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Literal responses to the questionnaire used in the informal consultation into the emerging Local Development Framework Core Strategy
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Where people have submitted literal comments with their questionnaire submission or via letters and emails, these comments have been collated under each issue and are reproduced in the attached report. It may be that some responses appear to be relevant to another issue in this summary report however the responses have been retained in the order that they were submitted by respondents.

Each respondent has been assigned a unique case number but the names and organisations have been removed from this report and will not be made available.

These literal responses are detailed in their nature and whilst the information contained in this supplementary report will be used to guide the drafting of policies in the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (this is the first document in the Local Development Framework) it is most likely that this detailed feedback will be used in later stages to guide the drafting of any subsequent development plan documents that provide specific policies and land allocations to guide future development.

Whilst every effort will be made to reflect the views expressed here in future Core Strategy and other development plan policies there will be some opposing views put forward that will require a comprise / view to be taken that reflects the preferred Core Strategy.
Section 1 - ENVIRONMENT

1.1 Urban Renaissance

1 "The major theme of the LDF in the next decade has to be the regeneration of the town centre. Now that unemployment is at an acceptable level the town centre problems must be addressed."
3 "Leisure and health facilities improved. Mature population town centre - quality of retailers and services; more alternative options - green approach."
4 "A combination of all three options thus allowing creativity as well and maintaining urban renaissance."
11 "Option A is not exclusive - partnerships with private sector for regeneration projects will make it sustainable"
13 "Option B: The main emphasis should be on Rotherham Town Centre more minor developments in Wath, Dinnington and Maltby"
26 "Renewal schemes must stand the test of time. Traditional design and materials should, despite costs, be a key feature."
31 "Greater use of existing/disused railway lines to establish new stations/halts with suitable parking facilities to encourage travel by public transport, including rail as opposed to using cars. Review car parking at existing stations eg Kiveton Park to encourage more people to park and ride. No room for expansion at this stage at certain places."
34 "Partially met by B but would wish to encourage local shopping and revitalise local shopping areas within residential areas. Promote corner shops/ small local shopping/community areas too if possible. Ensure facilities for teenagers are provided within the community as they often hang round these areas that are focuses for the local community."
56 "We will never encourage growth in Rotherham's town centre if we keep developing further out (towards Barnsley, Doncaster and Sheffield)."
59 "Provision - There must be widespread consultation at the early stage of planning, not the presentation of a finalised plan."
60 "...But must recognise impact on surrounding smaller communities and take steps to protect them."
64 "Water is to be in short supply in the future - please consider making sure that there is going to be a water supply and promote grey water use to help conserve water."
70 "Rawmarsh and Parkgate are in urgent need of renewal - HMRP may fill this gap."
79 "By focussing upon the Town Centre, this would help to restore a focal point within the town. This would undoubtedly help to bring ancillary benefits to all other areas."
81 "We have no specific preferred option, although of the main centres, Rotherham is the one with significant areas identified as being at high risk from flooding from the River Don and River Rother. We would expect you to discourage development in these areas by undertaking the sequential test at all levels of planning to ensure that high risk areas are not developed where there are other appropriate areas available at a lower flood risk. Any new development should be informed through consideration of your Sustainability Appraisal and, in respect of flood risk, through your Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). Any spatial options must have explicit regard to the Sequential Test in PPG25 'Development & Flood Risk' for land allocations i.e. low flood risk areas must be considered in preference to high flood risk areas."
Our latest version of the Flood Map should be used. It should also be noted that the forthcoming PPS25 may require a more stringent test to be passed for sustainability if development in floodplain is proposed. There are also likely to be variations for the type of development that would be allowed depending on the degree of flood risk and vulnerability."

87 "The renaissance of the town centre is urgent and required by policy. Development of out of centre schemes needs to be curtailed following the sequential approach."

94 "Option B is the most favourable as it looks at other areas that are in need of renewal both in development, transport and environmental issues."

101 "A combination of Options B and C would seem most appropriate"

103 "None: The LDF should be segmented to recognise the significant differences between the urban, rural, domestic, industrial, dormitory nature of the whole of the RMBC area. This proposal is too generalist."

106 "The town centres of Rotherham and Wath have numerous Listed Buildings and have been designated by the Council as Conservation Areas. Therefore, we welcome investment in the enhancement of these settlements."

108 "Really option B but to cover the whole of the borough. Each area has differing problems and resources and each has the right to have effort and money spent on it. For example, Swinton, on the periphery of the borough."

110 "These options appear to be exclusive and may be too restrictive in isolation."

126 "Refurbishment of some of the existing building that the Labour Council has neglected since 1974, is required in all areas."

134 "In general, YW favours redevelopment of previously developed land, within existing urban confines over greenfield development as it is more likely to represent more sustainable use of existing infrastructure in both sewers and water supplies."

137 "this must been done in partnership with communities and been done sensitively"

143 "Overall, a sequential approach to development supporting the development of brownfield sites prior to greenfield sites is supported in accordance with Government and Regional Policy."

145 "A combination of acceptable private sector developments and public sector intervention where necessary and feasible is regarded as providing the appropriate balance"

147 "Lets put the heart back into the borough"

155 "Restrict development to 'Brownfield' sites only"

165 "Sensitive programmes of refurbishment with some new building should be encouraged in the historic cores of Rotherham and of its outlying communities. I question your use of the term 'urban renaissance'. You mean 'town centre redevelopment.' Renaissance' means 're-birth' which suggests that the activity follows a death. Rotherham Town Centre may need to be put into the intensive care ward but Maltby and Dinnington are in a much more healthy state."

169 "Emphasis on renewal of town centre shopping good quality retail"

170 "Emphasis on renewal of town centre shopping good quality retail"

173 "Enhancing the shopping and commercial areas and building more housing in town centres – renewing worn out buildings and places. A combination of Option A and Option B would be the preferred option. Option C is objected"

175 "South Yorkshire Housing Association is an RSL with circa 1000 properties in Rotherham. We provide general needs and care and supported
housing. SYHA has a significant presence in Maltby where we have been involved in strengthening support for the white city estate."

177 "Option B but with proviso that there is adequate provision for young people inherent and that crime prevention is key."

179 "with consultation from local groups i.e. Parish Council"

180 "I support the notes prepared for the Rotherham South Area Assembly Workshop held 25/05/06 at Rotherham Town Hall."

184 "Proactive intelligent mix of the above. Object to maximise total wealth of area, not one sector or to reduce differential."

186 "The town centre is a high priority development which needs to be "jewel in the crown" of developments in Rotherham."

187 "A balanced consideration of all as agreed at the meeting"

188 "2nd preference is C"

190 "A combination of A and B preferred. The restrictive approach to renewing urban areas to the centres of settlements overlooks opportunity to enhance local centres and community centres. A composite approach promoting sustainability in all settlements whether through public or private investment - is the preferred option. It is too simple to see urban renaissance as an end to sustainability in itself whereas smaller towns and those outlying towns are left to decline. A sustainable approach to all urban areas should be promoted."

191 "Mixed Use Development: In British Waterways’ experience, the following factors are key to creating attractive, vibrant, active, safe and sustainable waterfront or waterside regeneration: Mixed use development with diversity of uses, activities and hours of operation. In waterfront developments where a single use dominates such as residential, these waterfront developments lack public and pedestrian generating uses resulting in few activities along the waterfront and "privatised" waterside areas. Maximise the use of under-utilised waterways (particularly redundant docks, wharves, basins and arms) as well as brownfield sites and re-use of redundant waterside buildings. The utilisation of the waterspace in its own right will improve urban capacities and densities, create strong sense of place and ensure life and vitality to the waterfronts. Provision of strong physical and visual linkages and connections within the waterfront scheme, with other waterside developments and attractions as well as, to other city quarters, town/city centres and to surrounding areas. For waterfront developments to be successful links should be direct, attractive and safe and have inviting places to stop located along them.

192 "The Draft RSS Figure 4.1 (p.52) notes 2 settlements in Rotherham District, Rotherham as a Sub-Regional centre and Dinnington as a main town and the Dearne Valley main towns are noted within the Dearne Valley area as a location for new development in Policy SY1. Urban Renaissance therefore will be focussed on these growth settlements and we believe that renaissance of the more difficult areas of Rotherham is capable of being undertaken by private investment."

195 "The LDF should be in general conformity with RSS. The current RSS identifies the urban centre of Rotherham, the M1 corridor and the Dearne Valley as regeneration priority areas. Draft RSS policy SY1 focuses development in Rotherham as a sub-regional centre, followed by Dinnington as a main town and more limited development to help regeneration in the Dearne Valley.

197 "Options B and C more emphasis on renaissance planning in Rotherham Town Centre than other centres".
1.2 Green Belt

12 "Protect green belt areas"
19 "Keep Green Belt. Don't build on it."
23 "Protection of the green belt is vital. Many of our villages are being lost due to erosion of the boundaries."
26 "Review current green belt boundaries to enable expansion of rural settlements which fit within the landscape and rely on traditional design and materials."
29 "None of the above, green belt should remain green belt."
30 "No building on green belt"
31 "Bus and rail journey integration so that travelling public can travel from a to b on one ticket - wholly by bus or both having paid one fare or be in possession of a recognised pass."
33 "Utilise Brownfield sites first."
34 "Generally protect greenbelt unless it is absolutely necessary to develop areas due to compelling arguments for improved sustainability of the local settlements. Release greenbelts only with generous enhancements for local amenity, heritage and biodiversity interests."
35 "The land developer should be supplied with a county wide list of available brown belt land with potential for development. There is plenty of disused land that meets all the criteria above, in or on the edge of developed areas with natural beauty around them."
39 "Green belts must not be 'nibbled away' must not lose site of why they were originally established, development in the Green Belt will lead to a spiral of improved infrastructure - further development etc."
60 ". . .But must be restricted and not apply to conservation areas and areas identified in UDP as having high landscape value."
62 "Some development might be allowed on green belt land that is not of high landscape or wildlife value. Could there be a trade off to safeguard/enhance new wildlife sites/reserves."
64 "As above plus making sure there is energy efficient appliances and that there is ease to adapt households for daily living."
70 "Quality and style of development could minimise adverse effects."
72 "Allow some development within the village in gaps/spaces when it enhances the landscape line but does not spoil areas of high landscape value or vista."
78 "The Green Belt must be protected at all costs if not extended."
79 "Large sites of green belt need to be protected - perhaps this should be extended to cover residential gardens and offer these spaces the same protection as offered by existing Green Belt land"
81 "We have no specific preferred option. All areas providing natural spaces and wildlife habitats should be enhanced and protected to promote biodiversity and habitat networks."
82 "with of course a eye on retaining and enhancing transport and local schools. There should be no problem with green belt development as long as it is done well and thus safeguards development of brownfield sites that are inappropriate for residential"
87 "Again the Authority must re-evaluate the sites in out of centre locations and concentrate development into the centre of Rotherham."
94 "While Option B does appeal as it seems Option C (or should this be A?) is about building in green belt areas, the Green Belt should be protected and
only used if no other area on brownfield or especially in city/town centre's can not meet the Borough’s needs and requirements."
101 "N/A"
103 "Redefine all greenbelt boundaries to reflect the changes that have occurred specifically in Maltby why do we have "'blast zones'" when we no longer have quarrying and brickwork activities"
104 "ANY DEVELOPMENT TO BE KEPT STRICTLY WITHIN EXISTING BOUNDARIES, AND IN KEEPING WITH THE SURROUNDINGS."
108 "Land is a precious limited resource and once the use is changed for development the area will never get it back. Although the borough has to meet various housing targets etc but if the land is fully utilised then it cannot grow any further."
118 "C"
126 "Retain and protect the green belt sites exactly as they are."
142 "Best prospects for Rotherham when competing for inward investment is to develop a reputation as a "green city", attractive to live and work in"
143 "Brownfield sites located within the green belt should be considered prior to greenfield sites, subject to sustainability tests, to ensure that their development takes place prior to greenfield within urban areas."
147 "Combine B & C so that the new greenfield becomes part of the green belt, but also some development on selected settlements allowed."
149 "The currently identified Greenfield housing sites, need to be developed before any green belt is given up."
150 "Canklow Woods are a good model for the green belt - managed public access (no motor bikes) and interpretative panels that increase public awareness and sensitivity to the countryside."
151 "Do not allow developers in green belt at all"
154 "No building on sites which have outstanding heritage and bio-diversity value like Swinton Vicarage field. Some communities are very intensively developed and have a shortage of green space. Conservation areas should be given greater protection."
155 "Do not allow any reduction to land designated as 'Green Belt'"
165 "As C but with a little more circumspection. It may be that a site long designated for housing but now recognised as being of high bio-diversity would appropriately become green belt (e.g. site E off Bridge Lane at Matlby called Greenland Plantation but knows as "the Muddies".)"
169 "very careful use of brownfield sites. i.e. careful checks as to type of buildings proposed"
170 "very careful use of brown field sites i.e. careful checks as to type of buildings proposed"
173 "There is a fundamental difference of opinion between the Council and the Government in this respect as to what the function of the Green Belt is. It is not in fact a control to protect the countryside, rather it is to protect the settings of town, cities and historic settlement"
175 "Release of land to follow sustainability appraisal process as suggested by Option B. Extra flexibility in some settlements welcomed for regeneration purposes."
177 "option b, as above"
182 "Allow development of areas of Green Belt with little landscape or wildlife value, offsetting the loss of Green Belt with mitigation measures so no net loss of Green Space or countryside."
184 "Brown field better option to green field. NB much industry will be lost more quickly if left to market forces. Option A taken to extreme will reduce quality of villages. Play / community areas essential."
187 "A balanced consideration of all options"
188 "2nd preference would be B. Remember that the Green Belt helps to make the Borough "an attractive place to live and work"
190 "A comprehensive and thorough Green Belt review undertaken in the light of the requirements for development of the Borough set at regional level. A growth strategy that addresses the loss of population in Rotherham / Sheffield will require the release of Green Belt and Greenfield land on the urban edge."
191 "Small businesses in waterway settings, marinas and waterway based tourism provides vital support for rural shops, post offices and pubs. The waterways face similar constraints to other rural non-foot loose assets such as stately homes, country houses and mineral sites:...Planning policies need to be sufficiently flexible in order to utilise the waterways as a delivery mechanism for rural regeneration, this needs to be reflected in the locational requirements for development."
192 "A core strategy which is based on sustainability and an identified housing requirement may necessitate the release of some sites in the greenbelt where they perform so well in sustainability terms that they out-rank remoter brownfield locations. This is a matter of planning judgement when the housing is matched against the sites available."
193 "HBF considers the general extent of the Green Belt should be retained in accordance with national and draft RSS advice. HBF welcomes the reference to a more localised review of Green Belt boundaries in option B, which may be necessary in some places. We would caution against the expansion of the Green Belt. Boundaries that have been allocated or are redundant should be retained within boundaries to provide residential development, for example to meet local needs or to provide housing for key local workers."
194 "Support small amendments to the green belt, with some selected release for development and support an option similar to B but reflecting nation guidance in PPG2. Green Belt releases may be appropriate where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated, i.e. where there is a need for additional employment land to meet economic development and inward investment objectives, also and when an area of Green Belt no longer performs the role and function for which it was designated. This is an appropriate approach for sites such as Sheffield Business Park"
195 "Strategic Green Belt changes are an RSS issue. Any localised review should be in accordance with RPG12 Policy P2. Policy SY1 in draft RSS supports maintenance of the strategic extent of the South Yorkshire Green Belt."
198 "Option C."

1.3 Biodiversity

11 "Nature is taking over in Dearne Valley but careful planting (of correct plants/trees) will encourage wildlife."
13 "Option A - Particular care should be taken to ensure that any industrial development would not have an adverse effect on high value wild life and habitat sites."
Humans deserve respectable surroundings within which to live and work. Nature can adjust or be assisted to relocate. Need positive land management measures for biodiversity including: the provision of advice to landowners on management, an updated Local Wildlife Sites system in place, provide development buffers around wildlife sites, be more insistent on obtaining biodiversity gains and promote good practice, expand LNR series in the borough, implement the LBAP actively, explore green links and corridors (optimising amenity benefits also). Update geological knowledge and produce a Geodiversity Action Plan.

"more use of/strengthening of trans location"

No all green belt is of high value but important sites/networks must be protected.

I hope this includes the replacement of cut down trees, composting.

This should also include the impact of elements including: Increased light pollution, impact upon the surrounding area (ie. development should remain in character with existing area). It should not be acceptable to develop for the sake of developing, each must have a positive impact upon the area.

Option C is our preferred approach, however we would also like it to incorporate parts of Option B. Ideally, all development proposals should include strategies for habitat enhancement and creation to improve biodiversity. Biodiversity and habitat networks should form a much more important part of future planning than present. You should also be aware that the Environment Agency have now published the Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS) for the Don and Rother river catchment. This strategy provides information on water resource availability. This may help you to identify areas for water dependent habitat creation. A copy of the CAMS is available on our website at www.environment-agency.gov.uk/cams

While Option C is the best for Biodiversity elements of Option B would be acceptable

There should be a win, win, win outcome from all developments, in that the social, economic and environment should all benefit from any development and no net losers.

The 'natural' environment and the ecosystems of which we are, after all, just a part, is the hub around which everything revolves. Without adequate protection of our environment, our health, well-being and need for recreation and ways to fill our increased leisure time would be severely compromised.

A composite approach of those options appears most suitable in terms of the way that the Local Development Framework will deal with those trees, plants, animals and insects. As part of Option A, it is agreed that development should not be allowed in the most sensitive area of high value to wildlife. However, in those cases where a qualitative and / or quantitative improvement to b"
"We recognise the importance of biodiversity and the need for strengthened preservation, especially when considering the impact of climate change."

"option B"

"Enhancement of current sites is required."

"Balance and common sense must apply. Diversity and consistent policy application are a contradiction. To set aside land for it to be abused worse than doing nothing."

"2nd preference would be B. Option A (horrible) makes me smile, what is "high value" in this context? I think we have moved on from this attitude - the wildlife of the wider countryside (not just SSSI's) is thought of importance. The best sites cannot be isolated and preserved, they are not zoos! Everything is connected. Many people enjoy seeing a variety of local birds / flowers locally."

"A composite approach. Where a qualitative / quantitative improvement to bio-diversity could be made through a development scheme then this should be considered on its merits. The potential to enhance and revitalise other less important sites through development proposals should not be ignored. Development should have a positive or neutral impact on biodiversity would be more appropriate. The potential for improvement or alternative habitats and environments can, alongside mitigation measures potential improve the biodiversity of the Borough without undue restraint on development."

"The preferred option should be in accordance with Government Guidance in PPS9"

"Option B."

1.4 Countryside and Landscape

"needs to match traditional build - why not have kestrels and swallows nesting etc."  
"Landscape character assessments should be used to identify areas suitable for new desirable developments. Not as a way to further restrict it."

"Carry out a Landscape Character Assessment and use it as a tool to get better design in the countryside. Utilise the potential of the LCA as a positive tool for land management for biodiversity and to implement LBAP."

"Developers must not be allowed to rush through plans before adequate defences/protection can be mustered."

"This must not change countryside and landscape must be protected at all cost we do not want a concrete jungle there are still plenty of brownfield sites."

"Many features that make Rotherham unique are being lost. It is essential that these are preserved for the future. There is a real danger that the mistakes made in the 1960s and 1970s are being repeated. If we are not careful, all the elements that make Rotherham unique will be lost forever. E.g. in the housing sector it will not be possible to re-create many of the large homes across the borough that are threatened with destruction."

"Option C is our preference although it should ideally incorporate parts of Option B. Habitat creation and enhancement should be considered for all development proposals. Policies should be formulated to protect environmental and heritage features that protect or improve biodiversity e.g. ancient woodlands."

"While Option C is the best for this certain elements of Option B may be acceptable"
"N/A"

"Could be a mix of option B and Option C"

"We support a comprehensive assessment of the landscape character of the borough. This will help to provide a greater understanding of the context in which any proposed development will take place and to ensure that the future growth of Rotherham's settlements will not detract from their landscape setting. We would hope that any assessment includes consideration of the historic landscape."

"I would have chosen option C, but am worried that this would be used by NIMBYs to prevent development of renewable energy sources in the borough, for instance wind power, where the net gain to the environment may be higher than a debatable loss of 'attractiveness'. The aesthetics of landscape are less important than its ability to support a high level of biodiversity and reduce the impact of climate change."

"As above."

"There is insufficient protection for the countryside."

"heritage" - amend Planning Policy etc accordingly"

"see comment 1.3 Rotherham is also rich in vernacular buildings which lend character and distinction to outlying settlements. Value also needs to be placed on modern buildings which are rooted in the locality. Maltby Civic Centre is a case in point."

"The current protections afforded to the open countryside and landscapes by the Unitary Development Plan through Green Belt policies and Areas of High Landscape Value in some cases fail to realise the potential for enhancement of the countryside and landscape by development on the urban and settlement fringes. Option A is somewhat unreasonable and given its wording does not appear a rational or logical alternative. It is of course not"

"Plan should consider the opportunities for tourism presented by local characteristics, archaeology, woodland and heritage."

"Option C"

"B unless funding available to achieve C."

"2nd preference is B. Heritage feature include ancient trees (I don't know if there is a policy on these) again Option A, horrifying. Option C promotes those things which make Rotherham different from everywhere else (and protects those special atmospheric areas eg Morthen)."

"Amended option B supported. Through this approach development / redevelopment of sites provide opportunities to improve the countryside and landscape through improved boundary treatment, soft landscaping and improved design of built form and layout."

"More emphasis should be placed on a local assessment of landscape character aimed at protecting and improving local distinctiveness. The landscape character of inland waterways is both distinctive and valuable within the wider landscape framework. A policy supported by a local assessment of landscape character could afford greater protection and encouragement to improve the local distinctiveness of the Borough and its waterways."

"The preferred option should be in accordance with Government guidance in PPS 7 with particular reference to paragraphs 24 and 25."
1.5 Historic Built Environment

3 "Protect heritage - make it a feature of Rotherham, new builds to be interesting and modern using green reserves. Town Centre - mix of residential/shops of quality and making conservation use of river - create individuality using what we have."
11 "since when was pebble dash historic? (Wath Library) New builds can be ambitious enough to have a place in history for the future and reflect our heritage (mining)"
13 "If listing is the only way of protecting some of the handsome buildings in the town centre then consideration should be given to them 'being' listed. If a new use is found for such buildings then external appearance use not just the facade should be maintained, although the inside could possibly be reordered."
26 "Future development should compliment that of the past through use of correct design principles and materials."
34 "Utilise the potential of the Historic Landscape Character Assessment being done. We should employ archaeological consultants to look at the land allocations. This work would help developers as it would help indicate roughly the importance of archaeology on the site so could help timetabling, and help flag up costs upfront."
60 "Areas identified within UDP for consideration as conservation areas should move quickly to achieve that status."
64 "Also to work with groups in local areas, to get funding to do the work necessary to keep and preserve existing and future heritage sites."
70 "Not much point in listing buildings if there is not the will nor the finance to care for them."
74 "Moorgate Conservation Area needs extending including roads adjacent to Moorgate eg Moorgate Grove and Whiston Grove. There needs much tighter control on the conservation of trees."
81 "No comments on this issue."
87 "Where the renaissance of Rotherham is centered, to bring in stricter controls at this stage would be counter productive."
94 "Whilst not for the Agency to comment on Option C is the best for this certain elements of Option B may be acceptable"
99 "Historic buildings don't always qualify for listed status yet still contribute to the built environment and should be protected where possible. Furthermore buildings that are listed such as the Rectory in Rawmarsh (Grade 2* Listed) has fallen into decline and may never recover. There is no point have policies/laws to protect buildings if these are not enforced."
104 "WE HAVE ALREADY LOST A LOT THAT CAN NEVER BE REPLACED SO WE MUST NOT LET MORE BE LOST TO UNWANTED AND IN SOME CASES UNNECESSARY DEVELOPMENTS"
106 "We fully support this Option and welcome the proposal to examine locally important buildings for protection (in line with the advice in Paragraph 6.16 of PPG15). We also support the examination of other settlements within the Borough as possible Conservation Areas. We hope that this will also involve the production of up-to-date management plans."
109 "Town centre development should take account of historical architecture above shop facades where appropriate. See development adjacent to Norfolk Row in Sheffield, where facade has been retained whilst structure of building behind has been completely rebuilt."
"C"

Would have chosen option B, but concerned that listed status might sometimes 'conserve' valuable buildings but prevent them being redeveloped for a new lease of life as active and useful buildings. This might hinder renewing urban areas, which would otherwise have a positive environmental impact.

"see also comment at 1.4"

"The protection of historic buildings and places should be made in accordance with PPG15 and not merely regarded as an opportunity to introduce more controls on development. The statement under Option A that development should not be unduly restricted is supported. However that is not to say that issues relating to the historic"

"option c"

"I support the notes prepared for the Rotherham South Area Assembly Workshop held 25/05/06 at Rotherham Town Hall."

"Option A would eventually lead to Rotherham's built up area looking pretty much like anywhere else. There must be benefits in the sense of place provided by some of the buildings from earlier eras. Also these promote a sense of stability and (often) please the eye."

"Stricter controls (as per option B) may prejudice a viable economic use being found for these historic structures. Flexibility in the approach to listed building controls and the increased management of conservation areas should be tempered. These can introduce unnecessary obstacles to development and can detract from the devilment potentials. Such an approach would appear to run contrary to encouraging investment in Rotherham."

"Option B."

1.6 Countryside and Heritage Assets

"Ambitious thinking can 'win-win' eg roof gardens as part of the new projects micro countryside! Strict control of usage eg off road motorcycles stopped."

"Don't do anything without first considering the wishes of the owner and if agreeable only then promote the least sensitive sites of local significance."

"Option B /C It depends what is meant by promote, promotion should be sympathetic to environmental constraints and well resourced, effective management should be in place of countryside sites especially if visitors are being encouraged. Coordinate approach with other bodies (eg transport) to minimise harm and optimise benefits for the local environment, local communities and visitors."

"open space with good car parking areas."

"But needs much more focus on safety for horse-riders, cyclists and pedestrians."

"Whilst access /local involvement are important and managing reserves the needs of wildlife are paramount it might be necessary to restrict access at certain times of year or say keep dogs on lead (if possible)."

"Limited access to the most sensitive sites, where there is plenty of supervision and if there is wild life no access at and in the breeding season."

"The countryside should be enjoyed by all and through effective promotion this will help to attract more people to visit the town as well as challenge the negative connotations associated with both South Yorkshire and the borough."
"Option B is our preferred option although aspects of Option C are also welcomed. Consideration should be given to improving access and facilities for angling, recreation on still waters, canals and rivers."

"This is not really for the Highways Agency to answer but like the green belt it should be promoted and protected."

"N/A"

"C"

"It is important for countryside and heritage assets to be promoted and this can be done in such a way as to also protect and improve the assets as well as educate visitors to respect and look after these assets. Protection and promotion are not mutually exclusive"

"Important that local residents feel "ownership" of important sites and can access them for legitimate uses. Needs to be coupled with advice and education on how to enjoy sites whilst not damaging them."

"Protect the sites but don't spoil the opportunity for them to be enjoyed sensitively."

"There always seems to be insufficient funding for the protection of these assets (eg why is Ulley Country Park being abandoned?)"

"Option B needs to be exercised with a degree of common sense. For it to be a valid option it will be necessary for more resources to be applied to site research and assessment. Failing that there is an argument for C."

"The promotion of and provision of facilities to encourage the enjoyment of the countryside and heritage sites by residents and visitors should be supported in a sustainable pattern. In this respect an additional option would be required outside of those put forward. Option"

"Option B"

"What is wrong with promoting a heritage site, letting people discover is for themselves? The conservation of a site should have a higher priority than its tourist potential because that is what people came to see (and what is important in its own right). I do not like Option A."

"Combine options A and B to promote selective major projects having regard to the most sensitive sites and suitable protection and enhancement of countryside and heritage sites."

"British Waterways vision is 'that by 2012 we will have created an expanded, vibrant, largely self-sufficient waterway network used by twice as many people as in 2002. It will be regarded as one of the nation's most important and valued national assets. Visitors will be delighted with the quality of the experience and as a consequence many will become active participants.'"

"The preferred option should be in accordance with Government guidance including PPS7, PPG13, PPG15, and PPG16 and in general conformity with RSS."

"Option B".

1.7 Control of Pollution

"Improve green services - promote environmentally friendly living"

"Joined up thinking into other domains please. Carbon neutral conifers from locally farmed willow etc. Set targets for local authority vehicles to run on locally produced bio diesel."

"Pollution really is a major issue for those of us who live under the M1."
"Especially where near housing developments only add to road congestion
due to lack of local services and transport links. Encourage building
contractors to install solar panels!"

"Maintain correct approach"

"Option B/C These issues need to be tackled in a coordinated way with
other bodies and link with enforcement, regulation, education matters. More
environmental building techniques and standards are needed to be
couraged to reduce greenhouse gases. Ideally we would want no pollution
but I do not know if this is possible? Making choices in this questionnaire
does not include monetary considerations which guide most decisions."

"Traffic Management should be part of the solution."

"I would have gone for B but past experience of promises broken about
this topic leads me to believe a stronger will is needed when it comes to future
planning applications."

"Option A, if amended to include 'the environment' as a key consideration,
would be adequate in most instances. However Option B would be welcomed
in areas of sensitivity such as Source Protection Zones (SPZ) or areas where
there is a proliferation of non-mains foul drainage. In areas where there are
important species or habitats, stricter control should be in place to control
development"

"The Authority need to decide on a centralist approach to development in
the Borough so as to increase the use of the town centre for all functions and
encourage linked shopping/ leisure trips."

"Links to and the policy needs to adhere to EU Directive 96/62"

"Promotion of modal shift from Road to Rail (both passenger and freight)
as a more sustainable form of transport."

"C"

"use not only environmental impact assessment, but increase the use of
health impact assessment for new developments"

"See comments about value of gaining reputation as green city."

"Air pollution around our motorways is a problem, more steps should be
taken to prevent widening of the M1 in the air quality corridors"

"Policies should favour 'green' development. Reuse cleaned up brown
sites with areas of planting to enhance both landscape and environmental
quality. Encourage use of small scale 'green' schemes to reduce energy are
from external sources. (eg solar panels for water heating designs which
circulate natural heat within the buildings."

"Plan for an aging and longer living community"

"The continued policy of the Unitary Development Plan to support the
work of pollution control agencies such as the Environment Agency and
Environmental Health would appear suitable to be retained in order to protect
amenity, health and safety. Option A in this respect is supported, however a
scheme whereby pollution mitigation measures should be discounted from
other S106 obligations "

"Because of their location SYHA's tenants are heavily affected by noise
and air pollution. Strong measures should be taken to mitigate."

"Option C"

"European and National straight jackets will prevail. Plan must use its
little flexibility wisely and not be further this policy."

"Option B & C are clearly sensible policies."

"Continue policy of the UDP. Concern that green roofs and grey water
recycling and other environmental improvements to enhance pollution controls
of new development should be discounted from other S106 obligations"
"Welcome inclusion of policies to protect the wider environment from pollution and contamination."

"The preferred option should be in accordance with Government guidance in PPS23. We also note that Rotherham has declared an Air Quality Management Area under the Air Quality Directive 96/62/EC, which should be taken into account in the SA process. The SA Scoping stage sets out to make sure that the relevant policies, plans and programmes and sustainability objectives, baseline information, and sustainability issues and problems are collected as part of the evidence gathering of the DPD. Air Quality considerations collected as part of the baseline including any relevant survey work and regional policy on AQM should form part of the SA Framework which serves as a testing mechanism for emerging policy."

"Option A where there’s muck there’s brass! But national policy should create a level playing field for the siting of polluting industries."

Section 2 - ECONOMIC

2.1 Population and migration

"Plan for a smaller population"

"population shrinkage can only be reversed when there are positive economic, environmental housing and service (schools etc) reasons for people to live here."

"Plan for existing communities which are an aging community."

"Difficult to give opinion unless know what type of people wanting to encourage to move into Rotherham"

"With proviso of constant monitoring of trends which are hard to predict."

"regeneration of suitable existing sites to improve the environment in general which would help towards encouraging a more stable population. Inevitably some will leave out newcomers would be encouraged to take their place."

"between A and B"

"Residents are dissatisfied with RMBC - Authority is self-satisfying we know we are the expert/professional! We are deaf to the contribution from the individual."

"As new businesses are developed and larger employers come to Rotherham - The way to keep people here is provide lots more housing and leisure facilities."

"New housing (affordable/expensive) mix nearer to places of work."

"LPA’s must have full regard to up to date socio-demographic information for their area and most fundamentally the figures and projections contained within an up to date Regional Spatial Strategy."

"The largest increase in population comes through immigration rather than organic growth of the population. Perhaps this should be re-thought?"

"No comments"

"The Authority must plan positively, ie the town will improve, the number of shoppers will increase and the number of residents will increase."

"Not for the Agency to answer but development and especially infrastructure needs to be forward looking"

"Plan for a declining population"

"There are changes within the population structure with a greater proportion of elderly people. Rotherham has limited resources of housing and work and so it is not wise to encourage an increase in population."
123 "RMBC should plan for sustainable growth, including new births, reducing out migration and increasing the potential for inward migration through the provision of jobs and housing."
126 "People will leave Rotherham as there are very few employment prospects."
129 "Population will increase so develop sites in existing urban areas at higher densities or use more vacant industrial land"
134 "Yorkshire Water has no preference on the population increases in Rotherham. However it should be noted that these changes will have an impact on our infrastructure. Infrastructure needs to be in place to service new development and YW aims to meet this demand for its water, sewerage and waste water treatment services. PPS12 Paragraph B4 states that it is an important purpose of the planning system to coordinate new development with the infrastructure it demands."
137 "Plan to increase the population alongside the provision of skills and jobs which will enable people to work locally close to where they live."
138 "Difficult to say without seeing demographic trends and projections"
140 "This is very difficult to answer as it needs to be properly based on research and population projection figures."
141 "No opinion"
142 "Although population may slightly decrease, lifestyle changes means there will still be pressure on existing housing stock and leisure facilities. Likely to be steady drift from town centre towards more rural locations."
144 "Make plans to encourage new workers and younger people to Rotherham. Plan for housing allocation based on research and trend analysis."
151 "Be reasonably optimistic and plan for a small increase in population which may increase over time"
165 "I do not have the statistics to hand to enable me to say anything sensible about this matter. Should you wish to provide them I will be happy to comment."
167 "Plan for aging and longer living community"
173 "The current situation in Rotherham with the UDP providing for a small increase in population through new births but with a high level of outward migration thereby resulting in people leaving the Borough must be addressed. Continued population decline in the housing market is not conducive to the economic growth and regeneration objectives that are held so highly in the emerging strategy. However, the level of housing provision is not"
175 "Emphasis should be placed upon plan, monitor, manage so that strategy can respond to economic changes and regeneration as it takes place."
177 "We should be planning for people to want to live, work in Rotherham and ensuring the planning process complements that. So perhaps Option B"
178 "but delete reference to "large"
180 "I support the notes prepared for the Rotherham South Area Assembly Workshop held 25/05/06 at Rotherham Town Hall."
184 "Plan to increase per capita wealth in total and avoid if possible large possible population growth."
188 "I do not feel qualified to comment, except for the observation that I assume the population of this Country will continue to increase. Given the length of life of this LDF, I have decided to fill in a box now."
190 "Substantial comments regarding the level of housing provision and the type and size of new dwellings. Matching job creation with suitable household accommodation improvements."
"RMBC should plan for sustainable growth through new births, reducing outward migration and increasing inward migration through the adequate provision of jobs and homes in the places where people wish to live and work."

"The LDF should be in general conformity with RSS. Draft RSS sets out housing figures for the District. Housing policy in the LDF will need to reflect new PPS3 Housing when it is issued. If the approach to allocating and releasing land for housing in the final version is the same as in the draft of December 2005, the policy will need to cover a fifteen year time frame from adoption of the allocations DPD. Paragraph 12 of the draft requires LDF’s to set out the housing trajectory to meet the level of provision over the plan period, including allocation of sufficient land for the first five years of the trajectory and a further ten years to be indicated in the Core Strategy."

Option B.

2.2 Modern Economy

"To include training locally to align school leavers and the local workforce to benefit from the new jobs."

"Have we really recovered any high value or high skill jobs since the strike? Not exclusive of C"

"What is the main difference between the types of business in A & B. Will the new high technology businesses remain for the long term or move out to India in 5/10 years."

"Both B & C"

"Can A and C go together? Freedom for the market to develop, and specific RMBC support to new, small local enterprise?"

"Local jobs is the key feature here."

"UDP at moment not safeguarding existing businesses eg Imperial Buildings and All Saints Building."

"Option B/C C seems aspirational do not know if it is possible. But green environmentally friendly technologies should be encouraged and the Council should seek to use them where possible leading by example."

"Combine B & C. Aim to raise the level of skills of the local workforce through encouraging high technology industries that work to the highest ‘environmentally friendly’ standards."

"Any jobs would be welcome in providing work."

"Option C should not rule out encouragement of new high technology industries. The local jobs created should need development of skills and training of local people."

"Recycling and waster management businesses should be considered."

"Combination of A & B this will enable the market to create new businesses and industries in line with market trends and to support the local economy and develop the skills of local people."

"The current UDP seeks to safeguard existing businesses, provide a choice of sites for new businesses and support the creation of new local enterprises. However the policy approach in the emerging LDF needs to have regard to market forces and in particular the likelihood of sites being retained or redeveloped for employment purposes adopting a pragmatic and realistic approach."

"We have no specific preferred option, although the idea of “green ‘environmentally friendly’ technologies” is welcomed. One of our main business goals is to try and create a ‘greener’ business world, and policies
that can be included in your Core Strategy to promote this idea would be welcomed. It is widely accepted that businesses will benefit from a rich and diverse natural environment and it is important that businesses recognise the contribution they make to this. An increasing number of companies are finding that it pays to be green. New technologies offer new opportunities to solve environmental problems. In turn, these businesses will reap the benefits of good business practices by improving their competitiveness and value to their shareholders.

87 "Employment is now global and the Authority must be capable of encouraging any form of new development on suitable sites."

99 "RMBC has failed to provide leisure, recreational and retail opportunities on the scale enjoyed by its immediate neighbours (Barnsley, Doncaster and Sheffield). As such job creation (admittedly generally lower paid) is taking place outside the borough. Furthermore, Rotherham residents are forced to travel greater distances to access services and opportunities on which they will spend."

101 "N/A"

102 "Option B & C are both worth considering"

109 "A combination of elements of B & C?"

110 "Restriction of industries may result in lost opportunities"

123 "Option B plus a wide range of employment opportunities to meet all needs."

151 "all of these options are worthwhile"

165 "Blend of B & C. This question sounds a bit old fashioned. We are likely to see more people living and working in the same building which is valuable in terms of reducing unnecessary travel and the resultant pollution. We are however, still going to use it to provide for some businesses to be away from residential areas."

173 "The proposed economic policy puts forward three Options which do not appear to be mutually exclusive and indeed when combined would seem to be a more pro-active approach to business development than the current UDP. A composite approach to the modern economy is therefore suggested which enable the market to create new employment opportunities in line with market trends which show"

177 "Option c"

179 "Option B - but include ""environmentally friendly"" technologies."

184 "Market if left to own devices will generate short term property gains at expense of traditional manufacturing. Intelligent balance required."

187 "A balance of all"

188 "Option B - aren't people everywhere encouraging new, high technology industries? Option C seems likely to be more stable than Option A."

190 "Composite approach to enable the market to create new employment opportunities in line with market trends which show greatest demand and return. Local job creation should also be encouraged particularly where this can support local communities in ways that will improve the sustainability of settlements."

192 "It will be good to able to eventually understand whether the Borough want to re-use old out-dated employment sites for new uses including housing as over the recent past it has been hard to establish what the adopted stance is. The plan should make a realistic provision for new employment sites in places attractive to businesses and not hang onto out dated locations. This is not helping develop the economy of the borough with this misplaced view on the perceived value of such outdated sites. The Borough has not yet
produced their review of employment land, which must surely underpin any strategy relating to the allocation or release of employment land.”

194 "There is a need to provide a range of employment opportunities to support inward investment, the Yorkshire Forward cluster strategy, high technology industries and local businesses."

195 "Issues 2.2 and 2.3 Modern Economy and Employment Land. The preferred options should be in general conformity with RSS and in accordance with government guidance. Both current and draft RSS economic policy seek to support the availability of sufficient land in sustainable locations to meet the needs of a modern economy with cities and urban areas as the key drivers. It is likely that much employment growth will be in office-based uses and public services, rather than general industrial uses. Government policy and current and draft RSS emphasise the need to steer office, retail and leisure uses to town centres and this will need to be reflected in the Core Strategy, both in terms of policies relating to the location of particular uses and also employment land allocations. The pattern and scale of employment land provision should be informed by local employment land reviews required by current and draft RSS. These will need to consider the specific implications of the emphasis on Rotherham urban area in the sub regional strategy for South Yorkshire and the current supply of employment land in the District.

196 “A flexible approach to allow all three of the above”.

198 “Encourage those businesses that will benefit the local economy most.”

2.3 Employment land

3 "Some smaller businesses could be set within residential areas - only appropriate to the needs of that community"

10 "Need a balance between option A - out of town centre sites and sites close to motorway junctions - but also local jobs (risk of people just coming to Rotherham to work and returning to neighbouring areas and spending their wages in that local economy not within Rotherham.”

11 "All three have attractions and again are not immutable: ambition can accommodate the best of all these."

13 "Provide site attractive to the private sector - out of town centres and near to motorway junctions. Protect local job opportunities as far as possible within easy reach of residential areas to minimise length of travel to work. Ensure good public transport if travel necessary."

30 "Look to use existing sites instead of building more"

34 "Option C, but this appears ambitious and not sure if it's possible or always sustainable. Remember Post Industrial sites are a key habitat for biodiversity"

35 "Industry needs to be encouraged into Rotherham but with the loss of more core industries such as coal and steel there are enough. Develop those sites close to work forces the use of both these resources would cut down on out of town travelling and therefore reduce lost travelling time and vehicle emissions."

59 "Restrict to 'Brownfield sites'"

62 "I am sure that transport costs - £ and time will make people less willing to travel distances to work eg 1 hour <= each way"

76 " The council should review its existing employment land allocations on a site by site basis and considering the release of some sites for alternative uses."
"By releasing ex-industrial sites that are under populated for housing this would fit in with Government commitment to building on brownfield and offers a practical way of regenerating unused areas, rather than encourage the practice of "Garden Grabbing" by developers."

"We have no specific preferred option. Again we would expect to see evidence of the sequential test in relation to flooding for any sites considered for development as employment. The location of any new sites should be informed by your Sustainability Appraisal, and in respect of flooding, by your SFRA. You should also note that the Environment Agency have now published the Catchment Abstraction Management Strategy (CAMS) for the Don & Rother river catchment. This may help to identify areas for sustainable business developments. A copy of the CAMS is available on our website at www.environment-agency.gov.uk/cams Consideration of ‘crops-for-fuel’ and ‘biomass’ is welcomed as they provide an alternative to fossil fuels. This is essential to address the causes of climate change. Such proposals are not however without environmental impact, and careful consideration on the siting and design of such projects would need to be made in close consultation with the Environment Agency."

"Significant IDP funding spent on creating a Masterplan for the Aldwarke area. Yet a year on no significant work seems to have occurred. It would seem that public funding was wasted or could have been spent on something more useful."

"Promoting sites that are accessible from public transport, and ensuring that developers contribute (where necessary) to the enhancement of existing public transport facilities."

"HAVE ANY FARMERS OR LANDOWNERS BEEN CONTACTED AS TO THEIR WILLINGNESS TO TAKE PART IN SUCH AN UNDERTAKING."

"None of the above will be successful if the road/tram network has not been improved significantly prior to redeveloping of sites be it industrial or housing."

"Sites should be selected using a range of sustainable considerations including accessibility by public transport and other sustainable modes."

"Should be a mix of all three options (A, B and C) to maximise economic development potential and to ensure that employment land is provided in the most attractive and sustainable locations."

"What is "employment land"? - It certainly does not create employment in Rotherham!"

"Infrastructure needs to be in place to service new development and YW aims to meet this demand for its water, sewerage and waste water treatment services. PPS12 Paragraph B4 states that it is an important purpose of the planning system to coordinate new development with the infrastructure it demands."

"Needs to be closely linked to transport planning to keep jobs, housing and leisure facilities close together and reachable without use of cars. Inner city woodland could be very attractive and set Rotherham apart from other cities."

"Could sites near to motorway junctions be utilised for industry as they are not pleasant as residential areas."

"But add industrial land > housing as well. Rotherham is a victim of its industrial history in regard to employment land. Modern industries and businesses may well employ more people per hectare than a pit or a steelworks did. I see the question but don't have the necessary knowledge to answer it."
A review of the current large quantity of employment land in the UDP should be carried out as part of the Local Development Framework. This should seek to identify those sites which may not be suitable for employment, particularly those which are yet to be taken up for such a use. The potential for having an alternative allocation for the site such as housing or mixed use should be.

Option A

Sites must follow transport/road improvements which are probably out of scope of policy. NB wide total diversity required, but specific pockets of excellence need to be nurtured and developed.

A & B

Composite approach options A and B. A selection of sites should be provided which are attractive to investment and meet the locational needs of those new businesses and employment generating uses that can contribute to the enhancement of the Rotherham economy.

British Waterways supports the emphasis under Option B of reviewing employment sites, including the release of some for alternative uses. Our interest on this matter is specifically with respect to under-utilised and despoiled land adjacent to the River Don Navigation (‘the Navigation’). We set this in a context in which: There is a concentration of redundant, under-utilised and low-grade employment sites along the Navigation which constrain its potential as a catalyst for urban regeneration. B will assist in delivering the renaissance potential of the Navigation but full account needs to be taken to safeguard / provide strategically important waterway freight facilities and essential boating facilities.

Again unless you know how much land you have got already, how can you determine how much you need? Clearly new land needs to be in locations attractive to the market, to encourage new investment and not rely on outdated sites. We therefore cannot tick any of the choices available.

Mix of options A, B and C to maximise economic development potential and growth. There should be acknowledgement that prestige employment sites with excellent motorway accessibility provide an important economic role in terms of employment land supply and attracting inward investment. Non central office locations such as Sheffield Business Park can complement town centre office developments and improve the range of opportunities to maximise investment and maintain regional and sub-regional competitiveness.

Issues 2.2 and 2.3 Modern Economy and Employment Land. The pattern and scale of employment land provision should be informed by local employment land reviews required by current and draft RSS. These will need to consider the specific implications of the emphasis on Rotherham urban area in the sub regional strategy for South Yorkshire and the current supply of employment land in the District. Both current and draft RSS economic policy seek to support the availability of sufficient land in sustainable locations to meet the needs of a modern economy with cities and urban areas as the key drivers. It is likely that much employment growth will be in office-based uses and public services, rather than general industrial uses. Government policy and current and draft RSS emphasise the need to steer office, retail and leisure uses to town centres and this will need to be reflected in the Core Strategy, both in terms of policies relating to the location of particular uses and also employment land allocations.

A flexible approach that will allow for the best solution for each area within the borough.
2.4 Local Businesses

10 "Employment is the key to reduce crime, improve local housing and personal safety and regenerate areas of low employment. Need to ensure training and routes for career progression are built into new job opportunities."
11 "Consider the rare occasion when free market forces need brakes eg protecting environment and public services"
19 "What is meant by local? Yorkshire or towns"
25 "Option A garbled. Failed to reach agreement on meaning."
34 "None of these as I do not understand what exactly is meant by an essential site. Need to adapt and move forward with the times rather than protect all Jobs per se, invest in the future and adapt for longer term gain. Industry needs to be located in a sustainable location eg not fostering greater car use. Green environmentally friendly technologies should be encouraged. Provide relevant training and other measures for local people to access jobs created."
64 "There is a need to find out what jobs and industry is needed in each area, what qualifications are needed for local jobs and industry. Also to educate employers as well as employees, due to some to employers pigeon-holing employees for some areas."
79 "I think the Council's approach to business is excellent and it should keep up the good work!"
81 "We have no specific preferred option, however your Sustainability Appraisal should inform your choice of options and the related environmental considerations."
94 "Elements of all 3 but helping to reduce the need to travel and helping the local economy, whilst building in sustainable locations"
95 "I do not understand what the options actually mean. The sentence structures appear wrong somehow. I agree with the current position and would suggest a stronger commitment to it."
101 "N/A"
102 "Option C is also important for communities with employment needs which need to be linked to good public transport system."
108 "The success of this sector has to be questioned bearing in mind the last 10 years or so. By developing Parkgate and the knock on effect of Meadowhall this has knocked the stuffing out of small businesses, particularly in Rotherham. In fact, you should promote zero rates for small businesses to encourage them and bring life back into the Borough."
109 "A combination of elements of B & C?"
123 "There needs to be a balanced portfolio of sites available for all employment purposes. They need to be accessible to all communities."
126 "Protect and create jobs all over Rotherham."
137 "A combination of both options b and c"
142 "Need to accept that some villages may need to shrink if their previous major industry has disappeared and/or population has decreased."
147 "We failed to stop job cuts in mining and steel areas, so we should make provision for new jobs."
165 "Blend of B & C. There is however no point in protecting jobs 'at all costs'. High levels of unemployment do not always respond to the creation of local
jobs usually because of a low skills match. There needs to be flexibility and constant re-evaluation of need."

170 "Greater emphasis on protecting existing businesses/retailers"
173 "Once again, a composite of the Options would appear a more suitable approach than any one of A, B or C in isolation. Under Option A, it is clear that to support the regeneration of the Borough and retain population that job creation will be a major priority and that attractive locations need to be identified for such uses to b"
177 "Option B"
184 "All of the above at different times. Pragmatic encouragement if possible."
186 "B & C"
190 "Composite of the options. Achieve a high level of job creation by providing locations which are attractive to new industries whilst also meeting the local needs of communities in both sustainable locations and in ways which would improve the sustainability of those more rural or smaller settlements."
192 "See above but also note that employment is not only B1, B2 & B8 but also a wide spectrum of activities including retail, leisure, tourism etc. More jobs are often created in these sectors than in the traditional 'B' classifications. We therefore cannot tick any of the choices available".
198 "Option B."

2.5 Transport and access to jobs

3 "public transport more appropriate for eco friendly living, quick and free shuttle type buses to get to all major services."
4 "There needs to be greater co-ordination between all methods of transport."
10 "Targeted motorway widening, improved rail and canal usage to move freight. Improve links to key areas (including air ports). High investments in public transport."
11 "Ask Sheffield to pay us back for our share of funding Supertram or they can fund the extensions to Manvers and Dinnington."
25 "Option B gained most support, but included 2 many options, especially supertram."
30 "No supertram. Make fares cheaper to encourage use."
31 "Work towards integrated transport systems to move people and goods with greater increase in the use of railways and canals."
32 "Forget canals, the Victorians did - too slow, costly and excessive pollution of water due to diesel exhaust fumes."
34 "Provide better provision for cycling and walking. The car is given priority and more weight needs to be given to alternative more environmental uses of the highways. Provide more opportunities for cycling. Seek to cut car journeys by providing facilities together eg creche /work / shop."
35 "More freight to be removed from roads and introduced to the rail network. I also think pro active road safety is required to slow traffic therefore creating a safer more pedestrian friendly environment in the 1970's. Tinsley marshalling yards was full of freight ready for movement all over the country now this had been replaced by the M1 traffic chaos."
62 "I'd like to see cheaper public transport to see if people can be encouraged to return to buses/trains. Super tram involves too much capital expenditure/infrastructure. More carrots less stick!"
72 "Include better road links to Manchester and Robin Hood Airports."
77 "We support the proposed Super Tram extension up to the retail world site to provide better public transport and linkages with Rotherham Town Centre, as outlined in Option A."
79 "I would love to see Rotherham re-connected to the Main Line (Possibly through the re-opening of Masbrough Station?). It would be a sensible measure to introduce trams. Public transport at present is expensive, under-serviced and provides poor value for money."
81 "We have no specific preferred option however carbon dioxide (Co2) emissions from transport are a significant factor in air pollution and the resultant climate change. Your Sustainability Appraisal should help to guide your choice of option."
87 "The Authority must reconsider the proposed tram link to Meadowhall (or should this be Retail World?) it will we fear remove shoppers from Rotherham Town Centre."
98 "Better transport links as well as better bus lanes etc and may be introduce supertram."
101 "A combination of Options B & C. Network Rail supports the principle of improvements at stations as a means of encouraging a modal shift to public transport. A further important issue is the safeguarding (and enhancement where necessary) of station car parking to encourage 'park and ride', or multi-modal journeys."
108 "Why the emphasis on airports etc when you can't get the main arterial roads out of Rotherham running smoothly! Parkgate is a nightmare - what effort has there been to widen/improve the road between Swinton and Parkgate? None! Also, the only half decent road to Sheffield - Meadowbank road - was wide and allowed traffic to move"
123 "There needs to be a balanced approach to investment in infrastructure. There is a clear range of needs including improvements to the M1 and M18, which will benefit South Yorkshire and the region as a whole, along with a requirement to improve all forms of public transport, especially heavy and light rail options."
126 "Restore and improve cross border travel (that is transport to Nottinghamshire etc). It's no good having a frequent bus from Maltby to Rotherham if there isn't any employment. Nottinghamshire is nearer to Maltby than Rotherham yet there is no transport to it from Maltby. Restore the frequent bus service from Maltby to Doncaster. Town Centre"
142 "Careful spatial planning should be able to reduce the need for extensive travel to work or leisure. Road building is ultimately doomed to fail as simply attracts more cars. Should be extensive network of segregated cycle lanes."
165 "Robin Hood Airport is the 'new toy' and we need to ensure that transport links to it are improved. We also need to face the fact of increasing air travel pollution and we need to fly less not more."
172 "The road network and other infrastructure plays an important part in the operation of Royal Mail services. Any improvements to the network are supported as are improvements to public transport for the benefits of staff and the associated impact on the overall network."
177 "Option B"
179 "With consultation from local groups."
185 "not including rail improvements"
186 "We must ensure our infrastructure is second to no one."
187 "A balance of all"
191 "Substantial comments provided in letter regarding the future use of waterway towpaths as recreational routes, the shared use of the paths for
walking, recreational cycling, angling and moorings. Funding of access and towing path improvements via grant of planning permissions. Consider the contribution of waterways via Green Travel Plans. Transport and distribution: freight and passenger usage including using waterborne freight in the construction cycle, for delivery of supplies and removal of waste; Encourage the carrying of minerals and spoil by water wherever possible. Safeguard land for realistic opportunities for new waterway connections to existing or proposed manufacturing, distribution, and warehousing sites adjacent or close to waterways. Encourage Local Transport Plans to explore opportunities for waterborne freight transport, the feasibility of establishing and operating water bus and water taxi routes, the potential for integrated passenger services between waterways and key waterside destinations, the concept of “Park & Glide” schemes and use of towing path for walking and cycling.”

195 “The preferred option should be capable of being translated into deliverable policies in the context of PPS12 Soundness Test viii. Transport proposals should only be included if they are consistent with current and emerging RSS transport investment priorities and the LTP and the delivery mechanisms and timescale for implementation can be clearly indicated. There should be an emphasis on making best use of existing infrastructure, managing demand and encouraging modal shift.”

198 “Rotherham needs to upgrade the outer ring road, particularly the northern section from Barbot Hall to Mushroom Garage. Other road changes as detailed in the Town Team Masterplan should be implemented, also the rail improvements, plus rail link to Robin Hood airport. Supertram should be put on hold.

2.6 Town and Local Centres

3 "should be clean attractive and safe - less bars, clubs, lapdancing etc."
10 "Main emphasis on Rotherham Town Centre for Retail and Leisure and try and get bulk of employment sites plus large companies out in the local communities."
11 "York Bath Chester - small town centres why can't Rotherham have lots of these?"
19 "When say close. Mean in the Town Centres"
34 "How about a more environmental/green town centre to help change the image of Rotherham. Most of the borough is rural that the residents enjoy a high level of access to green spaces but Rotherham has a poor industrial town image. C sounds aspirational."
56 "Less out of town shopping more central facilities."
62 "No more Retail Worlds but I'd like to see something innovative for the Waverley Site."
73 "Retail Worlds etc will eventually kill off all local centres unless there is an alternative"
75 "Development should be focused both to the town centre and urban areas as well as suitable individual sites which can meet the Council’s regeneration objectives."
77 "The options are put forward in a polarised way, the policies should put forward a balanced approach by recognising the benefits that major retail developments in a holistic way…Thus it should be policy that improvements should be allowed to the quality of retail and leisure offer at Retail World with the possibility of ancillary uses. Consideration should be given to putting forward a bi-nodal approach with Rotherham Town Centre and Retail World.
The two could develop in a complementary fashion with Retail World being given joint Town Centre status. Support is given to the proposed Super Tram extension up to the Retail World site to encourage the wider use of public transport and to improve the accessibility and linkages with Rotherham Town Centre.

79 "Reinvigorating the Town centre must be a priority"
87 "The principal focus must be the town centre."
95 "No space for my comments - A bad design.!!!!!!!!!"
101 "N/A"
108 "A proper mess has been made of Rotherham – a disgrace"
109 "A combination of elements of B & C?"
123 "Box could not be enlarged for comment."
137 "Important focus on leisure facilities in communities"
165 "Out of Rotherham Centre developments need to be kept in scale with that of their communities."
173 "Refer to Comments Emailed Separately"
177 "option A"
182 "No more big TV's in Conservation Areas."
188 "2nd preference is B"
190 "There should be an encouragement of Rotherham town centre, however, the emerging draft RSS identifies hierarchies of settlements and this approach has been adopted elsewhere. By following much of the ethos in Option C this hierarchical approach can be articulated into the Local Development Framework. Furthermore it will enable promotion of sustainable levels of investment in those centres not specifically identified as a retail or leisure hub. Furthermore Option C appears to articulate the advice of PPS6 and the location of retail, leisure and office developments, thereby complying with national planning policy. However, the Renaissance Towns Initiative and other regeneration schemes for the improvement of outlying town should not be prejudiced by these objectives.

195 "The preferred option should be in accordance with Government guidance in PPS6 and in general conformity with RSS which support retail and other town centre uses, including offices and leisure in existing centres."
197 Having examined these options we do not consider that any of these individual options adequately reflect the approach characterised in PPS 6: Planning for Town Centres in respect of the location of retail and other town centre uses. PPS 6 provides guidance to selecting sites for retail provision through the sequential approach. None of the three Core Strategy options would appear to accommodate the sequential approach to selection of sites for retail development and town centre uses.

As the Council will be aware outline planning permission has recently been granted to Henry Boot Developments Ltd for comparison goods retail development on land at Rotherham Road, Parkgate, Rotherham. This decision was made on the basis that quantitative and qualitative need for the proposal was demonstrated within the catchment area of the site, and that no sequentially preferable sites were, available, suitable or viable for the proposed development within or on the edge of town centres within the catchment area. The Parkgate site has therefore been chosen as the most sequentially preferable out of centre site available in Rotherham because of its high level of accessibility by public transport and opportunity it presented to encourage linked trips with Rotherham town centre and Retail World.
As none of the three Core Strategy options would appear to reflect the sequential approach to the selection of sites for retail development, we would ask the Council to consider a new option that provides a balance between each of the three development options and responds more robustly to the area’s shopping and leisure needs in terms allocating future shopping and leisure provision throughout the Borough. This new option should reflect the sequential approach identified in PPS 6”.
198 “Option B”.

2.7 Land for new housing

10 "Still develop new communities linked to local jobs"
11 "Remember vertical society not horizontal ie. no clusters for elderly, young, single families, ethnic minorities etc."
13 "all buildings - housing and office - should be energy efficient (both new and existing)."
23 "Energy efficiency - major need in new builds."
26 "Relax the fascination with Waverley!"
28 "Question the need for higher density need to explore Quality."
34 "Option B/C - Allow building on brownfield /greenfield only where biodiversity value is enhanced. Promote sustainability, greater requirement for affordable housing better design and energy efficient housing. Provide good local amenity for new houses with access to green space and public footpath network where possible."
56 "We need bungalows for older or disabled people not apartments!"
60 "Create green spaces in new developments nice to live in."
62 "Chosen with care and consultation with locals/experts."
63 "As no plans have been finalised by developers of the Waverley site no comments can be made. In view of this I would go toward Option C."
75 "We consider that suitable urban extensions should be considered for future development in the Local Development Framework. The LDF Core Strategy should include suitable sites for residential development preference should be given to brownfield sites and then urban extensions. The LDF Core Strategy should include suitable sites in urban extension locations, as the brownfield land may be constrained, unsustainable or unavailable.
76 "The allocation of sites suitable for new residential development should be based on a thorough understanding of the need for new housing and physical capacity in the Borough to accommodate these needs on previously developed land where possible, particularly where such development has links to existing services and facilities, and can contribute to the creation of sustainable communities."
77 "we support the first sentence of Option A"
79 "Protect existing homes from "Garden Grabbing"
81 "We have no specific preferred option. We would expect to see evidence of the sequential test in relation to flooding for any sites considered for development as employment. See also 3.1."
85 "no more building on green field"
101 "Where new housing development has the potential to (?)"
109 "A combination of elements of B & C?"
118 "B"
123 "Should be emphasis on providing a range of residential properties"
137 "mix of option b and c"
140 "Innovative, modern, sustainable living introduced"
"Option C but green & brownfield = too simplistic"
"More public green space will be needed"
"New community at Waverley also seems a good idea."
"Higher density can mean flats which are not suitable for all groups in society. Encourage better contraception and we won't need so many houses."
"careful use of brownfield site building no more flats."
"Refer to Comments Emailed Separately"
"option B"
"but ensure there is an agreed balance in Pathfinder areas"
"with proviso of ‘Greater requirement for affordable housing, better design and energy efficient housing’ being removed from statement"
"I support the notes prepared for the Rotherham South Area Assembly Workshop held 25/05/06 at Rotherham Town Hall."
"2nd preference is B"

There is a need for the development of greenfield land and indeed the RSS has a percentage of new housing expected to be built on sites which have not been previously developed. The draft PPS3 is now placing a changing emphasis on the selection of housing sites. The question now is one of availability, viability and suitability. This has abandoned the sequential test put forward within PPG3 and has therefore adjusted the weight to be attached to the previously developed land preference. Although brownfield sites will be preferred under the point of suitability, this does not lead to a preclusion of greenfield sites. The draft PPS3 approach places greater emphasis on those sustainable locations which are nearby good transport links and key local services and amenities. The increase in provision of town centre urban living is one way in which to achieve this. However, the use of additional housing to create sustainable locations which support local services should also be recognised. Increased accommodation in more rural settlements can help to support key local services such as post offices and primary schools. With Waverley as a brownfield site, the possibility for developing a new community should in any case see the interest in such a major redevelopment site be increased. The increase in higher densities of housing provision should not be made so restrictive as to preclude the Council’s ability to provide a range of housing types and tenures. Need to retain family accommodation and people within the Borough mean a broader provision of housing should be provided. An up-to-date housing market needs survey identifying the level and type of need for different areas is required. Concern that it may become uneconomic for the land to be developed for housing and need to ensure that sites are deliverable."

"See our comments about the role of the RSS and National Planning Policy. These choices are not real. Option A is not an option if tested against PPG3, PPS3 and the RSS. A cogent strategy will maximise the use of PDL, encourage urban living in the largest settlements and allow development on some Greenfield sites if they are more sustainable than the available PDL sites. No strategy should exclude private development from bringing forward appropriate sites within the HMRA by an over-reliance on the ability of the public sector to deliver within these areas. The funding for HMRA is limited to a 2 year event horizon, while your plan is to look forward for the next 15 years. We do not consider that Waverley is the appropriate choice for a major housing project given its poor relationship to the major urban areas in transport terms. We consider there are better sites available within the urban areas which relate to infrastructure and transport routes.”
193 "If it is demonstrated that Rotherham cannot accommodate its housing requirement within the urban area, it may be appropriate to allocate Greenfield sites outside the urban area. Some Greenfield sites may be in more sustainable, suitable locations. Whilst we recognise the need to regenerate the Pathfinder area we consider the best approach to take would be one of allowing a balance between renewing regeneration areas as well as building on undeveloped site. We do not consider that restraining growth outside market renewal and regeneration areas, as advocated in option C, is the correct approach to take."
195 "Highways Agency provided substantial comments regarding the creation of a new community at Waverley: Housing at Waverley is an issue for many reasons. From a transport perspective this will impact on the motorway network and the HA may have a view as the location will obviously be attractive to those planning to commute via the M18/M1. From a more local perspective we still await the decision on Rotherham's application for funds to build Waverley Link Road. The case for this scheme is made on relieving the congestion existing developments will cause when they are built out and does not consider the impact of housing being built on the remainder of the site. The immediate questions that spring to mind are; could the housing go ahead without the Waverley Link Road, what would be the impact on the local road network and is this a sustainable location for housing (public transport links are poor and the proposal to route supertram through the development is firmly off the agenda)? Comments from GOYH: the preferred option should be in accordance with current Government guidance and will need to reflect new PPS3 Housing when it is issued. The search sequence for housing allocations should fit the pattern of development in current or draft RSS. The scale and pattern of housing provision needs also to support Transform South Yorkshire’s Pathfinder HMR strategy (policies in draft RSS aim to achieve this)."
198 "Option C".

2.8 Tourism

10 "To ensure least damage/promotion of sensitive sites but encourage business and tourism through a more imaginative promotion strategy and campaign."
11 "Imagine a good friend from USA visits where would you take them in Rotherham? I rest my case where are the outstanding restaurants, theatres, stunning scenery (un-vandalised) conference facilities etc face it tourism in not really on our agenda! leave it!"
26 "Consider the wishes of the owner."
34 "Develop green tourism opportunities. Reduce impact and offer of tourism by working in an integrated fashion with internal and external bodies to give a coordinated approach."
55 "The failure to keep Wentworth House as an amenity within RMBC control negates any stated concern, or interest in the promoting of tourism within the Borough."
62 "One off developments such as Yes or Magna should be encouraged for locals and tourists. Act as honeypot and near to transport links."
63 "Plans to promote tourism should involve only small impact on the environmental issues. Greater use of the canals for leisure and sensible routes for bridleways, cycleways and footpath development with consultation with local users would make a welcome change."
72 "But any new development should not harm the countryside or heritage assets."
81 "We have no specific preferred option however any opportunities for the promotion of tourism involving angling and other water-related recreation would be welcomed. It is possible that the northern rivers are still perceived as being polluted, although water quality has improved in recent years. It should be noted that valuable fisheries now exist there."
94 "Not for the Agency to answer"
101 "N/A"
106 "We would favour a continuation of the current position."
109 "A combination of elements of B & C?"
110 "Investigate the opportunities presented by inward tourism from Robin Hood Airport."
118 "A but there is considerable concern over lawlessness in the wider countryside. Encourage the Police to treat rural crime equally with urban crime."
126 "Promote tourism sites that are outside Rotherham as well."
138 "See 1.6"
141 "Tourism is a pipe dream and a distraction for Rotherham. Who the hell wants to come here when they could go to the Peak District, etc. Resources used developing tourism infrastructure better spent elsewhere."
142 "If successful in developing as a "green city" then this becomes more attractive to tourists"
151 "Very difficult to market this area for tourism. Good luck!"
154 "Mix of C + A Magna needs to be promoted as regional and national significance as does the YES project and Chesterfield Canal."
165 "A blanket polity is difficult here. We could do much to promote increased responsible use of the Roche Valley but the site on its own offers limited scope for development because of the SSSI's and listed and scheduled sites. Cases really do need to be considered on their merits with local consultation as a key driver."
177 "Option A"
184 "Business tourism / transport links first, rest should then follow."
185 "Want a vision with clarity of "design requirements" and quality aligned to "market realism. Plus clarity of how things will be developed and by whom ie work with the Town Centre Renaissance Vision but do it on a flexible basis "breaking up" plots/zones of activity so that local businesses can participate, looking after those who are disadvantaged and requiring the larger developer to work with local supplies."
186 "A,B and C"
187 "A balance of all"
188 "Development should be sustainable and not damage that which people come to see. Promoting what is specific to Rotherham / South Yorkshire should be considered."
191 "British Waterways vision is ‘that by 2012 we will have created an expanded, vibrant, largely self-sufficient waterway network used by twice as many people as in 2002. It will be regarded as one of the nation’s most important and valued national assets. Visitors will be delighted with the quality of the experience and as a consequence many will become active participants’. As multi functional assets, one role of which is act as a leisure and tourism facility we trust that the waterways of Rotherham, assisted by the policies of the LDF will be able to contribute to achieving the vision.”
"Ancillary facilities for business parks such as hotels and other leisure facilities will encourage business tourism in the borough."
"In Town Team we said there should be a major tourism attraction on Forge Island."

2.9 Rural Economy

3 "would love to have local farmer markets where healthy green foods available. Should also encourage less packaged food and food miles."
10 "Need to adopt imaginative projects to support and supplement the rural economy."
11 "Bio diesel? Carbon neutral boilers?"
13 "Encourage local farmers and small holders to promote the sale of locally grown food and farmer's markets."
23 "Greater emphasis on local shops selling local produce. More farmer's markets and therefore less need to buy foreign rubbish at Tesco, etc."
30 "Leave green belt alone"
34 "Farming is suffering hard times and many farmers need to diversify. Development needs to be sympathetic to its location. I have great sympathy with farmers but approving developments to improve the rural economy must be in keeping with its surroundings and sympathetic to its location. Encourage eat the view schemes and better food labelling through council policies and support Council to use locally sourced food. Encourage local food provision."
55 "All decisions will demonstrate the active interest in improving, sustaining and protecting the rural economy."
59 "Alternatives to farming could lead to more movements of people and consequently traffic from home to work with inevitable infrastructure becoming under pressure and then a spiral of development to meet demands"
60 "Needs to include: protecting existing rural communities."
63 "More emphasis on the views of those who live in rural areas (and workers in the greener parts of the borough). This might result in services they require rather than ones other people think they need."
81 "We have no specific preferred option however the promotion of fisheries as a rural economy would be welcomed."
101 "N/A"
104 "GO BACK TO 2.3: THE LAND WOULD BE PUT TO GOOD USE AND NOT HARM THE ECONOMY."
118 "C"
134 "YW owns 70,000 acres of land, of which 50,000 is non-operational. This is used for a variety of farming and leisure uses e.g. shooting, fishing and sailing. Whilst the land is not in operational use, careful management is required in order to contribute towards the protection of the natural environment, particularly the quality and quantity of ground and surface water resources."
154 "Energy crops and introduction of wood fuel boilers in public and commercial buildings."
165 "Are there really three options here? The hundreds of rural acres in the Borough need sensitive but practical support. New technology offers alternative employment in rural areas subject to 'virtual' infrastructure. Buildings may offer scope for sensitive adaptation. (A farmer's wife in N Yorks sells outsize bras to fat ladies from a former barn)"
175 "Affordable Housing in rural areas important."
177 "Option C"
184 "Farming rural communities will disintegrate if none agricultural opportunities are not encouraged and permitted."
191 "Inland waterways can provide much needed employment and a focus for tourism. Small businesses in waterway settings, marinas, and waterway-based tourism provides vital support for rural shops, post offices and pubs."
198 “Option C”.

2.10 Utility infrastructure

10 "Need to ensure utilities are in place to meet developments but not to the cost of health of the individuals within these communities."
11 "grey water!"
13 "To achieve and maintain a high standard of good health for the whole population provision of a reliable supply of clean water, with sufficient pressure and provision of adequate sewers and changes is essential. Has this been taken into account when planning permission has been granted for conversion of single properties to multiple occupations where high density living accommodation has been allocated to replace one dwelling. Provision should also be made for the increase in visitors to town."
26 "Maintain current approach and underground services where ever possible."
59 "Outside existing urban area developments should not be beyond the capabilities of existing infrastructure in order to prevent excessive development and its consequences."
73 "Unable to reach a decision on such an involved supply of resources."
81 "Option B is our preferred option. We would expect development to be discouraged in areas where there is no spare capacity in the existing sewerage or where there is a proliferation of non-mains foul drainage disposal."
87 "If the focus is on the town centre and urban area enhancements of infrastructure can be co-ordinated and planned in a positive manner."
101 "N/A"
102 "Utilities should be developed on a planned managed basis to meet the planned growth of the targeted or selected areas of Rotherham district."
118 "B"
126 "Planners should ensure that sewers are in place BEFORE building of any property is allowed. They should not approve the installation of any septic tanks in Maltby after the construction of a house is underway."
134 "YWS suggested option: Development should be directed to areas with spare capacity. Development in areas without current capacity should be phased to allow for the necessary infrastructure and capacity to be created. Public amenity and health should be protected, from both new utility infrastructure and the siting of new development."
139 "However, this should not prevent the development of alternative power generators, such as wind farms"
142 "Adequate water supplies likely to be an increasingly important issue."
154 "ICT connectivity needs to keep pace/catch up with, other regions."
165 "How can there be one policy for all this lot? 1. Without good drains, sewer and clean water and sewage treatment sites we all die. These are vital. 2. Maybe we can reduce the impact of electricity transmission on the environment by promoting local green schemes. 3. Phone networks would stimulate usual business but we don't really need mobile masts in rural areas."
177 "No opinion"
184 "Current position plus intelligent use of opportunities available."
188 "2nd preference is B".
198 “Options A & C prefer A but with a high concern for health and environment”.

2.11 Mining and Quarrying

3 "We must improve services for recycling where ever it helps to reduce CO2 emissions."
11 "where does all the recycled paper, tin and glass go? Why can't we use it locally? Need the jobs, no problems with reopening mines if the environment protected."
13 "Protect known reserves of coal and stone. Enforce the recycling of demolition waste."
23 "Encourage people to recycle by only emptying the grey bin fortnightly. Follow Glasgow's example - need more plastic recycling depots."
31 "Without the past and the present we would not be looking to a future. Reserves from the past eg coal should be reserved in case it is necessary to call on them at some stage in the future."
34 "Do not fully understand option C, does it mean that new quarries will be used to provide places to dump waste? Quarrying ok under strict environmental codes and where schemes to substantially enhance biodiversity and amenity provided. Needs to be linked to measures to reduce waste and improve efficient use of resources."
35 "More recycling of building waste should be a priority when redeveloping sites and should also carry incentives - this would reduce un-necessary landfill of reusable materials."
55 "New and/or extended developments in both mining and quarrying will be approved,"
101 "N/A"
109 "A combination of elements of B & C?"
118 "B"
128 "There will be a demand for both primary and recycled aggregates and thus option b provides a balanced position."
145 "No comment"
154 "Try to avoid development which requires the transport of materials over long distances eg marble from China or Italian stone etc."
165 "Brick clay workings has not been interested in Maltby in recent years. You may know better than I do! The reserve of clay is important. At Maltby we also have an integrated system where colliery waste fills quarries from which limestone is extracted. The scheme bridges Rotherham and Doncaster. We need a policy which will use this opportunity to best advantage then ensure the site is restored."
177 "B"
184 "Recycling to be fully encouraged and promoted but better use of local rather than Indian/Chinese reserves."
188 "2nd preference is B"
198 “Option C".
2.12 Waste Management

1 "Encourage use of recycling centres by making them more accessible and user friendly thereby reducing fly-tipping"
3 "Facilities much needed for removing/recycling household appliances in a 'green way' - initiatives to recycle household appliances to avoid landfill."
10 "Need to optimise regarding opportunities and build on the good initiatives already in place within the Borough."
11 "Incinerate - use energy from domestic waste can go the bio-diesel and willow field sites."
23 "Community composting centres and more local depots for disposing of plastic waste - a major source of concern."
26 "Encourage creation of less waste and support new waste management solutions match financial penalties to discourage tipping with better services to cope with fly tipping and prosecutions."
34 "Need greater fiscal regulation to prevent waste being created and encourage recycling."
62 "waste is a raw material with great potential for re-use/recycling. Job opportunities."
81 "There is little to choose between the three options although Option C is arguably the most aspirational. In general we would expect the foundations of any waste policy to be built on the principles of the waste hierarchy in accordance with PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management. The waste hierarchy prioritises the order in which waste should be dealt with. Firstly, efforts should be made to eliminate the waste produced at source, avoiding all management and disposal problems. If waste materials have to be disposed of, the quantity of these materials should be minimised to reduce the quantity being created and thrown away. If creating waste is unavoidable, methods of reusing the waste should be explored, or finding someone else who could use it. The recycling of waste materials comes next, which also has the benefit of creating new materials with which to work. Disposal is the least favoured option, and therefore lies at the bottom of the waste hierarchy. Valuable materials are either buried in the ground at landfill sites, or burnt at incinerators. It is important that these principles are given due consideration."
94 "Combination of B & C"
108 "Make disposing of waste easier. Don't penalise people for getting it wrong just encourage them for trying to do it right!"
118 "C"
126 "Replace blue boxes and blue bags with a green bin to prevent injury to people having to lift them to the curb side."
141 "Option C but with focus also on waste reduction"
145 "No comment"
165 "Are there really three policies here we need to increase our capacity to recycle and reuse 'waste' but we also need to reduce waste. National legislation is required. We also need to continue to tip until better approaches are available."
177 "B"
184 "Mix of above, take care not to put our manufacture at a significant competitive disadvantage."
195 "Guidance in PPS10 is clear that waste planning authorities should identify in the LDF sites and areas suitable for new and enhanced waste management facilities, in support of the apportionment set out in RSS. The Core Strategy should identify how the Council will designate areas for future
major waste facilities – whether in Rotherham or shared with other Districts. The Council should also consider the need that may arise for the identification of smaller facilities within its area to be identified in a Site Allocations DPD. "Option C".

Section 3 - NATURAL RESOURCES

3.1 Efficient use of land

1 "Less parking spaces is not viable the car is here to stay!"
3 "Brownfield sites should be derelict/wasted areas reclaimed land and not back garden brownfield site. All new housing must be energy efficient."
10 "New developments need to be evaluated against the benefits to the existing community e.g. jobs, health, shops, facilities needed locally."
13 "Except the reduction of parking spaces."
23 "Definite need for more regulations / covenants on the number of cars per household. Otherwise side streets and estates end up full of vehicles."
26 "Enable the consideration of schemes on individual merit."
34 "Ensure biodiversity valuable areas are maintained. Encourage walking and cycling. Provide accessible green space and encourage links to footpath network."
55 "Existing settlements are to be strengthened, supported by enhancing the local preferences and championing the interests of the local community."
62 "Not all brownfield sites are still derelict, valuable habitats / amenity land for local communities. No public and new parks are being created in the 21st C."
71 "not sure"
75 "Should also include suitable Greenfield sites."
76 "To seek to focus all new development on brownfield sites irrespective of their location, or sustainability credentials, will not contribute to the creation of sustainable communities. The appropriateness or otherwise of, of identifying sites for development should be considered against a series of criteria, including i) whether the site is previously developed, ii) the viability of the proposed use on the site, iii) the proximity of the site to associated services and facilities, and iv) the ability of the site to contribute to the retention and enhancement of existing facilities."
77 "Priority should be given to making the best use of existing urban land and existing urban developments."
81 "We have no specific preferred option we would expect to see evidence of the sequential test in relation to flooding for any sites considered for development. In general, we welcome concentrating development on brownfield sites as it can help to make the best use of existing services such as transport and waste management. It can also encourage more sustainable lifestyles by providing an opportunity to recycle land, clean up contaminated sites, and assist environmental, social and economic regeneration. It also reduces pressure to build on greenfield land and helps protect the countryside. However, some brownfield and derelict land can represent important wildlife habitat, public green space or a core part of urban green networks. These are important in providing good quality of life, and brownfield reuse must strike an appropriate balance in the interests of sustainable development."
3.2 Reducing harmful greenhouse gasses

3 "All initiatives must be energy efficient and discourage waste of energy. All homes should be converted to reduce waste of gasses."
10 "RMBC need to promote renewable energy usage otherwise it will never be adopted."
11 "At last we can sensibly welcome nuclear power: systems must be on clean recyclable basis. Technology allows for "no waste" option."
13 "Encourage awareness of building used by the public, banks and building societies to reduce the minimal temperature during winter periods and encourage their employees to wear warmer clothing during this time. At present may employees wear the same amount of clothing in summer and winter. Even 1 degree lower would reduce fuel consumption."
14 "if the costs are not ridiculously high"
19 "Substantially increase energy from renewable sources. Increase energy efficiency on all new buildings and look at ways of improving old builds."
23 "Major increase needed here. Building companies need to be regulated to ensure that they are using energy efficient materials from renewable sources."
31 "Grants should automatically be available if projects are to lead towards more energy efficient solutions."
52 "Support C but should also include compulsion"
57 "A major resource of CO2 is emitted from high flying aircraft. This causes a greenhouse effect on the stratosphere"
60 "Combine B & C, requirements for new builds (home or industry) should be stricter. Renewable sources should be encouraged if effectiveness is proven and overall add gain to local community. Support initiatives to encourage change in individuals."
62 "Might need to revisit old technologies coal/nuclear but in less harmful ways."
81 "Option C is our preference. It is widely acknowledged that climate change is the biggest threat to our environment. It is absolutely essential that through planning, we reduce our impacts on climate change, and make sure that we adapt to its potential effects. More aspirational requirements for energy efficient buildings and sustainable design and construction would make a positive and cumulative impact on reducing CO2 emissions. The implementation of renewable energy schemes in appropriate locations would help contribute significantly to reducing emissions. It is important to encourage such schemes on a range of scales, right down to small domestic installations. It is also important to be aware that climate change may increase the frequency and intensity of rainfall events, which could lead to increased severity of flooding. It is important that new development is discouraged in areas at potential risk from flooding and that new developments incorporate sustainable drainage techniques which may help to alleviate flooding elsewhere."
101 "N/A"
106 "This drive for increased energy from renewable resources should be accompanied by a requirement that any renewable energy schemes are appropriate in terms of their impact on the landscape and buildings and that buildings constructed using sustainable construction are appropriate."
109 "A combination of elements of B & C?"
118 "C plus encourage new housing to develop energy resources from solar power."
137 "Raise the profile of the energy advice team, support them to extend their affordable warmth work."
165 "Explore the production of local green energy. Apply common sense. Don't go wild but encourage a few good schemes and build on that. Energy conservation is vital. Have a policy which encourages people to wear thicker knickers! Warm clothes save energy (but seriously lifestyle affects energy consumption)."
184 "Of World / National importance. Minimise additional detriment to industry. Ultra vires sort National / International policy out first."
188 "2nd preference is B. It's probably as well to do these things when there is sufficient time to think them through rather than at the last minute."
195 "The preferred option should be in general conformity with RSS and reflect Government guidance in PPS22. Subject to the Secretary of State’s consideration of RSS, the preferred option will need to reflect Policy ENV5 B (i) in draft RSS in respect of the South Yorkshire target."
198 "Option C".

3.3 Sustainable locations

3 "Wherever possible encourage initiatives to reduce car travel especially in local areas."
10 "Need to link transport and jobs. Need to promote job opportunities within and around existing communities."
11 "Town Centres dying make them the villages with mixed and active communities."
26 "A combination of A, B & C will be required if future development is to meet target levels."
57 "combination of B & C"
62 "UDP proposal still relevant"
75 "Option B should be expanded to include individual sites, which assist in meeting the Council’s regeneration objectives."
81 "We have no specific preferred option. The location of any new sites should be informed by your Sustainability Appraisal, and in respect of flooding, by your SFRA."
101 "Where development has the potential to increase passenger numbers, or has reliance upon rail transport in any TA, the developer should contribute towards enhanced passenger facilities."
108 "For example - there is hardly any spare land in Swinton so unless the greenfield areas are used Swinton is full. To expand greatly would also spoil the area."
110 "Also adjacent to main public transport corridors or rail stations."
118 "C"
126 "Improve public transport to all areas including Doncaster and Nottinghamshire from Maltby to reduce the use of car travel to employment."
137 "option b and c- improving transport networks in rural areas and working with employers to make them green transport friendly"
142 "Access to cycle lanes and footpaths also worth noting."
145 "The strategy should seek an appropriate balance, avoiding unsustainable, large scale expansion of settlements but allowing small scale development, well related to settlement boundaries, including on appropriate greenfield sites adjacent to the Borough's smaller settlements"  
151 "difficult to decide until growth track of car is reversed"
165 "sustainable communities need good public transport in all directions cross border issues subject to this, a blend of B & C"
173 "The objective to see a reduction in car travel by using locations that are viable and accessible is not pro-active. None of the Options put forward are sufficient to allow those areas of Housing Market Renewal and the outlying settlements to be supported in the face of decline."
180 "Option C as long as it doesn't involve demolition of existing buildings."
184 "Encourage B & C, but accept A in preference to doing nothing."
186 "B & C"
187 "A balance of all"
2nd preference is C
None of the options put forward are sufficient to allow those areas of HMR and the outlying settlements to be supported in the face of declining populations. In outlying settlements and more rural areas, additional accommodation to support local services and schools can help to reduce the number of car journeys made on a daily basis. The school run and convenience shopping, if in a local area and easily accessible, can provide an alternative to driving to a key service centre on a daily basis. The opportunity to provide for development opportunities to enhance sustainability has not been recognised within any of these options and must therefore be seen of falling short of the objective.

We would be concerned if a policy were to be introduced that placed significant constraints on the provision of facilities outside of the main urban areas which may be needed to enhance the waterways in Rotherham. This may include development associated with the further restoration of the Chesterfield Canal.

There may be instances where out of centre development may be appropriate. There may be the opportunity to provide park and ride facilities in these locations. Out of centre locations can be accessible by bus.

Issues 3.3 and 3.4 Sustainable locations and sustainable travel The preferred option should be in general conformity with RSS and reflect Government guidance, including PPS1 and PPG13, which encourage development in sustainable locations, which are accessible by a choice of means of transport.

Option B+. Emphasis on town centre development.

3.4 Sustainable travel

Definitely C
Need to develop rail and canal option for freight movements.
Yes hit the targets for cycle ways but I won't use the road ones - would you!
Short term free parking near the town centre would be attractive to car users and would encourage people to use the town centre more often.
Try to introduce a river or canal bus that can bring you into town avoiding Parkgate
Sustainable transport choices but without road pricing. RMBC car loan scheme? for their services, promote incentives not to use cars
Encourage school kids to cycle by running cycling proficiency schemes and more walk to work/school schemes.
reduce fares
Only a masochist would use a cycle in Rotherham. Do you really want to overload the coronary unit in Rotherham Hospital! Half the population would be dead within a week. Good business for Funeral Directors!!
Option C/B. Fiscal measures penalising road use must be countered by intelligent, quick provision of services allowing easy access to services and safe travel especially out of peak hours. Public transport is substantially slower around Rotherham for journeys I do regularly (eg work, nursery, home).
Don't forget the under used railways (the old road for instance).
Road pricing must be assessed to consider impact on small villages - already used as rat-run to avoid congestion. Traffic calming schemes need to be part of the plan.
62 "Encourage existing use of public transport by cheaper fares and reliability."
64 "Please remember disabled, travellers on foot, bus and car and car parking. Train, taxis community transport, dropped kerbs for wheelchair users and mobility scooters."
75 "The map for Option B shows the provision of Park and Ride sites at motorway junctions, including J33 at the request of the SYPTA. Concern that there may be a clash between activities already granted planning permission and proposals for Park and Ride on some sites."
77 "Option B should also refer to improving public transport to other major shopping destinations, as well as town centres."
78 "But no super tram."
81 "We have no specific preferred option however Co2 emissions from transport are a significant factor in air pollution and the resultant climate change. Your Sustainability Appraisal should help to guide your choice of option."
101 "Combination of B and C. Car parking at stations should be protected (not reduced), with increased capacity where possible."
102 "Option C is the favoured option but could also include elements of option B i.e. park and ride facilities."
108 "The emphasis on cycle walking lanes is ridiculous unless undertaken on a Sunday afternoon. Time and distance constraints are such that the roads have to be maximised unless the council supports the return of the 2 pence fare."
109 "A combination of elements of B & C?"
118 "B"
126 "Improve public transport to all areas including Doncaster and Nottinghamshire from Maltby to reduce the use of car travel to employment."
137 "option b, but also wider promotion of road safety training to encourage use of greener transport."
145 "Option B is favoured, but the reality is likely to be a continuation of the status quo"
151 "C is best of the three but very difficult to achieve"
157 "Do not reduce rural bus services"
165 "We need to accept that the topography of the Borough ensures that cycling will never be an obvious option. Bus and walking needs to be encouraged but we have to accept that rural communities and the centres that serve them need to provide for cars. New transport schemes might also be encouraged. Better cross border co-ordination needed."
177 "Should not use punitive measure to dissuade car use. If public transport is safe, clean, and affordable people will use it again. Park and Ride may be useful."
184 "Do best within National straight jacket. Education of public / nation at all levels first priority. Tolls / road pricing will further decimate UK manufacturing."
187 "A balance of all"
188 "I am appalled by Option A. 2nd preference is therefore B."
191 "See also our comments on issue 2.5"
195 "Issues 3.3 and 3.4  Sustainable locations and sustainable travel  The preferred option should be in general conformity with RSS and reflect Government guidance, including PPS1 and PPG13, which encourage development in" sustainable locations, which are accessible by a choice of means of transport."
"Combination of A and B. More car travel plus road schemes BUT promote public transport and concessions as well."

"Option B. Encourage use of smaller vehicles that take up less parking spaces and reduce emissions (electric buggies, motorised cycles for commuting)."

**3.5 Water Management**

"Risk of flooding particularly affects some areas of Rotherham. Need some quick and some long-term environmentally friendly solutions."

"New buildings of all types should be designed to collect rainwater and use it for flushing lavatories."

"Maintain current position."

"Not sure exactly what is meant by comprehensive new approach to management of water catchments but take it to be a reference to the requirements of the Water Framework Directive. Need to insist on better schemes for water balancing facilities to optimise their benefits for biodiversity and amenity. Links with the need to insist on better design for development site layout and ensure developers give it a higher priority in schemes and do not just tag it on at the end."

"Accelerate the introduction of water meters."

"Water needs to be conserved for drinking along with flood prevention."

"We welcome the sentiments of both Options B and C. In summary, we welcome a holistic approach to water management. Development should ideally be located in areas with access to existing supplies of water and sewerage. Buildings should incorporate water efficiency measures such as rainwater harvesting and grey-water recycling. Developments should make wider use of Sustainable Drainage Schemes with a presumption for their use. The wider benefits of the techniques such as flood prevention, pollution control, habitat creation and amenity enhancement should be publicised and optimised. We endorse the efficient use of water, especially in new developments. It is possible that such developments could take economic advantage of the technologies and they should be given due consideration. Wide spread use of these and other technologies that ensure efficient use of natural resources could support the environmental benefits of future proposals and could help attract investment to the area. In formulating your policies you should be aware of the Environment Agency’s Catchment Flood Management Plans and Flood Risk Management Strategies, your Strategic Flood Risk Assessments, the Water Framework Directive and the draft PPS25. These documents can be used for informing and justifying the decisions you make."

"Not for the Agency to answer"

"A combination of elements of B & C?"

"Promotion of water saving schemes, water butts"

"Planning and building regulations should be adjusted as necessary to encourage "green roofs" on new and existing buildings"

"As well as flood defence work, we must prevent housing development in flood plains so we don't have a repetition of Nov 2000."

"In view of the rate that the ice caps are melting, we need to make water management a national priority. Climate change, higher sea levels and more extreme weather events are on the cards. God help us!"
"Flood risk becoming a bigger issue."
"c but don't know much about it."
"Soup of above within funding / opportunities available. If substantial area released for development it should fund / enable the infrastructure improvement in that area."
"Doesn't the Water Framework Directive answer this one?"
"British Waterways supports the promotion of sustainable urban drainage systems"
"The preferred option should be in general conformity with RSS and reflect Government guidance in PPG25 and draft PPS25 when it is issued."
“Option C.”

3.6 Safeguarding natural raw materials

3 "Definitely C"
10 "Need to act quickly to ensure the infrastructure is in place to promote waste minimisation and recycling availability."
11 "what natural or raw materials in Rotherham?"
13 "Provide facilities for recycling for people who do not own a car."
19 "saying B at the moment move to C"
34 "Need to work together with other measures to encourage this aim."
59 "B is closest but I am opposed to ‘targets’"
62 "There is gold in them there waste mountains! And jobs"
81 "We would encourage the approach of Option C as it is aspirational and positive. We would again highlight the importance of the waste hierarchy in this issue. There should be an emphasis on waste minimisation, followed by the reuse of materials, and finally the recycling of materials as secondary aggregates. Where new materials are required, developers should be encouraged to locate materials from local sources."
94 "Not for the Agency to answer"
101 "N/A"
118 "B"
140 "Link to design of housing - ensure it is easy and simple to recycle (e.g. enough space for storage etc.) Also recycling of plaster board is now possible."
145 "No comment"
147 "Be realistic"
165 "But option C requires legislation to make the supermarkets do their bit. (Returnable containers, loose fruit and veg, paper bags packaging cost displayed on products"
184 "Native wit required to maximise wealth of area without creating future problems."
195 "The preferred option should reflect Government guidance in PPS10. In the case of household waste, national targets relate to both the recycling and composting of this waste stream; other targets have been set for the use of alternative materials as aggregates, and for the recovery of municipal waste."
198 “Option B. “
4.1 Creating a strong community identity

3 "Hard measures must be implemented to encourage all communities to support a clean, vibrant and safe environmental identity for Rotherham."
10 "Need to promote community cohesion via planning for integrated communities and not segregated communities."
11 "Get our communities going so mixed vertical not horizontal eg 6.30pm youths only eg mini malls and public services included."
13 "Where developers do not find it economic to contribute towards improvements other funds should be available to ensure the best outcome from improvements."
23 "Greater use of parks in new development sites and more allotment sites!"
26 "Option C as amended/deleted. Remove sentence of "strong provision of all open spaces (across the Borough) and improvements funded by contributions from developers"."
34 "From the workshops it is apparent that all local space is important to people no matter what the condition. They may be opportunities to increase the biodiversity value of open spaces by relaxing the mowing regime allowing areas of scrub to develop, giving more structural diversity on site."
58 "Look at the designs of modular housing as used in parts of Japan."
60 "Any development in open spaces (eg windfarms) should contribute to local communities directly affected (as in Scotland)."
81 "We have no specific preferred option although we would support the provision and protection of open spaces which benefit the environment, recreation and biodiversity."
94 "Not for the Agency to answer"
101 "N/A"
106 "We would favour a mix of Options B and C. Whilst we support the promotion of high quality design across the whole of the Borough and the protection of (?)"
118 "B"
125 "Perceived improved design generally dictates higher selling prices ensuring that for the majority of people new housing is out of reach."
140 "Vital to move past the current designs of new housing which seem to be obsessed with no social interaction and designs based on the past - look to integrate communities"
142 "See comments above about advantages of building reputation as green city"
150 "RMBC should be pursuing a policy of recognising the new rights of common such as the registration of the open land at Brookhill /Thorpe Hesley as common land."
165 "Option C but accept that our exceptional wildlife (in places like Maltby) merits proper local authority support."
173 "The objective to see a reduction in car travel by using locations that are viable and accessible is not pro-active. None of the Option put forward"
177 "Community Safety should be paramount and designing out crime embedded in design."
180 "I am extremely suspicious of the term “contributions by developers”. This often turns out to be little more than a bribe by "big" developers it sweeps
away early buildings and replace them with formula constructions which leave all British towns looking the same. We don't want this."

181 "A & B selected. I would like to see some plans eg different ideas (temporary plans). This would give an idea of what we want and what would attract visitors and custom back into Rotherham. I want to see if the lovely thriving shopping centre that I knew a few years ago, a pleasure to shop in Rotherham without going to Sheffield etc - only going for a trip out. I hope I should see this."

188 "Option A sounds an unpleasant place."

190 "Substantial comments in email. Use of private development as a catalyst to investment. Quality of design and place to reflect the needs of an area and provide a mix of tenure and type of accommodation on offer. The design should seek to enhance where possible the character of the area. The potential for enabling development to result in a better quality of open space should not be confined to just informal urban green spaces. Relocation of formal spaces and recreational pitches may improve accessibility whilst redevelopment can secure long term maintenance of those retained portions of sports fields to a better standard. Housing Market Renewal Areas should be supported and Renaissance Towns initiative with positive approach to development proposals from private developers in such areas. The use of private development as a catalyst to investment will be an indicator of success in addressing those areas of decline."

191 "Substantial comments provided: In relation to waterside developments there is the need to employ a new approach to Waterside Planning & Design to unlock the added value of water. It is therefore:

1. Crucial to optimise added value of waterways themselves not just the waterside location
2. to exploit the multi-functional nature of waterways & waterspaces
3. to adopt a corridor wide approach
4. to look from water outwards as well as from land to water
5. to integrate land and water
6. to treat the waterway & environs as integral part of public realm

The result is the creation of a sense of place / destination. It is also important that the siting, configuration & orientation of buildings maximises views of water, generates natural surveillance of waterspace and encourages access to, along and from the water. Development which positively addresses the waterspace does not necessarily require all buildings to face the waterspace (i.e. sited parallel to the waters edge). Buildings that are sited with a side facing onto the water (i.e. sited perpendicular to the water) can often encourage greater access to and from the water, generate more long and oblique views of water from within the development. British Waterways would welcome the opportunity to engage with Council in the preparation of planning obligation policies, in the interests of securing joined up working across public sector."

198 “Option C. In the urban environment open spaces can be filled and new spaces created, but green spaces should be protected.”
4.2 Local Service infrastructure

3 "Rotherham needs to change from a "tacky" identity to a place to be proud of - more health and caring facilities, good quality shops alternative greenspace. Well kept parks and woods and healthy living - clean, safe and environmentally aware."

10 "Important to support communities by providing the facilities they require to thrive - without having to migrate elsewhere at times of the day. This will reduce car and transport usage and promote community identity and cohesion."

11 "Mini malls and super centres facilities and services including retail entertainment and sport?"

13 "Improve where not satisfactory as time passes."

19 "Ensure some facilities are available in all communities not dependant on bus routes/cars. Give each town something to offer their community which involves leisure. Take away the focus of super and just have good facilities for all."

35 "All estates should have local access to facilities after all we are supposed to promote healthy living!"

55 "To strengthen and improve facilities for local people."

64 "Some communities already feel isolated already. Maintained and improved services for all communities are needed for better inclusion not more isolation."

70 "Need to review provision e.g. libraries, swimming pools to the places with limited facilities."

81 "No comments."

101 "N/A"

108 "leisure in particular has suffered in the last 10 years. Again land is short and the closure of the swimming pools in certain areas not acceptable."

137 "provision of services needs to be based on need of community to ensure it is appropriate and therefore used."

141 "Mix of B and C. Daft to put a swimming pool in every village, but every estate or village needs access to health care, local shops, banking (not ATMs that charge), etc."

147 "Local Services ought to be available in all locations, we should work with our partners to achieve this"

151 "all communities need facilities, better financial management is needed to ensure that targets are available for these facilities"

165 "Health facilities are vital and must be accessible to all. All children need schools. Everyone needs to be able to buy food. Leisure services are desirable but not essential. Providing some open space that is accessible for exercise, people can survive without sport's facilities or may wish to access them with some travelling involved."

173 "Opportunities to make improvements in qualitative and quantitative terms to the leisure activities within the district may be achieved through the allowance of enabling development. Similarly access of these facilities to the benefit of the community could also be improved by the use of private development opportunities."

190 "Improvements in qualitative and quantitative terms to the leisure activities within a district may be achieved through the allowance of enabling development. Facilities for the benefit of communities could also be improved by private development opportunities."
"In terms of local infrastructure if our inland waterways are to remain open and accessible for navigation, we need to ensure that essential boat services and facilities continue to be available throughout the network. These services and facilities include for example boat repair and maintenance yards, marinas and slipways. It is therefore important for the LDF to safeguard commercially viable boatyards used in connection with water-based transport and recreation and other services used in connection with water based recreation (PPG 13 Annex B Para 12 refers). Additionally the policy should resist the loss of any commercially viable boatyard unless a clear case exists which justifies its loss or an alternative site is secured that is equally accessible & in a convenient location and would accommodate similar capacity."

"Option B. Small village communities may not welcome such facilities."

4.3 Local transport links

1 "Please stop wasting tax payers money on largely un-used cycle lanes. The money can surely be put to better uses eg greater subsidy of public transport."
2 "Transport must be eco friendly - quick and free shuttle services to all major services"
3 "Need an inclusive public transport infrastructure and system to be inclusive for all citizens including disabled and mobility impaired people."
4 "Could be very expensive - look how its done in the Netherlands!"
5 "Encourage use of Rail Service by the public - provide railway facilities for goods ie depots for goods to be delivered by rail to reduce road usage."
6 "reduce fares"
7 "People are not going to walk in this area maybe in Lincolnshire but not here. The population is made up of a much larger % of older people who cannot walk large distances because of years of hard toil in heavy industry!"
8 "Link with incentives for using public transport. It will be difficult to tempt people out of their cars; public transport needs to be more convenient. Much could be done to encourage walking; many roads in Rotherham are difficult to cross, especially for the infirm."
9 "For most people cycling/walking to work is not an option. This is a recreational pursuit only. Not a supertram - too expensive. Modern buses - Yes"
10 "More 'joined up thinking' no point in cycle tracks which suddenly end on busy roads."
11 "The recent introduction of local free travel has brought an increase of 20% in travel by concessionary pass holders - this should give us food for thought in aiming to improve use of local transport."
12 "No super tram."
13 "Perhaps the buses should be taken out of private ownership?"
14 "Option B is our preference although it should be amended to include the principles of Option C. It should be noted that Co2 emissions from transport are a significant factor in air pollution and the resultant climate change. The use of Co2-producing vehicles should be discouraged. Your Sustainability Appraisal should help to guide your choice of option."
15 "The potential for local rail services is as yet untapped. There are several possibilities to put rail services into many outlying communities. Both freight and passenger, both in street running and conventional."
16 "There should be a better transport links to different parts of the borough, e.g. Manvers and outlying areas."
108 "You can improve the public facilities without tying it to cycling and walking. The train system is quite good Swinton station is a success. Buses not so but then the roads are not great either!"
109 "A combination of elements of B & C?"
126 "Improve public transport to all areas including Doncaster and Nottinghamshire from Maltby to reduce the use of car travel to employment."
141 "Development of 'naked streets' where appropriate. Users must be involved in development of cycle and pedestrian facilities. It can't be left to the planners on their own. Cyclists should not be driven off the roads 'because there is a cycle route' which may be poorly designed, littered with glass, and not actually connect with (?)"
145 "Option B is favoured, but the financial realities are such that Option A will be the likely outcome"
151 "subs: line the form at people with relevant public transport"
165 "see comment at 3.4 - cycling is not to be considered on the same breath as walking. Option C but less emphasis on cycling facilities except in rural areas (where there are none)"
188 "2nd preference is B. Here it is necessary to be fair to everyone."
191 "The potential of the towpaths to be used as sustainable transport routes should be recognised."
198 "Option A. Cannot see how walking and cycling can be improved (e.g. cycle lanes on Moorgate / Broom Lane are useless) but public transport can be improved and subsidised more. For many the car is the only viable solution see also comments for issue 3.4."

4.4 Housing choice

9 "More private bungalows instead of apartment blocks for disabled and elderly people. The existing private sector is much in demand and therefore local prices have escalated."
10 "Greenfield sites should only be used where brownfield sites cannot creatively be used to meet the needs of the community at that moment in time. Need a fair system for allocation of affordable housing."
11 "mixed communities!"
13 "All housing should be built to be energy efficient to collect and use rainwater."
21 "Between B & C but excluding use of greenfield sites. As C but allow brownfield development in new places provided community infrastructure is included."
23 "Avoid greenfield sites"
34 "A rigorous test needs to be carried out to check that the most sustainable locations are being used. Any Greenfield use could be used to obtain substantial gains for biodiversity and improved local amenity. Consider providing a variety of housing types, joint ownership with the council etc to tackle housing problems in the area."
56 "Lifetime homes, extra care housing, sheltered accommodation bungalows rather than apartments."
57 "No compensation clause that allows developers to restrict the number of affordable housing."
58 "More houses for rent."
62 "Must be planned for."
63 "Not all brownfield sites e.g. Waverley site which has not had housing or any other buildings prior to open casting."
76 "Need to ensure that the option chosen complies with Circulars 06.98 and 05/05 affordable housing and planning obligations respectively. Negotiations on the level of the affordable housing, and other contributions, to be provided on individual sites should therefore be undertaken on a “reasonable” basis, taking into account the specific circumstances of each case."
79 "Building on existing gardens and using existing houses to build at increased density is simply not acceptable…"
81 "We have no specific preferred option. Again we would expect to see evidence of the sequential test in relation to flooding for any sites considered for development as employment, housing or other uses. See also comments re: issue 3.1"
101 "N/A"
102 "Some rural settlements have affordability problems and these should not be overlooked, affordable housing should…(?)"
108 "Do not use Greenfield sites they were put there for a purpose! Do not encourage developers to put cheap & (?)"
109 "A combination of elements of B & C?"
137 "to provide a wide range of housing and services in sustainable communities in areas which will have limited (?)"
140 "With developers being required to contribute as per option B and submit innovative, wellthought out designs."
141 "Greenfield sites may in some cases be preferable to brownfield where the brownfield site has been reclaimed ."
147 "We should stop the growth of large flats complexes and ensure better designs"
165 "Both B & C Brownfield where appropriate limited Greenfield development"
170 "Careful design aspects to both housing and multi-tenure properties. Ghetto type appearance not acceptable"
173 "The guidance in draft PPS3 and the requirements of emerging RSS12 will have to be taken into account in any policy."
177 "Housing should match demographics and affordable housing is imperative."
184 "Mix of above but minimise additional depletion of manufacturing."
190 "Provision of affordable housing, open space improvements and other community facilities will need to be on a sound basis and justified through up-to-date needs studies. Anything other than this robust assessment could be regarded as not being reasonably related to development and therefore regarded as an attempt to ‘buy planning permission’. The promotion of sites only within those sustainable communities once again misses the opportunity to improve the sustainability and long-term viability of those smaller settlements and outlying communities which may require greater levels of support for local services."
192 "Option A is not a real option on our reading of PPG1, PPG3, PPS 3 the RPG12 and the RSS. The recently approved circular of 05/05 sets out the requirement for affordable homes, relies on the authority being able to demonstrate a need."
193 "HBF believe it is appropriate to allow market trends to dictate the type and size of dwellings. This is likely to result in a natural mix of houses being delivered. The objective should be to create mixed and balanced communities, which means providing a range of house types to meet the full range of housing need and demand."
195 "The preferred option should be in accordance with current Government guidance and will need to reflect new PPS3 *Housing* when it is issued. Circular 01/2006 states that core strategies should set out criteria for the location of gypsy and traveller sites which will be used to guide the allocation of sites in the relevant DPD. These criteria will also be used to meet unexpected demand. We understand that a South Yorkshire-wide needs assessment is being carried out which should provide a basis for policy direction. The Core Strategy should indicate how the authority intends to incorporate any additional sites through the allocations DPD and to what timescale."

198 “Option C.”

4.5 Areas of Low housing demand

3 "Regeneration of these houses to improve identity."
10 "Need to ensure employment opportunities are included as an aspect featuring all housing renewal programmes."
13 "All housing should be built to be energy efficient and to collect and use rainwater"
19 "Still keep good quality houses - old properties."
52 "with some exceptional design quality demonstrator projects, do not have segregated communities no walled developments"
58 "see 4.1"
79 "Renewing areas in decline would be a positive step for the borough"
81 "We have no specific preferred option. Full consideration should be given to the flood risk of these areas and whether it is desirable to continue to place any such settlements at such risk. The issue can be considered through your SFRA."
94 "Not for the Agency to answer"
101 "N/A"
108 "We have to use all other areas for development so that greenfield sites are not encroached upon"
142 "Important to try to retain the historical character of villages and town centre and protect housing stock ...(?)"
165 "Depends on external resources. Don't know how much funding there is to play with"
170 "Design aspect is vital"
173 "Private sector development proposals in the HMRA should be supported where in a sustainable and suitable locations."
184 "Intelligent mix of above as appropriate."
188 "Option A - I think green space makes any area more attractive to live in."
190 "Private sector development in the HMRA should be supported where in a sustainable and suitable location and the project is deliverable. The use of public funding should act as a trigger in drawing new investment into the area and should be of a standard and quality that can overcome those obstacles to market housing delivery in such locations. The potential for mixed use opportunities should not be over looked in order to help update the sustainability of areas of decline and also to improve quality of life, service provision and job creation in these areas."
192 "Housing Sites in or adjacent to HMR areas should not be prevented from coming forward because it is our experience that clearance and re-building projects of the type envisaged by pathfinder can have a deleterious effect on an area by virtue of the uncertainty that is created and the extensive time that
goes by in putting together and delivering these housing schemes. We will strongly object to any policy that will hamper private sector development in or adjacent to these areas. How does releasing Greenfield sites in the HMRA sit with National Policy on the re-use of land?"
195 "See comments under issue 2.7"
198 “Option B. Too much intervention can damage communities.”
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### Planning Policy Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development</td>
<td>February 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS6: Planning for Town Centres</td>
<td>March 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas</td>
<td>August 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation</td>
<td>August 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS10: Planning for Sustainable Waste Management</td>
<td>July 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS11: Regional Spatial Strategies</td>
<td>September 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS12: Local Development Frameworks</td>
<td>September 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS22: Renewable Energy</td>
<td>August 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control</td>
<td>November 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Policy Guidance Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Date/Expected Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPG2: Green Belts</td>
<td>January 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG3: Housing</td>
<td>March 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG4: Industrial and Commercial Development</td>
<td>November 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG5: Simplified Planning Zones</td>
<td>November 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG8: Telecommunications</td>
<td>August 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG13: Transport</td>
<td>March 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG14: Development on Unstable Land</td>
<td>April 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG15: Planning and the Historic Environment</td>
<td>September 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG16: Archaeology and Planning</td>
<td>November 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation</td>
<td>September 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG18: Enforcing Planning Control</td>
<td>December 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG19: Outdoor Advertisement Control</td>
<td>March 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG20: Coastal Planning</td>
<td>September 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG21: Tourism</td>
<td>November 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG24: Planning and Noise</td>
<td>September 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG25: Development and Flood Risk</td>
<td>July 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary


Annual monitoring report (AMR): part of the Local Development Framework, the annual monitoring report will assess the implementation of the Local Development Scheme and the extent to which policies in Local Development Documents are being successfully implemented.

Area action plan (AAP): used to provide a planning framework for areas of change and areas of conservation. Area Action Plans will have the status of Development Plan Documents.

Community Strategy (CS): local authorities are required by the Local Government Act 2000 to prepare these, with aim of improving the social, environmental and economic well being of their areas. Through the Community Strategy, authorities are expected to co-ordinate the actions of local public, private, voluntary and community sectors. Responsibility for producing Community Strategies may be passed to Local Strategic Partnerships, which include local authority representatives.

Core Strategy: set out the long-term spatial vision for the local planning authority area, the spatial objectives and strategic policies to deliver that vision. The Core Strategy will have the status of a Development Plan Document.

Development Plan: as set out in Section 38(6) of the Act, an authority’s development plan consists of the relevant Regional Spatial Strategy and the Development Plan Documents contained within its Local Development Framework.

Development Plan Documents (DPDs): spatial planning documents that are subject to independent examination, and together with the relevant Regional Spatial Strategy, will form the statutory development plan for a local authority area for the purposes of the Act. They can include a Core Strategy, Site Specific Allocations of land, and Area Action Plans (where needed). Other Development Plan Documents, including generic Development Control Policies, can be produced. They will all be shown geographically on an adopted proposals map. Individual Development Plan Documents or parts of a document can be reviewed independently from other Development Plan Documents. Each authority must set out the programme for preparing its Development Plan Documents in the Local Development Scheme.

Front Loading: A phrase that denotes early consultation and decision making in the plan making process.

Generic development control policies: these will be a suite of criteria-based policies which are required to ensure that all development within the areas meets the spatial vision and spatial objectives set out in the Core
Strategy. They may be included in any Development Plan Document or may form a standalone document.

Issues and Options: produced during the early production stage of the preparation of Development Plan Documents and may be issued for consultation to meet the requirements of Regulation 25.

Key diagram: authorities may wish to use a key diagram to illustrate broad locations of future development.


Local Development Framework (LDF): the name for the portfolio of Local Development Documents. It consists of Development Plan Documents, Supplementary Planning Documents, a Statement of Community Involvement, the Local Development Scheme and Annual Monitoring Reports. Together these documents will provide the framework for delivering the spatial planning strategy for a local authority area and may also include local development orders and simplified planning zones.

Local Development Scheme (LDS): sets out the programme for preparing Local Development Documents. The first such schemes were submitted by 28 March 2005 by all Local Planning Authorities to the Secretary of State for approval.

Local Strategic Partnership (LSP): partnerships of stakeholders who bring together service providers, the private, community and voluntary sectors to identify and meet local needs more effectively and in a joined up way.

Local Transport Plan (LTP): 5-year strategy prepared by each local authority for the development of local, integrated transport, supported by a programme of transport improvements. It is used to bid to Government for funding transport improvements.

Preferred Options Document: produced as part of the preparation of Development Plan Documents and issued for formal public consultation.

Proposals map: the adopted proposals map illustrates on a base map (reproduced from, or based upon a map base to a registered scale) all the policies contained in Development Plan Documents, together with any saved policies. It must be revised as each new Development Plan Document is adopted, and it should always reflect the up-to-date planning strategy for the area. Proposals for changes to the adopted proposals map accompany submitted development plan documents in the form of a submission proposals map.
Regional Planning Body: one of the nine regional bodies in England (including the Greater London Authority) responsible for preparing Regional Spatial Strategies (in London the Spatial Development Strategy).

Regional Spatial Strategy: sets out the region’s policies in relation to the development and use of land and forms part of the development plan for local planning authorities. Planning Policy Statement 11 ‘Regional Spatial Strategies’ provides detailed guidance on the function and preparation of Regional Spatial Strategies.


Saved policies or plans: existing adopted development plans are saved for three years from the date of commencement of the Act. Any policies in old style development plans adopted after commencement of the Act will become saved policies for three years from their adoption or approval. The Local Development Scheme should explain the authority’s approach to saved policies.

Site specific allocations: allocations of sites for specific or mixed uses or development to be contained in Development Plan Documents. Policies will identify any specific requirements for individual proposals.

Spatial Planning: goes beyond traditional land use planning to bring together and integrate policies for the development and use of land with other policies and programmes which influence the nature of places and how they function. Spatial planning includes policies which can impact on land use, for example by influencing the demands on, or needs for, development, but which are not capable of being delivered solely or mainly through the granting or refusal of planning permission and which may be implemented by other means.

Statement of Community Involvement (SCI): sets out the standards which authorities will achieve with regard to involving local communities in the preparation of local development documents and development control decisions. The Statement of Community Involvement is not a development plan document but is subject to independent examination.

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA): a generic term used to describe environmental assessment as applied to policies, plans and programmes. The European ‘SEA Directive’ (2001/42/EC) requires a formal ‘environmental assessment of certain plans and programmes, including those in the field of planning and land use’.

Supplementary Plan Documents (SPD): provide supplementary information in respect of the policies in Development Plan Documents. They do not form part of the Development Plan and are not subject to independent examination.
Sustainability appraisal: tool for appraising policies to ensure they reflect sustainable development objectives (i.e. social, environmental and economic factors) and required in the Act to be undertaken for all local development documents.