Park  
**Date:** 24/01/07

**Officers in attendance:** Mike Smith (Chamber of Commerce) Phil Turnidge / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**
- Promotion of sustainable waste management and innovation with potential benefits to the local economy. Green - Policy Supported. Chamber suggested need for more joined up thinking in collection of household waste at source. E.g. collection of plastic bottles. - Use of blue bags for paper and boxes for cans/glass is impractical as they often disappear. Consider using small bins instead.
- Provision for new waste management sites and operations. Green - Policy Supported. Chamber suggested innovations in waste management could bring benefits to local economy
- Investment needs to go into recycling. Increase number of bins rather than bags and boxes, which are easily lost.
- Separating glass colours is important; many loads are wasted because they are mixed.
- Needs education of householders.
- Some people would accept an additional charge for removing recycled waste, providing normal rubbish was taken away with no charge. Some businesses were concerned that cardboard waste could not be recycled, despite their efforts to separate it out.

---

### Meeting: BME Community Workshops – Tassibee (Urdu / Gujurati speaking Women’s event)

**Venue:** Unity Centre  
**Date:** 28/03/07

**Officers in attendance:** Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**
- **Recycling**
  - Bin Collection every two weeks is very difficult if you have a large family.
  - Don’t have a lot of tins etc to recycle. The people buy fresh food – not tinned.
  - Poll tax increases but house hold income not as high (kids are students).
  - People need to know about why we recycle there is a need for greater education as to why this is important.
POLICY DIRECTION …….. FIVE

COUNCIL’S RESPONSE

Various points, at both the detailed and strategic level, have been raised in the proceeding meeting notes. Many are general concerns and suggestions about routine operational waste collection matters. These are not within the remit of the LDF and have been referred on to the waste management authority for consideration in relation to the Municipal Waste Strategy. The issues relating to the strategic policy directions of the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation document are included in the following assessment with recommendations for further action in preparing the final Core Strategy for submission for Examination in Public. The Core Strategy will again be subject to further community consultation at the submission stage.

Promoting sustainable waste management
The Council, as both waste management and planning authority, was seen to have a lead role in providing facilities and improving public understanding of the importance of sustainable waste management which seeks to reduce environmental impacts and greenhouse gas emissions which contribute to climate change. From the planning perspective waste should be seen as a resource rather than a liability and many respondents felt that there was scope for innovation in waste management technology which could assist the local economy. This is recognised in both the seventh bullet of PD5 and in PD3.3 in referring to new and innovative environmental technologies.

Many respondents were concerned with recycling which are covered in the promotion of the Waste Hierarchy (reduce/reuse/recycle) as a fundamental premise in the Policy Direction.

Waste sites
Waste management in line with the principles of the waste hierarchy is more sustainable than continuing reliance on landfill which some respondents were aware was subject to escalating fiscal penalties. Contrary to the belief of one group, there is not a shortage of landfill capacity in South Yorkshire. The Policy Direction seeks to reduce dependency on landfill, in favour of more sustainable waste management facilities in keeping with the waste hierarchy and located on suitable sites with appropriate environmental and amenity safeguards.

Some groups acknowledged the need for the LDF to identify suitable sites but there were mixed concerns about the location of incinerators as well as recognising the potential of energy from waste plants.

The approach to waste management in the submission Core Strategy is dependent on discussions with the other South Yorkshire Planning Authorities concerning preparation of a Joint Strategic Waste Management Development Plan Document for all waste streams, including municipal waste. Rotherham, Barnsley and Doncaster Councils are preparing preliminary assessments of strategic sites to inform the Joint DPD. This will assist in identifying broad locations in the Core Strategy which will also set out criteria to assess other proposals which may come forward in the future. The Allocations DPD will then identify specific shortlisted strategic sites together with locations for more local waste management facilities.

Waste and new developments
Many points were raised about provision for suitable waste storage and collection facilities within all types of new development. This issue is covered in the final bullet of Policy Direction 5 and will be made more specific in the submission Core Strategy and possibly expanded in the supporting Policies DPD and a future Supplementary Planning Documents covering layout and design of new developments.

The final bullet of Policy Direction 5 also covers another issue raised concerning the
management of construction waste. The policy when drafted is likely to require developers to submit, with appropriate planning applications, statements of both proposed sustainable construction measures and proposals for the sustainable management of on site construction waste.

**Transportation of Waste**
Concerns raised included the need for accessible waste management facilities to avoid a net increase in environmental disbenefits caused by excessive travel to waste sites. This is covered through the "proximity principle" in the fifth bullet of Policy Direction 5 in encouraging a range of facilities in proximity to the source of the waste. The seventh bullet also covers the sustainable transport of bulk waste movements by canal which was another issue raised in group discussions.

**Recommendations/proposed action**

1. In view of no major adverse group representations, proceed with the further development of PD5 to the submission stage.
2. Proceed with the Joint Strategic Waste Management DPD.
3. The Submission Core Strategy to identify broad locations for strategic sites together with a criteria based policy for other proposals that may come forward in the future.
4. The Allocations DPD to identify specific short-listed strategic sites together with criteria and/or locations for more local waste management facilities.
5. The Policies DPD to include policies setting out specific circumstances requiring developers to provide waste storage and collection facilities in new developments together with the submission of statements of both proposed sustainable construction measures and proposals for the sustainable management of on site construction waste with appropriate planning applications.
6. A future Supplementary Planning Document covering the layout and design of new development to include guidance for the provision of waste storage and collection.
7. The following issues which are not within the remit of the LDF be referred on to the appropriate Council service for consideration:

**WASTE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY**
Better co-ordination of recycling
Need for more joined up thinking about collection at source
Two weekly collections difficult with large families
Scope for RMBC to do more with plastic/bottles
Better coloured bottle sorting discipline needed
Storage/transportation of recycled batteries
Businesses concerned that separated cardboard was not being recycled
BME community uses fresh rather than tinned food – less to recycle
Use small bins rather than blue bags/boxes
Improved public education needed about reason/importance of recycling
Study effective ways of recycling by residents
Fines needed for not recycling
People would pay for collection of recycled materials but normal waste collection needs to remain free

**PLANNING AUTHORITY**
Concerns about Park Farm – composting site.
**POLICY DIRECTION SIX: TRANSPORTATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth North</th>
<th>Date: 08/02/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>Brampton Parish Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, Andy Duncan, Michael Hill, Jill Ratcliffe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Town centre railway station is inadequate. The people of Rotherham are badly served by the rail network. No direct rail link between Doncaster and Barnsley.
- Need to extend super tram.
- Increasing congestion problems at Rawmarsh/Parkgate, especially if Retail World expands
- Modern travel and work patterns simply do not fit with old land use patterns – people do not live close to work any more, therefore need to focus efforts on making travel/transport more sustainable rather than expect everyone to walk/cycle to work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth North</th>
<th>Date: 05/02/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>Swinton Civic Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, David Edwards, Michael Hill, Jill Ratcliffe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Parkgate is getting worse; there should be a second entrance to the retail park.
- Public transport needs improving.
- Need to be more proactive in promoting car sharing and park and ride schemes.
- How to implement QBCs on narrow roads?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth South</th>
<th>Date: 07/02/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>Thrybergh Church Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, David Edwards, Julie Colley, Margaret Ball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- The motor car is affecting the vitality of Rotherham Town Centre and RMBC should recognise that to compete with other areas, such as Meadowhall, car parking should be free.
- Public Transport is not reliable as an alternative to the car, particularly from outlying areas such as Ravenfield.
- Public Transport is too expensive and should be subsidised by the SYPTE.
- Successful businesses have free car parking. Town Centre parking charges discourage people from using Town Centre.
- Bus Services – not reliable – money needs putting in to make buses go to outlying area. Prices too high.
Meeting: Rother Valley West Area Assembly  
Venue: Catcliffe Memorial Hall  
Date: 05.02.07  
Officers in attendance: Noel Bell, Helen Sleigh, Julie Barnett, Elaine Hale

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Leaflet (produced by the Rother Vale Railway Group) from representative submitted regarding transport concerns. In particular the proposal to create two new rail stations to be built to serve the YES project and Waverley to alleviate traffic congestion that may occur as a result of these developments.
- Car parking should be seen as a key component as part of encouraging the public’s utilisation of public transport services (e.g. trains, buses) with particular support for park & ride.
- Waverley link road was felt to be going where people want it to go i.e. routed away from the residential properties at Orgreave.
- Air Quality Management Areas: concern reference piecemeal development - housing and commercial development should go hand in hand with public transport a key factor to promote the creation of a sustainable community where people live and work.

---

Meeting: Youth Cabinet  
Venue: International Centre  
Date: 14.2.07  
Officers in attendance: Noel Bell, Rachel Overfield, Clare cope

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

Sustainable transport solutions
- Traffic issues were noted as a disincentive to using Rotherham town centre.
- Road designs need to be changed so the pedestrian has priority.
- There needs to be more nice places to walk. With more greenery amongst buildings, routes with colour and features of interest would help encourage people to walk. Footpaths need to be cleared of litter more often and path surfacing satisfactory for people with wheelchairs and buggies. More lighting is needed on remote paths for safety.
- Maltby does not feel safe for pedestrians to cross the road.
- Poor public transport provision in rural areas needs to be looked at.
- Parking is a key part of design.
- Rotherham bus and train stations were thought of as being unsafe with poor facilities especially toilets and seating at the train station. It was noted that the bus routes go via town but there is a perception of poor safety at night in the town centre which is a disincentive for using the service.
- It is practically more difficult for parents with young children to use public transport than cars.
- There was support for improving accessibility to cycling eg increase the number of cycle lanes and quality of the existing lanes. More cycle storage is needed in the Town Centre.
- B and Q roundabout is a bottle neck and puts off cyclists due to the traffic.
Meeting: Rotherham South  
Venue: Town Hall  
Date: 25/1/07  
Officers in attendance: Ryan Shepherd, Rachel Overfield, David Edwards, Kay Bacon, Lucy Reader

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Reducing the need to travel
- Is the concept of trying to change travel modes out of date given that society has an essential reliance upon use of the car (e.g. separation of housing from employment areas)?
- Concern re commuting car parking particularly in residential areas near Rotherham Hospital.
- Concern about lack of car parking to support retail and shopping areas.

Improved public transport services
- Cost of public transport is excessive compared to using car. The measures advocated by the Policy Direction are all very well but the pricing and efficiency of public transport is more influential.
- Quality Bus Corridors – may provide wheelchair access on buses into town but not necessarily for return journeys.
- The promotion of shorter stay parking was not supported – the emphasis in the group was around more and cheaper parking of all types to attract and retain visitors

Better pedestrian and cycling facilities
- Too much focus given to providing links to employment areas whereas should also provide links from residential areas to community and local facilities etc – i.e. the promotion of accessibility within settlements.

Connecting sustainable locations by corridors
- Map does not explain how the transport corridors have been derived

Better local bus and rail services etc
- Concern that Core Strategy is not addressing need for more car parking, including commuters parking, to relieve pressure in residential areas around town centre and hospital.

Appeared to be general rejection of the concept of reducing private travel therefore part a is amber moving towards red. Part c received limited discussion although the promotion of accessibility within settlements was raised.

---

Meeting: Access Liaison / Rotherham-4-All  
Venue: Meeting Room Arts Centre  
Date: 08/03/07  
Officers in attendance: Helen Sleigh / Eric Stowe / Neil Finney

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Eric Stowe introduced this section and described the contents of the Policy Direction on Transportation.

There was support from the meeting for the development of the canal infrastructure to try to encourage more use of the canals for transporting goods.
Helen Sleigh advised there was new housing and new employment areas proposed, and asked the meeting “can we support this with the current transport routes we have in existence?”

There was a suggestion and support for more radial links, i.e. taking the traffic out of the town centre

A suggestion that there should be more priority bus lanes and more bus stops.

Also a suggestion that we need more in the policy about pressing for better bus services for people who want to access other services and facilities not just travel to work. The policy includes the idea of access for employment, but we need more about bus services to assist access from housing to health centres, other amenities and town centres.

There was further discussion of the need for Community Transport to be more involved in travelling to outlying rural areas. There were difficulties in managing the amount of demand for services from Community Transport.

It was suggested that we should look at improving Community Transport in areas where there are gaps in the provision of public transport. As an example, people quoted the lack of provision on Herringthorpe Valley Road which is a main road running through several housing estates, but does not have regular bus services from one end of Herringthorpe Valley Road to the other.

In confirmation of this, Helen Sleigh referred to the Arup Sustainability Appraisal this comments that “It (the policy direction) does not address movement within developments”.

When discussing the other parts of this policy, there were comments from the meeting about the need for traffic lights at St. Ann’s roundabout and Mushroom roundabout, due to the volume of traffic.

---

**Meeting: Speak Up**

**Venue:** At Speak Up premises, Parkgate  
**Date:** 17/04/07

**Officers in attendance:** Helen Sleigh / Eric Stowe / Neil Finney / Charlotte Bailey

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

*Next Question - How do you get around, by bus / car / train / walk / bike?*
*How easy is it to get around or do you have problems getting around?*

There were concerns from people about the poor maintenance of some of the roads

Some find bus drivers miserable, and don't always stop when they see disabled people!

Problems with buses setting off before elderly or disabled people have sat down.

Some have difficulties crossing busy roads due to lack of pelican crossings.

**Problem with Greasbrough Rd in Parkgate.** The residential home, Holly House, is about 300 yards along the road from Parkgate Crossroads, but for about the last 100 yards there is no footpath on either side. There are about a dozen people who live there with varying levels of difficulties and mobility. The lack of footpaths on a narrow road makes this a very dangerous stretch of road for the people who live there.
Some people experience problems with the textured paving that is put at the side of crossing places. This is supposed to help poorly sighted people, but it causes problems for those with wheelchairs and balance difficulties.

Would like more disabled parking spaces in Town, as these are often taken up by people who are not disabled.

**Taxis:** Some problems with taxis. On one occasion a driver tried to force them out of the car, but this was reported and dealt with. Other problems with taxis unwilling to pick up and not waiting for people. Problems mainly with A1 and Goldstar. Others were pretty good, e.g. Eurocabs and Crystal.

**Community Transport:** Problems with giving a specific time for picking people up. Often giving a time for pick up which could be “between 8 o’clock and 9 o’clock” which makes it very difficult for people to make arrangements to meet others etc. The prices rose dramatically when some of funding was withdrawn, making this difficult to afford for some people.

**Trains:** People expressed general satisfaction with train travel. One problem experienced was with booking wheelchair assistance. The assistance was generally provided when boarding a train, but when the train arrives at its destination, there was often no-one there to assist with getting off the train and exiting the station.

**Bus Station:** Buses keep changing platforms which makes it really difficult for people with learning difficulties - some people can’t read, others have great difficulty in finding the information. For example, when a bus has moved, it can take a long time to find someone who knows where its new stop is. Changing things too frequently can cause big problems for people.

---

**Meeting:** Chamber of Commerce  
**Venue:** Genesis Business Park  
**Date:** 24/01/07

**Officers in attendance:** Mike Smith (Chamber of Commerce) Phil Turnidge / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Reducing the need to travel and more sustainable transport solutions by locating new development in accessible urban areas and sustainable settlements with mixed use development. Green - Policy Supported.
- Improved public transport services, interchanges and parking management. Amber - Chamber agreed in principle but wished to register that they felt current parking management was draconian and forcing people out of town centres. They wanted to see parking management improved, but not if this meant stricter enforcement of restrictions.
- Connecting sustainable locations by corridors containing better integration and management of transport choice with improved links to strategic locations. Amber. Policy supported with reservation that this does not simply mean an increase in only bus corridors.
### Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

#### Transport / Parking
Short stay strategy for the town centre is essential
Need attractive alternatives to the private car.
Meadowhall / Parkgate alternative shopping area for people to go to.
Older generation do not feel safe on public transport especially at school times. Hotspot areas in subways – safety issues are a concern to local people.
Need to tie in attractions of the Town Centre with local communities and sufficient parking and quality public transport.

#### Rail service
Catch train from other locations e.g. Sheffield - carriages are too small on certain services.
Poor looking service.
Not welcome place / lighting poor, especially for women.
Parking is at side of station – not enough
Need for directions once leaving station
More people leaving Rotherham via train than coming in.
Not much point in providing parking – focus on improving station.

---

### Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- Not enough buses to Town Centre and low frequency.
- Need transport for children.

---

### Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- One way system in Rotherham is not good. It limits the circulation around the town. The problem is around the library and the bus station area.
- There are also problems around the Yates area – is this being tackled in the new town centre designs?
- St Ann’s area is a problem for crime due to the layout of the buildings and streets (this was
brought up in the 2006 consultation with REMA also)

Public Transport

- Problems with racist drivers on the buses.
- Bus Service is ok and safety is ok
- A disincentive to public transport is the long wait between services e.g. half an hour. Even though there is a bus stop outside the house because of the infrequent service they would not be inclined to use the bus.
- Cars are needed for work involving travel all round the borough
- Wellgate area is narrow and overcrowded.
- The journey to work from Swinton to Maltby on public transport would add an hour on to the journey and work starts at 7pm
- The cost of buses has an impact on usage—bring back 10p bus fares
- Bus should start at retail world and go on to the Town Centre
- The Train is quicker then the bus. When people are going on the train shopping they get off at Meadowhall - you can’t get off at Rotherham’s Parkgate shops which have the big chains.
- The extension of Tram network into Rotherham is supported.

Roads

- Silly bollards in the street
- Town centre parking is an issue
- Short stay parking should not be encouraged at the expense of losing all long stay parking. How will people get to work? (People may work unsocial hours and variable length of time during the days).
- Wellgate area is narrow and overcrowded.
- Rotherham has 2 town centres (Parkgate and the old town) with a gap in the middle
- Fitzwilliam road has a fear factor for crime. Look at the area and how the new car parks would integrate into it and address security issues.
- Speed bumps are unpopular
- Block paving on street kerb corners is a waste of money and unpopular.
- There are problems of traffic around Parkgate. Can a loop system be put in for traffic?
- Also strengthen rail and green link provided.

| Meeting: | BME Community Workshops – Tassibee (Urdu / Gujurati speaking Women’s event) |
| Venue: | Unity Centre |
| Date: | 28/03/07 |

| Officers in attendance: from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA) | Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers |

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

**Transport / Parking Issues**

- Car parking is a problem. People park in front of homes, 2-3 cars per house hold as many people are taxi drivers.
- St Leonard’s Lane is very narrow and parking is a particular issue.
- Ridge Road is also very narrow and the nursery adds to the problem of parking in this area.
- Functions at Clifton Park mean that people park on residential streets causing problems for the residents.
- Residents only parking is to be considered in these areas but what does this mean for those households with two / three cars?
• Public transport within the communities is an issue for school and hospital visits.

**Access to Services and Facilities**

• Car parking in Town Centre is very expensive and when shopping at the market and looking after children at the same time this is an issue if also trying to travel by public transport.
• Concern that this will drive people to Parkgate where there is free car parking - we are pushing people out of the Town Centre.
• Access via public transport to Doctor’s surgeries / hospital is costly.
• £1 for 2 x stops on the bus. £1.60 each for single fare to Town centre from Stag.

---

**Meeting: Thorpe Hesley Residents, Community Forum, STAG.**

**Venue:** Thorpe Hesley Junior School  
**Date:** 12/03/07

**Officers in attendance:** Phil Turnidge/Pat Michael/Paul Rollinson (also Councillors Walker and Kaye)

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

Forward Planning was invited to inform Thorpe Hesley residents about LDF and current consultation on Preferred Option.

LDF Manager gave a powerpoint presentation to approx 15 representatives of the Scholes and Thorpe Action Group and the Scholes and Thorpe Community Forum. Cllrs Walker and Kaye and Community Development staff (Pat Michael and Paul Rollinson) were also present.

Main concern relating to PD6 was:

• Prospect of park and ride site off M1 Junction 35 – better potential on brownfield land in Sheffield
POLICY DIRECTION …….. SIX

COUNCIL’S RESPONSE

Numerous points, at both the detailed and strategic level, have been raised in the proceeding meeting notes. Many are general and specific concerns and suggestions about routine operational service matters. These are not within the remit of the LDF and have been referred on to the SYPTE and relevant Council services for consideration. The issues relating to the strategic policy directions of the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation document are included in the following assessment with recommendations for further action in preparing the final Core Strategy for submission for Examination in Public. The Core Strategy will again be subject to further community consultation at this submission stage.

Public Transport
There was much concern amongst all groups about the need to improve public transport for all users in terms of quality, pricing, frequency, reliability and safety. This is implicit in the Policy Direction in encouraging more sustainable transport choices and better integration between all forms of transport to utilise available network capacity within the principal corridors connecting the Boroughs communities and destinations beyond.

Bus-based solutions (Quality Bus Corridors, Bus Rapid Transit) are likely to continue for the foreseeable future following funding difficulties over Supertram extensions. However, the Core Strategy is unlikely to rule out tram extensions and other new rapid transit technologies in the longer term.

The increasing popularity of rail travel is acknowledged requiring improved rail services, parking and interchange facilities at Rotherham Central as well as examining scope for new rail stations at YES, Waverley and Retail World.

The Core Strategy will promote better public transport, improvements to rural transport and bespoke community transport services in so far as they are relevant in setting a broad spatial planning framework and subject to the likely availability of resources and the current limitations of a commercially based transport regime.

The supporting Allocations DPD will identify the land requirements for specific public transport proposals in conjunction with bodies such as SYPTE and the Strategic Rail Authority taking account of the Local Transport Plan and realistic prospects for funding and deliverability in the longer term.

Road Schemes /Congestion
With the exception of an unspecific suggestion for more radial routes to relieve the Town Centre, most group responses appear to acknowledge that major road building programmes were unlikely. It would not be sustainable to attempt to escalate road building to combat congestion. There was support for the Waverley Link Road and suggestions for improvements to the Mushroom Roundabout, other roundabouts on Centenary Way and a second access to Retail World. These types of road scheme, to assist regeneration and to optimise existing road capacity, are envisaged under PD6.2 and subject to technical assessments and funding arrangements will be included, as appropriate in the Core Strategy or supporting Allocations DPD.
Sustainable transport solutions
Groups saw that travel to work patterns had changed and it was no longer realistic to expect people to walk or cycle to work. People had become reliant on the car for business and longer trips to work and there were concerns about restricting private travel. It was also felt that there was too much emphasis on employment trips and that it was also important not to forget access to local community service facilities.

There was some acknowledgement that the need to travel could be lessened by encouraging development and mixed use schemes in sustainable locations as promoted in the Policy Direction. These locations have good services and transport choices and where people wanted to both live and work.

Groups generally felt that there should be attractive alternatives to the car and that there was a need to be more proactive with car sharing and park and ride. These points are implicit in the Policy Direction.

There was general support for the Policy Direction in looking to connect sustainable locations by corridors with better integration of genuine transport choice not just more bus corridors. These corridors are illustrated on the Core Strategy Key Diagram and are generally based on the current bus, rail, road, canal and cycleway networks where there will be scope for future improvements and more integrated transportation policy framework in line with PD6.1

It was felt that housing and commercial development could be better co-ordinated with public transport provision and the Policy Direction has this in mind when requiring developers to submit Travel Plans setting out how new developments can be served by more sustainable transport options which seek to reduce environmental impacts and greenhouse gas emissions which help to combat climate change.

Parking
There was general concern amongst the groups about adequate residential parking, commuter parking in residential areas and the pricing and availability of parking in town centres faced with competing retail attractions with free parking. Many respondents opposed short stay parking, supported cheaper parking to attract and retain visitors and wanted long stay parking for workers with unsocial and variable hours. The business community even felt that parking management was draconian and forcing people out of Rotherham Town Centre. There were concerns that residential parking was inadequate as many households had multiple car ownership.

Despite the number of concerns about parking there was some acknowledgement that parking management linked to park and ride can influence the use of public transport. This is in line with the Policy Direction which is seeking to use parking policies alongside other measures designed to help reduce reliance on the car and to encourage sustainable transport choices which seek to reduce environmental impacts and greenhouse gas emissions which help to combat climate change. However, in developing the policy direction there needs to be recognition that managing car parking capacity should be related to the availability of good and reasonably priced public transport which in turn is ultimately dependent on enhanced public funding. Car parking management aiming to promote sustainable transport choices also needs to be balanced with the pricing and adequate provision of parking to support the viability of town centres.

Pedestrian/cycling facilities
Group discussion included calls for better footpaths to encourage walking with attention to greening, lighting/safety and surfacing for disabled users. It was felt there should be more
pedestrian priority in road design as well as more cycle lanes and storage facilities. These points are taken up in general in PD 1.1.

**Freight**
There was support for the Policy Direction looking to the optimum use of canals for freight and bulk raw materials.

**Recommendations/proposed action**

1. Proceed with the further development of PD6 to the submission stage taking account the need for the management of parking to encourage more sustainable travel choices to be balanced against residential amenity and town centre viability considerations
2. The supporting Allocations DPD to identify the land requirements for specific public transport proposals including park and ride sites, highway improvement schemes, QBCs/BRT/Tram extension corridors, new rail stations, etc
3. The supporting Policies DPD and/or future Supplementary Planning Document to set out requirements for developers to submit Transport and Air Quality Assessments and Sustainable Travel Plans
4. The following issues which are not within the remit of the LDF be referred on to the SYPTE, Highway Authority and other appropriate Council services for consideration:

**SYPTE**

**Public transport**

**Rail**
Rotherham Central - safety, lighting, seating, signing and toilets issues
Difficulty booking wheelchair assistance - alright on boarding but not at destination
Not enough parking at Rotherham Central
Carriages too small on some services from Sheffield

**Bus**
Safety issues in Rotherham Interchange - particularly at night
Changing bus departure platforms can cause difficulties - particularly for those who can't read
QBCs have wheelchair access inbound but not always outbound ???
Community transport over-subscribed - need more services in rural areas and where there are gaps in conventional pt - egg Herringthorpe Valley Road
Community transport - no specific pick up time and fares increases when funding withdrawn
Bus drivers miserable and inconsiderate to disabled people when boarding/alighting - problems with racist drivers
Bring back cheap fares to encourage use - bus fares to doctors and hospital too expensive - £1 for two stops, £1-60 single from Stag to RTC
Buses should start at Retail World a go onto RTC??
Swinton to Maltby journey to work takes too long particularly at 7 pm
BME communities concern about school and hospital trips

**ROTHERHAM HIGHWAY AUTHORITY/STREETPRIDE**

**Congestion**
Congestion at Retail World - especially if it expands - need for second entrance
B&Q roundabout is a bottleneck
Need for traffic lights at Mushroom and St Ann’s roundabouts
RTC ( one way) TMS generally OK except in vicinity of bus station, Yates and library
Wellgate is too narrow and overcrowded
Parking policy
Commuter parking problems in residential areas and at Rotherham Hospital
Current parking management draconian and forcing people out of RTC
Residents Only Parking Schemes - multiple car household problems
RTC parking too expensive - particularly for those with children visiting the market who cannot use public transport

Roads
More radial routes to relieve the town centre??
Poor road maintenance
Silly bollards
St Leonards Lane is narrow and has a parking problem
Ridge Road is narrow and the nursery adds to parking problems
Parking on surrounding residential roads during Clifton Park functions

Pedestrian facilities
Maltby pedestrian safety issues
Lack of footways in vicinity of Holly House Residential Home near Parkgate crossroads
Textured surfacing for partially sighted can cause stability problems for wheelchair users and those with balance difficulties
Old persons concerned about subway safety
Green link to Parkgate Retail World
Lack of Pelican crossings

Cycling
More/better cycle lanes/storage required
B&Q roundabout discourages cycle use

Street Layout/Design
Street pattern in St Ann’s encourages crime
Fitzwilliam Road - fear of crime - implications of new car parks
Block paving on street corners a waste of money

ROTHERHAM LICENSING
Taxis
Taxis unwilling to pick up disabled people - particularly A1 and Goldstar
Core Strategy Preferred Options July 2007 –
Summary of comments from facilitated workshops / internal / external consultation

- POLICY DIRECTION SEVEN: LOCAL HERITAGE

Meeting: Rother Valley West Area Assembly
Venue: Catcliffe Memorial Hall
Date: 05.02.07
Officers in attendance: Noel Bell, Helen Sleigh, Julie Barnett, Elaine Hale

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**
- The proposed Ulley Conservation Area (CA) was identified as a priority in the UDP. Ulley residents were concerned about the possibility of losing green spaces and also the potential for losing the heart of the village was a key catalyst for this stance. However as yet the Conservation area has not been delivered - why identify the designation of an Ulley CA in the UDP and then not deliver? The LPA loses credibility as a result
- St Helens church is the oldest church in South Yorkshire yet it is not getting the funding to maintain it. If RMBC weight could be thrown behind it, it would help
- Landscape character assessments - are communities going to be consulted before the mapping takes place? It is important that consultation is undertaken to gauge local community views

Meeting: Rother Valley South Area Assembly
Venue: Dinnington Resource Centre
Date: 22.02.07
Officers in attendance: Noel Bell, David Edwards, Andrea Mason

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**
- General support given to intent
- The Policy Direction should specify the need to protect rights of way / footpaths / bridleways. Proposals should be developed in conjunction with local Access forums
- What controls could be applied to protecting privately owned woodland?

Meeting: Biodiversity Partnership
Venue: Arts Centre, Rotherham Central Library
Date: 12.02.07
Officers in attendance: Carolyn Barber (RMBC/RBF), Rachel Overfield (RMBC), Helen Sleigh (RMBC), Neil Finney (RMBC).

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments) on Policy Direction on Local Heritage (PD7)**

First bullet point of PD7
Query on why the Policy Direction wasn’t covering SSSI’s and countryside parks. The meeting was advised that the policy does not go into this level of detail as it is an over arching strategic policy on Local Heritage. More detailed policies will be prepared in due course for inclusion in the LDF portfolio.

Support for the inclusion of geology in the policy although we need a geodiversity action plan. It was noted that Rotherham’s biodiversity action plan needs to be firmed up.

The Policy Direction could be a bit more about positive action to improve things, rather than just reacting and mitigating problems which arise. Suggested re-wording of the first bullet point in the policy to “appropriately manage and improve sites” so it gives more force to managing the environment. Funding for the implementation of these plans is needed.
In a group discussion about the wording of the first bullet point of PD7 several people felt it was too much of a generalisation - how do we manage and maintain sites? There is a need to maximise resources eg from the RDA. Suggested including the word preserve.

It was proposed that the Council should lead by example in the management of their own sites.

Some support was expressed for the inclusion of buildings. There was a suggestion of including the word "restore" in the text, but some felt this would be too onerous on private owners, who would not be allowed the leeway to restore "where appropriate" and that sites could then become a liability which would not be welcomed.

The consensus of the meeting was that the words in the first line of the first bullet point should be changed from "Protect and, where appropriate, enhance and manage" to the revised wording "Protect and manage and, where appropriate, enhance...

Biodiversity/geodiversity headed paragraph in Section 7

Some people felt that this paragraph and the subsequent titles in italics should be made into bullet points in order to emphasise the separation.

Various queries about brownfield and greenfield status were raised (regarding the present greenfield moratorium, the definition of brownfield and greenfield and the allocation of too many brownfield employment sites in the town centre into housing sites). The allocations DPD should assess the needs of new housing and industrial uses and ensure sufficient land is allocated to meet all needs.

The Council should be willing to pay more for professional work on the surveying and management of Regionally Important Geological Sites. Much of this work has been done in the past by volunteers, e.g. RIGS Group. There is a need to improve the evidence base on geology as a whole.

Historic built environment paragraph in Section 7

It was thought that the key to this is the way the council manages its own sites and buildings, and if the council doesn’t look after its own buildings, then no-one else will be willing to do the same. The management and assessment of work done on the historic built environment should be done much more professionally.

Paragraph headed Landscape Character in Section 7

There was wide agreement that there should be a Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) Suggested quality control of the LCA was thought essential and it needed local input to ensure it is appropriate to Rotherham. External as well as internal parties should be involved in the production of the LCA

Greenspace networks headed paragraph in Section 7

There should be a strong statement included on the requirements for greenspace corridors. There is a problem that the current wording has no "action words" included in it.

Greenspace networks needs to be properly defined within the policy document. There is overlap between recreation grounds and bio diverse greenspaces and these needs to be highlighted. Wording needs more clarity that the Networks are about multiple sites and the added value of having sites near to each other.

Countryside resources headed paragraph in Section 7
The wording is back to front and needs to be re-arranged. It is not in proper sentences and needs more clarity.

**Provisional Monitoring Indicators paragraph in Section 7.**
Incorporate "local" wildlife sites and the measure of quality of local wildlife sites as a monitoring indicator. Other indicators should be the amount of ancient woodlands, wetlands, heathlands, grasslands, hedgerows, etc. in the borough.

There needs to be a measurement of the amount of new habitat created. Opportunities mapping should identify opportunities for the location of new habitats of conservation importance.

Surveys should be an integral part of monitoring with agreed measures of quality.

There was a suggestion for the monitoring of the percentage of Greenspace Sections management plans which are updated within 5 years, as this is the timescale in which they should be revised.

South Yorkshire Forest Partnership has a great deal of information about sites which could be used by the council. Also, there are many other organisations with specific monitoring information which the council could use.

---

**Meeting: Youth Cabinet**

**Venue:** International Centre  |  **Date:** 14.2.07

**Officers in attendance:**  Noel Bell, Rachel Overfield, Clare Cope

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

**General**
- Protect heritage and integrate heritage sympathetically within development

**Historic Built environment**
- The pit head baths should be retained and turned into a museum to celebrate the working past of the area.
- Old historic buildings need to be preserved and their maintenance needs to be sensitive
- Town centre development need to be sensitive to the heritage of the area (repeated from PD3). Heritage is a real asset to the town. Use heritage as an asset in development and in improving an area.

**Biodiversity/greenspace/countryside resources**
- People need to be educated and made aware of their responsibilities to the environment and the type of wildlife and plants that can be found nearby. Promote education in dealing with environmental issues.
- As new buildings are created habitats also need to be created.
- Communal areas need to be well maintained and landscaped so not as to become a wasteland. Everyone needs to access greenspace areas equally.
- More greenspace areas with wildlife to visit were wanted.
- More green roofs were wanted
- A balance of green and urban development - integrate buildings and landscape/greenery.
### Meeting: Wentworth Valley
**Venue:** Full Life Church, Maltby  
**Date:** 12/2/07

**Officers in attendance:** Ryan Shepherd, Noel Bell, Mick Stowe, Sue Weatherley

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- In Maltby, Friends of Maltby Parks, Heritage Group and Environment Group need to be kept informed
- Heritage elements of the Community Plan need to be looked at
- Successful fundraising by Ulley Country Park illustrates the importance of natural spaces to members of the public. Wickersley has received awards for woodland and Doorstep Green projects
- Highfield Park & Colliery needs some TLC
- Timeframe - people felt that the out-of-date policies in the UDP were being used as an excuse to ignore them completely
- What will we do to ensure the area doesn't become one large sprawl – use of landscape character assessment, design
- Identity is not as it is designed but how it evolves
- Risk of masterplans rather than people shaping how a place evolves
- Not in the business of imposing things on people – need to carefully balance investors aspirations – specifically, worries over how Woodlaithes has developed
- Raised the importance of joint working with Sheffield, Doncaster & Barnsley. For example, waste processing Important to try and utilise the under-capacity in the Sheffield incinerator
- Generally happy with the policy direction - ultimately people said they were more interested in the weighting and prioritisation of all the different issues

### Meeting: Environment and Sustainability Workshop
**Venue:** Bailey House, room 3  
**Date:** 05/03/07

**Officers in attendance:** David Edwards, Alan Bamforth, Rachel Overfield, Neil Finney

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

**Biodiversity/ geodiversity and historic built environment**

- Support reference made to naturally regenerated brownfield sites
- Include reference to sustainable drainage systems as a means of enhancing biodiversity
- Refer to the use of greenfield sites which are of “historical” interest due to their change of use and the change of management systems over long periods
- Clarify that PD is not just targeting the protection of designated sites
- PD should also refer to the protection of potential sites

**Landscape Character**

- Include reference to the use of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)
- Support given to intended preparation of a Landscape Character Assessment.

**Greenspace networks**
- Should refer to “Greenspace Infrastructure” to describe greenspace more effectively.
- PD should refer to the promotion of river corridors as buffer zones
- The definition of greenspace should be expanded to incorporate river greenspace.

**Countryside resources**

- Whilst the aspirations of this paragraph were welcomed it was generally considered to be vague and requires expansion and better definition of purpose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Chamber of Commerce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>Genesis Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Mike Smith (Chamber of Commerce) Phil Turnidge / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promotion of biodiversity and geodiversity in the designation of new local wildlife sites and habitats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conservation Area assessments and management plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Landscape character assessment and new area designations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continued safeguarding of greenspace networks and setting new local standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sustainable management of countryside resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Green - Policy Supported.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>BME Community Workshops –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>Reach Building Ferham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environment**

Lack of local open space / amenities / facilities in area
Link to community spirit
Need to be proactive / place to go that caters for local need
Play areas - are appreciated by the community
Council shift away from taking responsibility for the ongoing maintenance of new green areas – responsibility is with developers etc but open access to the facility may be a problem. This issue can be included in Community Strategy – the provision of green space and other facilities open to the public.
### Meeting: BME Community Workshops Arabic Speaking Women’s event

**Venue:** Unity Centre  
**Date:** 28/03/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

#### Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

**Open Spaces**
- Poor siting and lighting of children’s playing facilities, toilets in Clifton Park. Need better maintenance.
- Would like to see a dog free area in Clifton Park.

---

**Meeting: BME Community Workshops – Tassibee (Urdu / Gujurati speaking Women’s event)**

**Venue:** Unity Centre  
**Date:** 28/03/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

#### Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- Lack of green open space near to where people live, although recognition of the value of Clifton Park.
- Dogs running free in Clifton Park causes concern to the community, particularly for families with disabled children. A child has been attacked by a dog in Clifton Park.
- Community facilities are required especially for children e.g. local play areas / space for children.
- There is a need for somewhere for young people to play, as well as youth facilities in youth centres.
COUNCIL’S RESPONSE

Various points, at both the strategic and detailed level, were made at the workshops and these are summarised above. Where necessary general concerns not within the remit of the LDF have been forwarded onto the appropriate department. The most significant issues relating to the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation document are included within the following assessment with recommendations for further action in preparing the final Core Strategy for Submission for Examination in Public. The Core Strategy will again be subject to further community consultation at the submission stage.

This policy direction was welcomed however it was felt that it could be more pro-active in its approach. The main topics of conversation were around biodiversity and geodiversity, conservation areas and historic buildings and protection of footpaths/ rights of way.

Heritage Management
Greater emphasis to be given to the management aspects of heritage.

Biodiversity/ Geodiversity
The inclusion of geology in the policy direction was supported. It was recommended that a Geodiversity Action Plan should be produced and the evidence base for geology in the borough should be improved. It was felt that the Council should pay for professional surveying and maintenance of Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS).

It was also suggested that Rotherham’s Biodiversity Action Plan needs to be firmed up. Environmental education should also be promoted.

The policy direction should reflect a more positive approach to the creation of quality wildlife habitats alongside new developments through for example green roofs. Consideration should also be given to the protection of potential wildlife sites and the use of sustainable drainage systems as a means of enhancing biodiversity.

The problems of ongoing maintenance of green areas was raised, it was suggested that the Council should lead by example.

Support for recognition by the policy direction that naturally regenerated brownfield sites can contain areas of wildlife that may also be of geological importance; each brownfield application site should be considered on an individual basis.

Historic Built Environment
Support was given to the inclusion of the historic and built environment and areas in this policy direction. There was support for conservation area assessments and associated management plans but why did the Unitary Development Plan propose new Conservation Areas but not deliver? Concern was raised regarding the assessment and management of the historic built environment given the delays experienced to date in delivering Conservation Area Reviews. Work is currently underway to consider the existing boundaries of the designated conservation areas. A further 12 localities (identified in the Unitary Development Plan 1999) have also been surveyed for potential designation as conservation areas. It is intended that consultation on potential changes to existing conservation area boundaries and to the designation of new conservation areas will be undertaken in the near future.
Heritage should be used as an asset in redeveloping an area and should be protected and integrated sympathetically within developments. The town centre redevelopment needs to be sensitive to the heritage of the area. Regarding maintenance issues the Council should lead by example in managing and maintaining its own buildings.

**Landscape Character**

Support provided for a Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). Work is currently underway in preparing a tender brief to procure consultants to undertake the LCA for the Borough. The LCA will be undertaken to recognised guidelines. Consideration will be given to consultation on the LCA to gauge local community views and obtain local input for such a study.

**Greenspace Networks**

There was support for the safeguarding of greenspace networks and the need to properly define the networks. Future Policies DPD will consider greenspace networks and the requirements of greenspace corridors in greater detail, greenspace infrastructure, and the added value of multiple sites. It is noted that the RMBC Greenspace Audit considers individual sites but does not identify greenspace networks.

**Countryside Resources**

This section was considered to be vague and unclear and as such, requires greater clarity and definition of purpose.

General issues raised in the consultation include: equality of access; green space needs of young people and children; balancing landscaping and urban development and the protection of Rights of Way, footpaths and bridleways.

**Monitoring**

Suggestions for monitoring indicators included: the quality of local wildlife sites, the amount of ancient woodlands in the borough, the amount of habitats such as wetlands, grassland, hedgerows, the amount and location of new habitat created. A broad brush monitoring indicator could be the percentage of RMBC greenspace management plans that are updated in 5 years. It was noted that South Yorkshire Forest has a great deal of information that could be used by the Council.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**

This policy direction was generally welcomed, but in attempting to cover a diverse range of topics some weaknesses were identified that will need to be strengthened or expressed more clearly. Many useful comments were received that will aid the strengthening of this policy in the submission Core Strategy.

1. In view of no major adverse group representations proceed with further development of PD7 to the submission stage.

2. Future policies should be informed by improved knowledge base of the geological resource of the borough. Consideration be given to a Review of locally designated Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGS) and the preparation of a Geodiversity Action Plan and the establishment of the necessary partnerships to assist in this work.

3. Carry out a Landscape Character Assessment to recognised guidelines and with local input to reflect community views

4. Ensure new policies have stronger links with the Local Biodiversity Action Plan and consider need for supporting Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)
5. Consider the policy wording to promote: stronger measures, good practice, and more positive action for wildlife within proposed developments. Sustainable urban drainage systems should be considered to enhance biodiversity.

6. Consideration given to new greenspace standards and how best to foster through developer contributions, the long term management and maintenance of greenspace areas.

7. Future policies should ensure that the heritage value of brownfield sites is given appropriate weight and are fully evaluated within the planning process.

8. Ensure the delivery of conservation area assessments and reviews in order to inform conservation area management plans and townscape enhancement initiatives as future SPDs.

9. Consideration be given to: clarifying the definition of “Greenspace Networks”; commitment to the principles of creating Greenspace networks in future policies.

10. Clarify and define the purpose of the Countryside Resources section: specify the need to protect rights of way/footpaths/bridleways.

The following issues not within the remit of the LDF are to be referred to the appropriate Council Service for their consideration:

**Culture And Leisure Services**

- The Council should lead by example in managing its own sites of wildlife value.
- Need for a dog free area in Clifton Park and the need to avoid poor siting and lighting of children’s playing facilities, and the toilets in Clifton Park.
• POLICY DIRECTION EIGHT: EFFICIENT USE OF RESOURCES

Meeting: Youth Cabinet  
Venue: International centre  
Date: 14.2.07

Officers in attendance: Noel Bell, Rachel Overfield, Clare Cope

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- More green roofs (NB repeated in PD7)
- Incorporate renewable energy sources into new developments around Rotherham
- Subsidies for renewable energy should be given.
- More information is need on the accessing renewable energy sources.
- Promote the benefits of renewable energy and educate people about this.
- There are not enough recycling points

Meeting: Environment and Sustainability workshop  
Venue: Bailey House Room 3  
Date: 05/03/07

Officers in attendance: David Edwards, Alan Bamforth, Rachel Overfield, Neil Finney

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- Attendees expressed general agreement with the principle of the PD.

Bullet Point One – ground instability; contamination; re-use of previously developed land

- Concern was expressed about developing only brownfield sites when this could include some sites which are hazardous to develop due to toxicity levels, etc.
- Concern also noted that some brownfield sites may have environmental value, as those which have lain dormant for many years may have regenerated naturally into potential greenfield sites. It was felt that a policy which specifies development of brownfield first, without consideration of the characteristics of each individual site, would be too restrictive.

Bullet Point Two – density of development

- Include reference to sustainable design and the use of sustainable materials in developments.
- Include clearer definition of ‘net density’ to clarify whether it allows for open spaces within developments.
- Include greater reference to the design of houses including anticipating the future need for more housing for an ageing population.

Bullet Point Three – biomass and organic food production; agricultural land quality

Some attendees thought there are potential problems with the definition of “quality agricultural land” as this can mean different things to different people and the quality of agricultural land could be changed at the whim of a farmer.

Q: Isn’t it the case that the quality of land was not as important as the location and therefore, should the aspect of quality be put so high on the list? It was noted that lower quality
agricultural land can include important historical features.

**A:** Reference will be made to maps supplied by DEFRA (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs) based upon survey information they hold for agricultural land quality. The Policy will be drafted with reference to Government planning policy which states that ‘The presence of best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification), should be taken into account alongside other sustainability considerations (e.g. biodiversity; the quality and character of the landscape; its amenity value or heritage interest; accessibility to infrastructure, workforce and markets; maintaining viable communities; and the protection of natural resources, including soil quality) when determining planning applications’. Planning Policy Statement 7

**Q:** Should the policy be amended to say that brownfield sites should be developed first, before any other types?

**A:** The earlier Policy Directions do refer to the order of preference and brownfield does come before agricultural land and others.

**Q:** What are allotments classed as?

**A:** Normally classed as greenspace so have a relatively high level of protection.

**Q:** Could “brownfield” also includes some areas which have been left undeveloped for long periods and could potentially be classed as “greenfield “now.

**A:** This is referred to in another Policy Direction, PD7 Local Heritage, which includes protection of “naturally regenerated brownfield sites”

**Bullet Point Four – minerals; secondary aggregates, sustainable construction**

It was explained that targets are set regionally to regulate the development of quarries and mineral extraction. Rotherham does not have large areas of mineral sites in the borough, but those we have are generally subject to planning regulations.

Suggestion from the meeting that Policy should mention “mineral extraction” and “mineral use” in sustainable building as separate items. Suggested also that it should include wording on what will be done with the land after mineral extraction. Others agreed that the wording should keep these two items separate.

Policy Direction does not refer to the post mineral extraction phase of sites.

Reference could be made to geology conservation.

Policy Direction should strengthen the requirements to seek sustainable construction.

**Bullet Point Five – utility infrastructure**

Safeguard Utility infrastructure - most attendees generally agreed with the policy.

**Q:** Does this have any impact on the laying of over ground cables and pylons?

**A:** Utility services are usually covered by other regulatory bodies and are not subject to planning regulation.

**Q:** Are there any possibilities of including concerns about the effect on health in the guidelines?

**A:** It would not be easy to include the health aspects in this Policy Direction due to Government guidance which indicates this is not a planning matter.
It was suggested that whilst the Policy Direction addresses "protecting" the environment it should also refer to “enhancing”.

**Bullet Point Six – integrated management of water catchments**

It was suggested that it is essential we have management of flood plains and water use.

The policy wording should be strengthened beyond just “encouraging” and should refer to the “essential management” of water catchments.

Should refer to “avoiding development on flood risk areas” rather than “avoiding areas of flood risk”.

The wording “ensuring sustainable drainage systems” should be used rather than “encouraging”.

Meeting gave general support to a presumption in favour of seeking Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) from new development.

**Bullet Point Eight - energy efficiency**

The meeting felt it was essential that the policy is specific about climate change and its effects being taken into consideration in planning. In particular there was considerable support for the Core Strategy to include robust policy to seek renewable energy generation from new developments.

Some authorities (e.g. Merton MBC) already have targets within their UDPs to reduce carbon emissions by a set percentage, some at 10%, and some at 12.5%. Most attendees in the meeting were in favour of putting in targets for reducing carbon emissions/ Rotherham’s carbon footprint. It was felt that the Policy Direction was a good place for the target to be set at a strategic level and that, in view of the global importance of climate change, the target could be more ambitious in order to impact on future developments.

Requirements should ideally also cover change of use applications and for renovation.

Could Policy refer to requirements for building development to be environmentally friendly and include renewable sources of energy on site such as biomass energy, ground-source heat, wind turbines, etc.?

**Q:** Should apply this amendment to the policy to all sizes of development, including very small ones?

**A:** It is probably not practical to include in very small developments.

Attendees felt that the item on energy efficiency should be expanded upon in view of its importance, and the potential effects on climate change. People suggested it should also be included in other Policy Directions, e.g. Housing.

Reference was made to the City of York’s use of the REAP (Resource and Energy Analysis Program) eco-‘footprinting’ model to assessing new developments. The orientation of buildings was mentioned as an important consideration.
Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Forward Planning was invited to inform Thorpe Hesley residents about LDF and current consultation on Preferred Option.

LDF Manager gave a powerpoint presentation to approx 15 representatives of the Scholes and Thorpe Action Group and the Scholes and Thorpe Community Forum. Cllrs Walker and Kaye and Community Development staff (Pat Michael and Paul Rollinson) were also present.

Main concerns were:

- Need to safeguard ancient woodlands but management could include traditional coppicing to contribute to biomass initiatives.
- Potential concerns about effectiveness of treatment of contaminated land prior to housing development.
The overall response appears to be favourable to the broad direction of the scoping of the policy with various points of detail and clarification raised in the meeting notes under several topics as follows:-

**Treatment of Unstable and Contaminated (Brownfield) Land**
There was particular concern about giving priority to the development of brownfield land where sites contained hazardous and toxic material and where there might be biodiversity value. Definitions were queried in the case of allotments and naturally regenerated derelict land which are classed as greenfield.

The development of this policy direction promoting priority to developing brownfield land will be sensitive to these matters acknowledging that the particular characteristics of individual sites would have to be considered on their merits. In line with Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control the policy will require developers to provide risk assessments to accompany planning applications concerning the development of known or potentially contaminated land together with subsequent proposals for satisfactory treatment/mitigation of contaminated land.

**Densities**
There was little discussion about this aspect of the policy direction seeking to achieve more efficient use of land through increasing densities where appropriate. The meeting notes indicate discussion touched on sustainable design and construction and future need for housing for an aging population. Both these issues will be dealt with elsewhere – the former under PD2 and the latter below.

The main issue of concern was about whether “net density” included open space provision. In the light of this net density needs to be defined in the LDF glossary explaining that “net” is the built units remaining after deduction of land for open space, roads and other infrastructure.

**Agricultural Land Quality**
There was some concern about what was meant by agricultural land quality. A query was raised on placing emphasis on land quality whereas it was site location that was considered more important in practice. Concern was also expressed that lower quality agricultural land may include important historical features.

The general aim was to safeguard the best agricultural land for food production. Again the individual circumstances of sites would need to be considered and the policy will be drafted in the light of the Government’s Planning Policy Statement 7 which states that ‘The presence of best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification), should be taken into account alongside other sustainability considerations (e.g. biodiversity; the quality and character of the landscape; its amenity value or heritage interest; accessibility to infrastructure, workforce and markets; maintaining viable communities; and the protection of natural resources, including soil quality) when determining planning applications’

**Minerals**
It was pointed out that the Policy Direction does not refer to mineral restoration working restoration and the conservation of geological features. It was felt that minerals and sustainable construction issues should be kept separate although it was explained that the use of secondary aggregates (e.g. construction waste) and sustainable construction materials would assist in reducing the consumption of primary aggregates contributing to sustainability.
Utility Infrastructure
There was general agreement with the policy direction although there was some concern over the potential health effects of overhead electricity transmission lines but under Government guidance this was not seen as a planning matter. There was some discussion around whether the planning of utility infrastructure should seek to enhance as well as protect the environment.

Integrated Management of Water Catchments
It was considered essential that we have management of flood plains and water use and the policy wording should reflect this. There was general support to a presumption in favour of actively seeking rather than encouraging Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) within new development.

Sustainable Design and Construction
There is a need to include reference to sustainable design and construction (which complements contributed to promoting use of secondary aggregates under minerals policy and increasing energy efficiency, renewable energy and carbon reduction). It was thought that there should be more green roofs and that there are not enough recycling points (also raised in other group discussions of PD 5). The orientation of buildings was mentioned as an important consideration.

Promoting Energy Efficiency
It was generally felt essential that the policy is specific about climate change and its effects being taken into consideration in planning. In particular there was considerable support for the Core Strategy to include robust policy to seek renewable energy generation from new developments. Most meeting attendees were in favour of targets to reduce Rotherham’s carbon footprint and felt that the Policy Direction was a good place for the target to be set at a strategic level and that, in view of the global importance of climate change, the target could be more ambitious then Merton MBC’s in order to have significant impact on future development. Promoting improved energy efficiency and renewable energy capacity should ideally also occur in change of use applications and for renovation though it is probably not practical to include very small developments.
It was considered that the Policy Direction should refer to requirements for building development to be environmentally friendly and include examples of renewable sources of energy on site such as biomass energy, ground-source heat, wind turbines, etc. Reference was made to the City of York’s use of the REAP (Resource and Energy Analysis Program) eco-’foot printing’ model to assessing new developments. There was a need for subsidies for renewable energy sources, more information and wider public education and awareness about the benefits of renewable energy.

Recommendations/proposed action
1. Look to including ambitious carbon reduction targets in the Submission Core Strategy along with supporting evidence. Need to specify examples of sources of on site renewable energy and to consider development size threshold in applying policy.
2. Include reference to green roofs within sustainable building design
3. Explain more clearly what is meant by “net density” in the final policy or in a glossary
4. Consider including reference to restoration issues under mineral working
5. Strengthen aspects of water management to require rather than encourage sustainable drainage systems in new development
6. Prepare a Supplementary Planning Document promoting renewable energy including suitable technologies to meet policy targets.
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• POLICY DIRECTION NINE: COMMUNITY SAFETY AND WELL BEING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>Brampton Parish Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>08/02/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officers in attendance:** Alan Bamforth, Andy Duncan, Michael Hill, Jill Ratcliffe

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- There is insufficient car parking available on new housing estates.
- Waverley – issue of contamination, containment cells still “experimental”, long term safety still be proven
- Secured by Design principles and conflict with higher densities/reduced car parking with curtilage, leads to increased car crime
- Safety issue of children at risk on estates where layout design gives rise to traffic/road safety issues
- Efficacy of CCTV? “Easy” solution not necessarily the best
- Secured by Design a reactive response to crime, should be more proactive in reducing causes of crime, tackling social issues
- Need provision for young people to prevent crime, more facilities to combat boredom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>Swinton Civic Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>05/02/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officers in attendance:** Alan Bamforth, David Edwards, Michael Hill, Jill Ratcliffe

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- No time for discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venue:</td>
<td>High Street Centre, Rawmarsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>01/02/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officers in attendance:** Alan Bamforth, Andy Duncan, Julie Colley, Margaret Ball

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- The role of the Police employing crime reduction initiatives was welcomed.
- Concerned that road re-surfacings works use excessive amounts of chippings which may be contributing to the blocking of drains.
- Sustainable Drainage Systems – surface water run off – restrict block paving to properties.
- Can new development be required, both initially and in the longer term, to include and retain measures to encourage natural drainage, via for example, preventing block payments and the excessive concreting of surfaces.
• Concerned that the maintenance of drains appears to have been reduced they need to be cleaned more often.

• Grey water recycling.

• Secured by Design – important.

• Areas with shade to enable young/older people to get out of the sun.

———

Meeting: Wentworth South  
Venue: Thrybergh Church Hall  
Date: 07/02/07  
Officers in attendance: Alan Bamforth, David Edwards, Julie Colley, Margaret Ball

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

• Road safety should be considered as a very important aspect of community safety – i.e. as a pedestrian, road user, car driver. Considered of more significance than other aspects such as crime.

• Transport – roads – pedestrian/cycling – speed limits – need to be incorporated into this section.

• Flood Risk must be considered for any development on the Orgreave site.

———

Meeting: Youth Cabinet  
Venue: International Centre  
Date: 14.2.07  
Officers in attendance: Noel Bell, Rachel Overfield, Clare Cope

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Climate change should be a top priority

———

Meeting: Environment and Sustainability Workshop  
Venue: Bailey House, Room 3  
Date: 05/03/07  
Officers in attendance: David Edwards, Alan Bamforth, Rachel Overfield, Neil Finney

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Bullet Point One – mitigate flood risk in new development

The Environment Agency referred to their detailed submission to the Core Strategy concerning this Policy Direction.

An attendee suggested that the policy wording should be firmer about the action to be taken, rather than just making a statement about what is needed.

The second sentence should be amended to read “Where appropriate, development will need to be supported by site specific Flood Risk Assessments …”
Bullet Point Two – pollution

Should also refer to the problems which occur if development were to take place in areas which are already suffering from pollution. Need to consider cumulative impact from new developments.

The importance of the use of SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) for both greenspace and ecology was stressed.

Should include more on well being and health, e.g. parks and recreation areas, greenspaces. There appears to be too little about health and well being in the Policy Direction, as it is mainly about preventing pollution and floods.

Bullet Point Three – crime reduction measures in new development

Should include the need to encourage more use of recreational amenities. There should be a balance between the provision of greenspace and crime reduction measures.

Public realm improvements should consider how areas are maintained / cleaned.

Q: Does another policy cover the aspect of problems with the increase in the number of recycling bins for each house and the lack of storage space within current housing.

A: Yes. This will be covered under other policies.

Under Well Being, shouldn’t there be an item about ensuring sufficient health facilities within an area, e.g. doctors’ surgeries, chemists, etc? Development proposals should consider the future (cumulative) health needs and not just present needs.

The provision of green space should consider the need to provide appropriate shading, particularly for young people given climate change effects

---

Meeting:  Thorpe Hesley Residents, Community Forum, STAG.

Venue:  Thorpe Hesley Junior School          Date:  12/03/07

Officers in attendance:  Phil Turnidge/Pat Michael/Paul Rollinson (also Councillors Walker and Kaye)

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Forward Planning was invited to inform Thorpe Hesley residents about LDF and current consultation on Preferred Option.

LDF Manager gave a powerpoint presentation to approx 15 representatives of the Scholes and Thorpe Action Group and the Scholes and Thorpe Community Forum. Cllrs Walker and Kaye and Community Development staff (Pat Michael and Paul Rollinson) were also present.

- Mention of local land drainage issue – ineffective land drains in fields near Keppels Column causing localised flooding in gardens of some Scholes properties – resident advised to contact the Council’s Drainage Officer.
POLICY DIRECTION .......... NINE

COUNCIL’S RESPONSE

Various points, at both the strategic and detailed level, were made at the workshops and these are summarised above. Where necessary general concerns not within the remit of the LDF have been forwarded onto the appropriate department. The issues relating to the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation document are included within the following assessment with recommendations for further action in preparing the final Core Strategy for Submission for Examination in Public. The Core Strategy will again be subject to further community consultation at the submission stage.

There was general support for designing out crime but concerns that new guidance over densities, parking etc. might work against such principles. There is a perceived need to provide facilities for young people to combat antisocial behaviour. Climate change is seen as a major concern that should permeate the whole plan. There was general support for measures to combat climate change. Pollution issues were a concern, particularly the cumulative effects of development on pollution levels. It was felt that health issues should have a greater prominence in the plan, which currently concentrates on safety issues.

Crime
It was considered important that the police are involved at an early stage in the plan process. There were concerns that higher densities and reduced levels of car parking is at odds with Secured by Design principles.
More provision needed for young people
Secured by design is important
CCTV is easy option but not necessarily the best

Climate Change
Climate change should be a top priority permeating all through the plan
Use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDs) is important as is the need to control hard surfacing (block paving of front gardens, car parks etc) to reduce surface water run-off. SuDs are open drainage systems that allow surface water to percolate naturally into the ground, rather than being piped directly into river systems which can cause rapid rises in the river levels leading to flash flooding. SuDs are also beneficial for wildlife providing green corridors which aid wildlife movement.
Flood risk is an important issue for any development at Waverley. It should not exacerbate the problems experienced at Catcliffe.
Existing drainage systems need to regularly maintained
Grey-water recycling should be encouraged.
Will new development incorporate space for increased recycling?
Maintenance and cleaning of public realm areas is important.

Pollution
Containment cells are still experimental – long term safety still to be proven.
Need to consider the cumulative affects of developments on pollution levels. Building should not be allowed where high pollution levels already exist.
Health
There should be more emphasis on health and well-being e.g. greenspaces, parks and recreation areas – currently concentrates on safety issues.
There is a need for sufficient health facilities to meet future development
Concern was expressed regarding the safety of children on estates where layout creates traffic/road safety issues.
Need for shaded areas in public areas to reduce the incidence of skin cancer.
This section should be cross-referenced with Transport/road safety section.

Council Response

Public safety and the reduction of the fear of crime are very important aspects of the Council’s vision for Rotherham. Secured by Design principles will be applied to all new developments in conjunction with the national guidelines laid down by government, such as housing densities and car-parking requirements. It is suggested that police architectural liaison officers will provide input into detailed policy formulation for designing out crime and will also provide comments on individual planning applications.

Climate Change will be a major influence on future planning, with flood risk being a major concern. The Council has had a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment done to inform its future land allocation decisions and its development control policies. It is suggested that council policies should seek to incorporate SuDs, grey water recycling, porous surfacing and renewable energy generation into new developments. Current planning guidance does not give councils the authority to control the hard surfacing of garden areas, but this may come in time.

Containment cells are constructed using the best knowledge available at the time, and are thereafter strictly monitored. Pollution factors such as Air Quality Management Areas, Landfill sites, Hazardous industries etc. are taken fully into account when preparing new development plan documents. The Environmental Health Services of the Council, the Environment Agency and other relevant bodies will be fully consulted at all phases of the plan’s production.

It is recognised that green spaces are essential exercise and recreation resources for local communities and it is suggested that these aspects ought to be emphasised in the Core Strategy. The Primary Health Trusts will be consulted on the proposals in the Allocations DPD, as a matter of course, to determine if and where new health facilities will be needed. Road safety issues in estate design and shaded areas are dealt with at the detailed area action plan, supplementary planning document and planning application stage.

Recommendations / Proposed Action

1. Proceed with the further development of PD9 to the submission stage of the Core Strategy to cover aspects of public safety and reduction of the fear of crime.
2. The Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) to identify specific development sites together with criteria to guide new proposals in the future. Climate change issues, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the needs of organisations such as the Primary Care Trusts will be major considerations in this process.
3. The Policies Development Plan Document to include policies to guide all future development proposals. Policies covering orientation, sustainable construction renewable energy will all contribute to tackling climate change.

Supplementary Planning Documents and Area Action Plans will be prepared for sites / localities where required. Estate design, green spaces, community facilities etc will all be covered in these documents.
### Core Strategy Preferred Options July 2007 – Summary of comments from facilitated workshops / internal / external consultation

- **POLICY DIRECTION .......... ‘OTHER’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth North</th>
<th>Venue:</th>
<th>Swinton Civic Hall</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>05/02/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, David Edwards, Michael Hill, Jill Ratcliffe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Concern was raised regarding RMBC selling off the land near the vicarage field, to the side of the church.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth South</th>
<th>Venue:</th>
<th>High Street Centre, Rawmarsh</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>01/02/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, Andy Duncan, Julie Colley, Margaret Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- RMBC Departments should co-ordinate their activities better. Not convinced that some of the aspirations of the Core Strategy would be fully enacted by other RMBC Departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth South</th>
<th>Venue:</th>
<th>Thrybergh Church Hall</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>07/02/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Alan Bamforth, David Edwards, Julie Colley, Margaret Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- How will RMBC consult locals on the Allocations DPD?
- Would like to see more 3D plans / models of major developments to enable public to fully understand development proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting:</th>
<th>Wentworth Valley</th>
<th>Venue:</th>
<th>Full Life Church, Maltby</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>12/2/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance:</td>
<td>Ryan Shepherd, Noel Bell, Mick Stowe, Sue Wetherley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Questions asked regarding integration of LDF with the Maltby masterplanning work by RMBC Neighbourhoods and the Maltby Community Plan. Creation of so many Masterplans was also questioned as was a lack of consultation over the possible civic centre moves
- Links between different LDF’s – is Sheffield’s more significant? – RMBC should look after itself!
- Lack of consultation – people don’t feel as though they have an influence and lose interest because of this
- Suggestion that we should produce information on the 10 most significant issues where consultation has made a difference

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting: Rother Valley South Area Assembly</th>
<th>Venue: Dinnington Resource Centre</th>
<th>Date: 22.02.07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance: Noel Bell, David Edwards, Andrea Mason</td>
<td>Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Old Peoples Home at Parkstone, South Anston should be redeveloped as a leisure facility rather than for new housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How can Planning help resolve eyesores by promoting the demolition of derelict property? (particular reference made to former school site at East Street, Dinnington and housing at Silverdales &amp; Leicester Road, Dinnington)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting: Youth Cabinet</th>
<th>Venue: International Centre</th>
<th>Date: 14.2.07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance: Noel Bell, Rachel Overfield, Clare cope</td>
<td>Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More opportunities are needed for people to talk, mix and meet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote multiculturalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting: Chamber Of Commerce</th>
<th>Venue: Genesis Business Park</th>
<th>Date: 24/01/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officers in attendance: Mike Smith (Chamber of Commerce) Phil Turnidge / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC</td>
<td>Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the presentation there were questions from Chamber Members about the provision of family based affordable housing and was this part of the plans. PGT provided details of the government’s requirements for Housing Market Assessments indicating specific local housing requirements, including affordable housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further questions from the Chamber followed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q: Do we have to follow government plans for housing or do we have the ability to forge our own plans for Rotherham?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A: (PGT) The government have fairly prescriptive ideas for housing density etc. The LDF does give the opportunity to shape the way we do things in Rotherham, but we need to have justification for any alternative plans we make as they are subject to rigorous inspection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q: What percentage of Rotherham is greenbelt and how much of this will be changed in this process?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A: (PGT) There is not likely to be a large change to the greenbelt, as the policies suggest only looking at minor changes to the fringes of the greenbelt, related to making particular settlements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
more sustainable.

Q: Do Rotherham Council decide what comes out of the greenbelt and the community has no say in this?

A: (PGT) There will be meaningful consultation with the community on greenbelt and a lot of other issues, when future development plan documents are considered.

Q: Is the consultation process meaningful, or are we just playing lip-service to government requirements for consultation. The Chamber is reticent about giving carte-blanche support to the process, if it is to be used as a means of getting things through in the future which the Chamber would not support.

A: (HLS) There can be no guarantees that everything that is developed will be to everyone’s liking, but there will be detailed consultation and the results of the consultation will be used to influence future plans.

Recommendations were made by some members of the Chamber that they should have further opportunity to put forward their views in more detail. The Chamber Members agreed that they needed to form a working group to focus on the policy directions, in order to respond in depth in the near future. They would also be willing to form a joint working group with the Council’s Planning Department, to discuss matters in more detail.

---

Meeting: BME Community Workshops –
Venue: Reach Building, Ferham

Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

- Not right communication with community. Need regular meetings in a forum with service providers
- Communication not targeted and need right approach to communicating with communities
- Methods could include confirming numbers of people attending.

**Lots of consultation taken place – too much?**
No incentives e.g. day time events in working hours – difficult to attend
### BME Community Workshops – Arabic Speaking Women’s event

**Venue:** Unity Centre  
**Date:** 28/03/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

**General Community Issues**

- Shortage of large meeting places for local communities.
- Community safety in association with religion, in particular in schools.
- Don’t want a separate religious school want more respect of different religions within schools.
- Need more street lighting.

**Health Care**

- No dentists in local area
- Difficult to make an appointment to see the GP
- Need comprehensive health care facilities rather than a small GP Clinic

---

### BME Community Workshops – Tassibee (Urdu / Gujurati speaking Women’s event)

**Venue:** Unity Centre  
**Date:** 28/03/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

**Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):**

- Greater choice as to where to send children to schools.
- Better quality of education is essential at local schools (Clifton School is the local comprehensive school).
- Experiencing racism in the schools.
- Access to Doctors surgeries is more expensive, difficult because of the change to Doctors telephone numbers – now an 0845 number.
- Access via public transport to Doctor’s surgeries / hospital is costly.
- £1 for 2 x stops on the bus. £1.60 each for single fare to Town centre from Stag.
- Anti-social behaviour – because there’s not enough for young people to do in the local area.
- Drugs problems also in many of the inner areas.
- Want facility for women and children to go to.
- Problems on ready access to Doctors, long waiting times.
- Need to celebrate multi-cultural positives eg public art / images. Promote “all one community”, celebrate differences as well e.g. more could be done at Rotherham Show.
- Exclusive sessions for women at gym are required.
- Institutional racism in RMBC.
- Driving lessons are too expensive – should be means tested.
- Free transport for students is needed.
## BME Community Workshops – Rema Board Members

**Meeting:** BME Community Workshops – Rema Board Members  
**Venue:** Unity Centre  
**Date:** 28/03/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Pat Michael / Paul Rollinson / Kay Bacon / Lucy Reader / Rachel Overfield / Helen Sleigh / Neil Finney RMBC with Mike Dando and volunteers from Yorkshire Planning Aid (YPA)

### Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

**Education**
- Schools would be a priority. They need to have safe boundaries and crossing areas for children’s safety.
- School use for community use needs to be looked at. School opening hours are limited.
- Need to look at multi use buildings eg leisure centre with doctors surgery.

---

## Thorpe Hesley Residents, Community Forum, STAG.

**Meeting:** Thorpe Hesley Residents, Community Forum, STAG.  
**Venue:** Thorpe Hesley Junior School  
**Date:** 12/03/07  
**Officers in attendance:** Phil Turnidge/Pat Michael/Paul Rollinson (also Councillors Walker and Kaye)

### Key Points raised at the meeting (objections/support/comments):

Forward Planning was invited to inform Thorpe Hesley residents about LDF and current consultation on Preferred Option.

LDF Manager gave a powerpoint presentation to approx 15 representatives of the Scholes and Thorpe Action Group and the Scholes and Thorpe Community Forum. Cllrs Walker and Kaye and Community Development staff (Pat Michael and Paul Rollinson) were also present.

Concerns were:
- Traffic speed and number of movements along Thorpe Street
- Renewable energy symbol north of Thorpe Hesley on one of the earlier Options Maps – it was explained that this was only a discussion device.
COUNCIL’S RESPONSE

Various points, at both the strategic and detailed level, were made at the workshops and these are summarised above. Where necessary general concerns not within the remit of the LDF have been forwarded onto the appropriate department. The issues relating to the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation document are included within the following assessment with recommendations for further action in preparing the final Core Strategy for Submission for Examination in Public. The Core Strategy will again be subject to further community consultation at the submission stage.

One of the questions posed was “How can strategic planning help to resolve eyesores such as East Street, Leicester Road and Silverdales in Dinnington? “ Through the use of planning policies and the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents and potentially Area Action Plans, planning can assist in ensuring a comprehensive and consistent approach is taken to future development opportunities. Through joint working with colleagues in Housing Market Renewal Team strategic planning can ensure that this consistent approach is applied to any masterplanning undertaken in those areas in need of regeneration.

There is a need for regular meetings and communication between the Chamber and the council and between service users (the community) and service providers (including RMBC). Consideration should also be given to the timing of any consultation events during the daytime / evening and to confirm attendance numbers. The Council in preparing its Local Development Framework is committed to involving the community in meaningful consultation in line with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2004. The SCI sets out the Council’s policy for community participation, including the engagement of traditionally excluded groups, together with the standards of community involvement to be achieved in the preparation, alteration and review of the various documents in the new LDF and in consultations over planning applications.

There is a shortage of large meeting places for communities within the inner urban areas. Some participants queried whether there is a need to consider the creation of multi use buildings for example leisure centre with medical and dental facilities. There appears to be a shortage of health facilities within the inner urban area that are readily accessible on foot and public transport is perceived as expensive. The Primary Health Trusts will be consulted on the proposals in the Allocations DPD, to determine if and where new health facilities will be needed. The Council can only assist by allocating sites for new health facilities in local communities if a need has been identified by local surgeries or the PCT to upgrade existing facilities or provide new facilities to meet a projected need.

**Education / Schools**

Within the inner urban area there are limited choices of secondary schools (Clifton Comprehensive), concern was raised regarding a number of issues including the quality of the education provided, bullying within the school and racism. School boundaries need to be secure and there is a need for crossings immediately outside of schools. Consideration should be given to greater community use of schools particularly outside of school and term times.

There is a concern that there is a rise anti social behaviour because there are not enough activities for young people to undertake.
The bullying matter has already been referred on to Children and Young People’s Services. The other issues will also be highlighted to the Children and Young Peoples Services.

Promote multi-culturalism using design / public art and images. More could be done at Rotherham Show to promote “all one community” but there is also a need to maintain cultural diversity. Claim that there is institutional racism within RMBC. This is an issue for the wider council and through the activities of colleagues in drafting the Rotherham Equality and Diversity Strategy some of these issues are currently being tackled. In undertaking the consultation events with the BME community close links were forged with REMA, equality and diversity officers across the council and with Area Assembly network of officers. The involvement of Yorkshire Planning Aid in this process enabled the Council to be one step removed from the community engagement events (however officers were fully supportive of YPA). By inviting YPA to lead on the community consultation events this ensured that the Council’s approach to engagement was fully inclusive and empowered the BME communities themselves to get involved in the preparation of the Core Strategy. This approach will enable them to continue their engagement in the LDF process in subsequent DPD’s.

**Recommendation / Proposed Action:**

It is our intention to proceed with the further development of all policy areas to the submission stage of the Core Strategy.

1. Proceed with further development of all policy areas to the submission stage of the Core Strategy in undertaking this work maintain an overview of the issues and concerns raised. Also consider whether there is a need to make specific reference to schools and education.

2. The Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) will identify likely development sites for all uses together with appropriate criteria based policies to guide new development in the future. Consideration will need to be given to the need for new places of worship and suitable sized community venues to enable a variety of activities to be undertaken.

3. The Policies Development Plan Document to include policies to guide all future development proposals.

4. Further Supplementary Planning Documents and Area Action Plans will be prepared for sites / localities throughout the Borough when and where required.

5. The Council in preparing its Local Development Framework is committed to involving the community in meaningful consultation in line with its adopted Statement of Community Involvement and the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2004. The SCI sets out the Council's policy for community participation, including the engagement of traditionally excluded groups, together with the standards of community involvement to be achieved in the preparation, alteration and review of the various documents in the new LDF and in consultations over planning applications.