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The Options…

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council is required by Central Government to prepare a new development plan - the Rotherham Local Development Framework. The Council has to prepare a Core Strategy in the first instance this will be the “spatial” vision for the Borough to 2021. It will assist in deciding what development is needed, where it should go and when it should happen. It is a statutory development planning document and the way it is prepared is set out by Central Government in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase act 2004.

This legislation has been looked at and the principles adapted for use by this Council in its Statement of Community Involvement “adopted” on the 14 June 2006 following public consultation; this has been considered by an independent planning inspector. The Statement of Community Involvement establishes the framework for consultation at each stage of the development planning process.

During the latter half of 2005, the Council prepared 30 strategic objectives that the emerging spatial vision should use as the basis for its policies. Subsequently three options, based on these objectives, were prepared. Following analysis of this consultation one of these options or mix of the 3 options (or any other appropriate suggestions) will be developed as the Core Strategy to guide the future development of the borough.

These options are:
Option A: responding to market forces – based on the minimum actions to achieve the best development and reduce activities that will harm the environment
Option B: matching needs with opportunities – to ensure balanced development through partnerships with the Council, developers and other public agencies
Option C: managing the environment as a key resource – support development whilst protecting the natural environment, dealing with climate change and contributing to “global well-being” – reducing the impact of development on the Earth.
The current position was also included this reflected the achievements of the Unitary Development Plan.

Respondents were encouraged to consider other options that the Council may not have considered and add additional comments or suggestions, including the needs of specific sites or settlements.

**Background to the Current Consultation...**
In November 2005 the 30 objectives were sent to the 100+ people on the informal “Front Loaders” database this includes Government agencies and other external people such as planning consultants, Parish Councils and key local groups. A number of key officers within the Council are also included on this mail list.

In February 2006 a workshop was held with this group of people to discuss the emerging options and the sustainability appraisal. Whilst the number of people who attended this event, appreciated the workshop approach to discussing the emerging options, it became apparent (from the number of external representatives), that further consultation was required to attract input from local communities and partners from the Local Strategic Partnership. It was agreed that, by working in partnership with colleagues in Neighbourhoods Programme area and the Chief Executives department, community representatives and traditionally excluded groups of people could be targeted.

A questionnaire based on the 30 objectives was prepared along with an accompanying leaflet that outlined the main ideas, the questionnaire was available to be completed on-line. This was then circulated to a variety of people and organisations outlined below, and a number of workshops were held throughout the Borough. The outcome of this recent community consultation is the purpose of this report.

The questionnaire was divided into four sections – Environment, Economy, Natural Resources and Social - and people were given a choice of four options (A, B, C, or their own) for each of the 30 issues:

The findings of this informal consultation stage (Regulation 25), held between the 15 May – 16 June 2006, will inform the more detailed “pre-submission” public participation draft of the Core Strategy consultation to be undertaken over a 6 week period in September 2006. To encourage people who would not normally get involved in this type of activity the chance to be entered into a £100 prize draw on completion of the questionnaire was used to promote the consultation process.

It is anticipated that the practice of community consultation undertaken at this early stage will be followed in the latter stages and a network of community and traditionally excluded representatives willing to be involved in the spatial planning process will continue to be supported and strengthened.
Who we consulted and how…
This Regulation 25 consultation was undertaken in the following way:

10 workshops established within the 7 Area Assembly areas with invites to community representatives. Officers of the Council’s Community Engagement Team, who are responsible for the Community Planning process, agreed the invitation list.

Workshops with communities of interest; people with disabilities, biodiversity forum, Rotherham Ethnic Minorities Alliance (Rema) and Rotherham Chamber were undertaken. Work is ongoing with the Voice and Influence officers within the Council to engage with young people over a longer period of time.

Given the complexity of the planning issues, language and concepts such as emerging options / spatial vision / Statement of Community Involvement etc. the workshops considered between 6 and 8 of the issues posed in greater depth. In selecting the questions for each workshop it was ensured that all the questions and issues were covered by the consultation process. It was also anticipated that by encouraging a round table discussion the participants would be able to complete a full questionnaire with knowledge arising from the discussion undertaken in the workshops. In analysing the information received it is apparent that around 22% of all respondents did not respond to all of the questions in each of the four sections.

Presentations were undertaken to the Community Strategy Theme Boards of the Rotherham Partnership and to the Chamber of Commerce, by lead officers of the Local Strategic Partnership and the Chamber with a request to complete the questionnaire and return to Forward Planning.

The LDF Steering Group discussed the consultation process and consultation material at its meeting on 28 April 06 (minute 131) and at its subsequent meeting on 26 May 2006 discussed a selection of the questions in a workshop type event (minute 138 refers). A Members Seminar was also held on the LDF on 8 March 06 and the emerging options, the subject of this consultation process.

All Councillors / parish council clerks and adjoining parish councils have received a hard copy of the publicity / consultation material. A letter has been circulated to (the front loaders club) key internal, governmental, and non governmental agencies operating in the Borough (approx. 100 people).

A questionnaire has been placed on the forward planning web page (along with supporting and background information). During the consultation period a clear link from the home page was made. A press release was prepared for insertion into local papers week beginning 15/05/06 but the article was not considered sufficiently exciting to include within local papers.

The wider public was not targeted and whilst they were not excluded from the consultation process, the lack of any publicity meant that the Council web site
and associated on line questionnaire was the preferred route for those not included within local community partnerships. The local libraries were briefed (via the head librarian) to assist people wishing to access the questionnaire on line. Any individuals requesting a hard copy of the questionnaire to complete were provided with one. The questionnaire is Web based, but given the target audience nearly 400 hard copies of the questionnaire were printed and circulated to various groups and individuals.

Community groups involved in the parish planning / community planning process were invited to one workshop event (sometimes two events were held in an area to reach all people involved in community planning activity). The number of representatives invited to each workshop is dependent on the event and the numbers that have previously been involved in other discussion events or community planning activities. Attendance at the community workshops were between 6 and 14 people.

Analysis of the results has been undertaken using Snap questionnaire software and all literal comments received on the Snap questionnaire have been included within a supplementary report. A summary of the significant planning information from the community workshop events is included within the full report. This information will feed into the drafting of the Borough’s Core Strategy. Copies of the notes of all meetings have also been placed in a supplementary document to accompany this report. This Summary of feedback and accompanying full and supplementary reports will be placed on the Council’s web site, and hard copies and email copies will be made available as appropriate.

Consultants (Fuller Peiser) have submitted representations on behalf of UK Coal owners of the Waverley opencast coaling, and reclamation site that is currently being restored. This representation assesses the proposal to create a sustainable new mixed community at Waverley against the Council’s 30 Core Strategy objectives and against the approved 22 Sustainability Appraisal objectives. The Council has considered this appraisal that is to be amended by Fuller Peiser in the light of the comments received. The Waverley appraisals will be considered as part of the emerging preferred option for the Core Strategy.

There were approximately 9 responses received (predominantly from consultants) where the respondent had either been unable to complete the questionnaire on line or provided a fuller written response. The contents of these letters have been assimilated into the analysis and have been retained as a hard copy within the Council.
Survey Results

Methodology
This report summarises the results of the Choices Questionnaire. A total of 197 questionnaires were completed (either ‘hard copy’ or electronically) – this sample size has a maximum standard error of +/- 6.98% at the 95% level of confidence.

As already noted the following are the options:
**Option A – Responding to Market Forces** – based on the minimum actions to achieve the best development and stop activities that will harm the environment.

**Option B – Matching Needs with Opportunities** – to ensure balanced development through partnerships with the Council, developers and other public agencies.

**Option C – Managing the Environment as a Key Resource** – support development whilst protecting the natural environment dealing with climate change and contributing to “global well-being” – reducing the impact on the Earth

The current position – the Unitary Development Plan was included for comparison.

Respondents were encouraged to consider other options that the Council may not have considered and add additional comments or suggestions, including the needs of specific sites or settlements.

As already noted a £100 draw was included to encourage response rates and personal details were collected to try and ensure that any sample was representative of the entire population. This gave a split between individual/organisation responses, different age groups, gender, disability and ethnic background.

A list of the questions from the Choices Questionnaire is shown in Appendix 1 to the full report.

A full listing of additional comments submitted via the Choices Questionnaire is included in a supplementary report.

Respondent Profile

Of the total 197 completed questionnaires 158 (80%) were from people representing the views of organisations or community groups with the remaining 39 (20%) representing individual viewpoints.
Not all respondents answered all the questions but encouragingly the lowest response for any question was 143 replies, or 72.6% of all respondents.

An equalities monitoring form was included at the end of the questionnaire and, although not all respondents completed this fully, it did allow an analysis of age, gender, disability and ethnic background.
RESULTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 1.1: Urban Renaissance</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>None of these</th>
<th>Not provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 10.7%</td>
<td>93 47.2%</td>
<td>28 14.2%</td>
<td>14 7.1%</td>
<td>41 20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 1.2: Green Belt</td>
<td>16 8.1%</td>
<td>69 35.0%</td>
<td>44 22.3%</td>
<td>23 11.7%</td>
<td>45 22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 1.3: Biodiversity</td>
<td>9  4.6%</td>
<td>53 26.9%</td>
<td>83 42.1%</td>
<td>8  4.1%</td>
<td>44 22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 1.4: Countryside and Landscape</td>
<td>10  5.1%</td>
<td>32 16.2%</td>
<td>96 48.7%</td>
<td>10  5.1%</td>
<td>49 24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 1.5: Historic Built Environment</td>
<td>17  8.6%</td>
<td>55 27.9%</td>
<td>75 38.1%</td>
<td>5  2.5%</td>
<td>45 22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 1.6: Countryside and Heritage Assets</td>
<td>9  4.6%</td>
<td>78 39.6%</td>
<td>67 34.0%</td>
<td>9  4.6%</td>
<td>34 17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 1.7: Control of Pollution</td>
<td>12  6.1%</td>
<td>44 22.3%</td>
<td>87 44.2%</td>
<td>9  4.6%</td>
<td>45 22.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base sample (total respondents) = 197

Environment Section - Summary of Responses

- Option A: 7%
- Option B: 31%
- Option C: 34%
- None of these: 6%
- Not provided: 22%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 2.1: Population and migration</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>None of these</th>
<th>Not provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents preferred option:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2.2: Modern Economy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2.3: Employment land</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2.4: Local Businesses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2.5: Transport and access to jobs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2.6: Town and Local Centres</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2.7: Land for new housing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2.8: Tourism</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2.9: Rural Economy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2.10: Utility infrastructure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2.11: Mining and Quarrying</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 2.12: Waste Management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base sample (total respondents) = 197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Section - Summary of Responses

- Option C: 33%
- Option B: 30%
- Option A: 9%
- None of these: 5%
- Not provided: 23%
### Section 3 - NATURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents preferred option:</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>None of these</th>
<th>Not provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issue 3.1: Efficient use of land</td>
<td>7 3.6%</td>
<td>65 33.0%</td>
<td>63 32.0%</td>
<td>17 8.6%</td>
<td>45 22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 3.2: Reducing harmful greenhouse gases</td>
<td>6 3.0%</td>
<td>38 19.3%</td>
<td>108 54.8%</td>
<td>4 2.0%</td>
<td>41 20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 3.3: Sustainable locations</td>
<td>5 2.5%</td>
<td>74 37.6%</td>
<td>67 34.0%</td>
<td>14 7.1%</td>
<td>37 18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 3.4: Sustainable travel</td>
<td>11 5.6%</td>
<td>91 46.2%</td>
<td>52 26.4%</td>
<td>10 5.1%</td>
<td>33 16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 3.5: Water Management</td>
<td>3 1.5%</td>
<td>35 17.8%</td>
<td>99 50.3%</td>
<td>7 3.6%</td>
<td>53 26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue 3.6: Safeguarding natural raw materials</td>
<td>1 0.5%</td>
<td>54 27.4%</td>
<td>85 43.1%</td>
<td>6 3.0%</td>
<td>51 25.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base sample (total respondents) = 197*
### Section 4 - SOCIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 4.x:</th>
<th>Respondents preferred option:</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
<th>None of these</th>
<th>Not provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating a strong community identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local transport links</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing choice</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of low housing demand</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base sample (total respondents) = 197

### Social Section - Summary of Responses

- Option A: 2%
- Option B: 28%
- Option C: 46%
- None of these: 3%
- Not provided: 21%
RESULTS: Summary

Although the majority of respondents who chose one of the given options went for predominantly options B or C the percentage varied greatly from question to question. Preferences for Option C varied between 20% and 72% and for Option B between 23% and 65%. The numbers choosing Option A also varied from as low as 1% to as high as 23%.
Key messages arising from the questionnaire and workshops...

The following is a brief summary of the key messages arising from the consultation exercise and a summary of the responses to the questionnaire. The main report provides comprehensive feedback and is available either on request or on the Council’s web site.

Questionnaire responses summary

In the overall summary of responses 6% of people supported option A, 30% option B and 37% option C this masks the variation of responses received to each issue. It is clear from the responses received that in drafting the Core Strategy due consideration will need to be had to each issue and the comments and responses received.

Section 1 - Environment

Respondents supported option B for issues 1.1 urban renaissance, 1.2 Green Belt and 1.6 countryside and heritage assets further details of the questions are included within Appendix 1.

Respondents supported option C for issues 1.3 biodiversity, 1.4 countryside and landscape, 1.5 historic built environment and 1.7 control of pollution.

However there was some support for Option A for each issue (overall 7%) this recognises that without the involvement of the private sector many of the new build proposals cannot be delivered. It is essential that the needs of the development industry are accommodated without detriment to the environment and global warming.

22% of all respondents didn’t answer questions in this section

Section 2 - Economic

Option B was supported for issues 2.1 population and migration, 2.4 local businesses, 2.5 transport and access to jobs, 2.6 town and local centres, 2.11 mining and quarrying (33%) however there was also considerable support for option C in this matter (32% support).

Option C was supported for issues 2.2 modern economy, 2.3 employment land, 2.7 land for new housing, 2.8 tourism, 2.9 rural economy, 2.12 waste management. Issue 2.10 utility infrastructure had 30.5% support for options B and C.

Support for Option A was particularly significant for issues 2.5 transport and access to jobs (supporting investment in road infrastructure to service a growing economy) and for issue 2.8 tourism. However there was support for Option A for each issue (overall 9%) this recognises that without the involvement of the private sector in developing and supporting the local economy many of the new build proposals cannot be delivered. New job creation proposals are instigated by the private sector. However it is essential that the needs of the development industry are accommodated without detriment to the environment and global warming.
23% of all respondents didn’t answer questions in this section

Section 3 – Natural Resources
Option B was supported for issue 3.1 efficient use of land (33%) although 32% of respondents selected option C. Issue 3.3 sustainable locations (37.6%) although 34% supported option C, 3.4 sustainable travel. Respondents supported option C for issues 3.2 reducing harmful greenhouse gasses, 3.5 water management, and 3.6 safeguarding natural raw materials.

There was little support in this section for option A – less than 6% of respondents supported option A under any one issue.

22% of all respondents didn’t answer questions in this section

Section 4 – Social
Option C was supported for issues 4.1 creating a strong community identity, 4.2 local service infrastructure, 4.3 local transport links, 4.5 areas of low housing demand.

Option B was only supported for issue 4.4 housing choice (36.5%) however 34% of respondent to this question also supported option C.

There was little support in this section for option A – less than 3% of respondents supported option A under any one issue.

21% of all respondents didn’t answer questions in this section

The following are the key messages arising from the workshop events and other feedback.

Vision
- Need for a clear vision, clarity and reality aligned to market realities. There is a need for flexibility on how things will be developed and delivered making every effort to involve local people and businesses.
- The approach in the Core Strategy should not neglect the more deprived communities, whilst we need to make provision for new development opportunities such as those promoted within Rotherham town centre we also need to protect the older established communities.
- It is essential that the emerging Core Strategy preferred option is in accord with the Regional Spatial Strategy and Central Government guidance contained in planning policy guidance and planning policy statements.

Heritage: Green Belt
- The loss of Green Belt gave cause for concern
Heritage: **Countryside and Landscape**

- Support for a comprehensive landscape assessment

- Further countryside caravan/ camping opportunities at Rother Valley, Ulley and Thrybergh Country Parks could be pursued but such new developments can give rise to environmental concerns. Careful management of these sites is essential and their potential for tourism should be carefully assessed and managed.

- Ethnic groups rarely use the country parks but Clifton Park is well used. Consideration needs to be given to encouraging the use of country parks by all ethnic groups.

Heritage: **Biodiversity**

- The Council’s promotion of economic development to the detriment of the environment needs to change and the balance of decision-making to be more sympathetic to wildlife. The council operates in an environment where other public bodies, such as Yorkshire Forward, also have a primarily economic remit.

- Will the proposals for the new Waverley development impact on local habitats reducing their quantity and quality?

- The design of new buildings should be environmentally friendly and support wildlife.

- How will habitats supporting bio diversity be maintained in the longer term?

- The need for proper management of wildlife areas is essential. Sensitive landscaping of new development sites is essential to provide natural habitats.

- Provide clear planning guidance to developers about the importance of bio-diversity and designing for it in new developments.

- Flexible policies should be considered to accommodate any increase in biodiversity on those sites that have remained vacant for a while.

**Transport**

- Improvements to public transport essential, more frequent, reliable, decent, cheaper, busses (and trains) that go to places and destinations we want to go to are required. Services are often untimely at weekends, evenings and on bank holidays. Bus services are totally unacceptable for many disabled and elderly people. Co-ordination of public transport is essential. There currently is a lack of cohesion in the provision of public transport. If congestion charges are introduced the money that is received should be used to substantially upgrade the current public transport network.
• The potential for new railway stations should be fully exploited to support a fully co-ordinated public transport network meeting the needs of passengers and freight.

• Parking for town centre employment on local residential side streets causes real problems for residents. Integrated transport solutions are required: consideration needs to be given to car sharing to reduce the need for parking and reduce the impact of car use on the creation of greenhouse gases.

• Rural areas should be well linked into jobs and other services and facilities.

• HGV movements around the Sheffield Airport Business Park have increased (600 – 900 HGV movements per day). If more development occurs on the Waverley site how much worse will this situation become? Also some people were against motorway widening because of the potential impact on local communities and the likely increase in pollution. However the business community felt that consideration should be given to off line motorway widening and the provision of ample car parking.

**Housing Choice**

• Understand where people want to live. Higher densities and the number of gardens being developed for new residential properties is causing concern amongst local people.

• The recent drive to provide apartments for people doesn’t recognise the needs of those who need to live in bungalows because of disabilities. Consideration was given to the need for lifetime homes and a variety and choice of housing to meet all needs. Also the increased land value associated with apartment blocks has driven up the price of existing bungalows (as these are not perceived by many developers as profitable to build). What could have been afforded two years ago is now beyond the price range of many.

• Need for new services and facilities to meet the requirements of all new residential developments, this was particularly raised with respect to the proposal for a new community at Waverley.

• It was reported that two key themes had emerged from the dialogue with the Local Strategic Partnership, and these were:-

  (i) Housing Market Renewal areas – the need to choose an option which did not prevent development in these areas.

  (ii) The impact of the options on vulnerable people in the voluntary housing sector.
Efficient Use of Resources: Mining and Quarrying

- No concerns were expressed (within Rother Valley South) about the expansion of existing quarries provided it was acceptable from an environmental and local resident amenity perspective.

Industry and Commerce

- A balance between small and large scale investors should be promoted within the Borough. There should be a variety of sites and opportunities for all industrialists and investors to sustain the local economy.

- Need to protect and sustain existing jobs but be flexible to respond to market changes and encourage new development and the re-skilling of existing communities. Need for a quota of quality local jobs for local people not just ancillary jobs and to generate enthusiasm from local people to work in the Advanced Manufacturing Park.

Retail and Leisure

- Hotel provision in Rotherham is limited. Rotherham is strategically located in the centre of the country and could support greater business tourism including supporting conferences and exhibitions.

- Need for local shops to be multi-cultural and to support the shopping needs of the ethnic communities. It is essential that communities blend together and that we promote multi-culturalism.

- Recognition that Rotherham town centre does not have a distinct centre and that activities are spread between the town centre and retail world.

Waste

- Improve education in this area

Sustainable communities

- Need to maintain services and facilities within local communities, including shops and post offices. The presence and expansion of the big supermarkets is killing off the smaller shops in the smaller town centres. Comprehensive approach to all district and local centres not just focussing on one or two specific ones. Shop owners and occupiers need to have a greater awareness of the needs of disabled people.

- If Waverley is developed it must have its own services and facilities.

- The cost of maintaining country parks (and greenspaces) is a cause for concern particularly where greenspace is requested as part of new residential development. Of particular concern is the creation of greenspace in the Green Belt at Waverley. How will the long term maintenance and care of this site be secured?
• Need to integrate, employment, services and facilities and new housing making these facilities available to all people including those with disabilities and without access to the private car. This would in the longer term lead to less commuting and reduce the creation of greenhouse gasses.

• Industry and housing need to be well related reducing the need to travel but need for substantial screening between different uses.

• Integrate development into the landscape. Support good planting schemes and open space within new developments. Protect open spaces – all greenspace is important to the people who live near to them.

• Need for buildings of high architectural design, and quality
• Need to support the development of staff to enable them to successfully negotiate with developers.

• Adequate infrastructure should be put in place when the developer is on site and not afterwards, a good example of this is road improvements.

• Community gain (agreements made through section 106 planning agreements on the grant of planning permission) from major new developments (such as Waverley) need to be fully considered and the provision of local services and facilities to meet the needs of major development schemes should be pursued.

Community safety and well-being
• Pollution along the motorway corridors was a particular issue for the communities living in these areas. The proposal to develop Waverley as new community for 3,700 new homes causes concern in neighbouring settlements because of the level of pollution likely to be generated through increased car use and the congestion and pollution likely to be caused on the local road network.

• The communities to the north at Blackburn, Richmond Park and Kimberworth are concerned that this area also suffers from significant pollution from the Motorway network. Will a radical solution in the future be required to move these communities away from the motorway?

• Investment in new technologies to reduce and control pollution should be supported. However it may be that the precautionary principle should be adopted and developers will need to forego new development in these critical areas to significantly reduce or remove pollution risks.