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## Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td><strong>Introductions and Apologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introductions were made and apologies recorded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td><strong>Action Points from Previous Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AGREED</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was agreed further discussions still need to take place to clarify how the LPSA reward money and pump priming would be spent following concerns raised by partner organisations. The group were of the understanding that the LPSA reward money would cover any costs by incurred by lead partners and that pump priming money would be split between the Theme Boards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was suggested a paper be produced to clarify the situation and reported back to this group via email for comment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td><strong>Corporate Performance Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Gladstone, Head of Performance and Quality briefed the group on the CPA and handed out information about the self assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matt highlighted the key issues linked to Safer &amp; Stronger and Sustainable Communities, in particular anything connected to the Safe Theme Board and its representatives. The group were given a list of areas where gaps may be identified and were asked to provide any information in support of these areas to ensure they had not been overlooked. Matt Confirmed details of who may be interviewed would follow in the next few weeks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The group also had concerns around the future JAR and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DB / MG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
agreed it would be helpful to plan briefings for partners who will be involved. Dominic agreed to discuss further with Matt Gladstone and make arrangements for the partners involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>LDF Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominic reported that Forward Planning are in the process of developing their Core Strategy for the LDF. Dominic and Jeff Wharfe will take the lead within the LSP in coordinating LDF consultation and partner engagement. This will begin with presentations being made to each of the Theme Boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andy Duncan and Helen Sleigh attended the meeting to brief the group on the Local development Framework and the consultation to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andy gave an overview of LDF development. Helen put forward proposals on how the LDF would link to the Safe Theme Board and its stakeholders and how consultation will take place over the coming months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires will be circulated electronically towards the end of May as the first stage of consultation. Members of the group were asked to complete. Further consultation will be towards the end of the year and will be more detailed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A copy of the presentation is attached.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 5</th>
<th>Priorities for the Safe Theme Board 2006/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was agreed at last meeting that key priorities be identified at the three Partnership meetings, which would then be overseen by the Safe Theme Board. The initial intention was to split priorities into 3 categories; General, External funding and cross cutting priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However, after discussions at each of the Partnerships it was clear that until there was greater clarity about the commissioning role of the Safe Theme Board, it was</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
difficult to do. Though the groups have been able to identify several cross-cutting priorities which the Safe Theme Board is well placed to oversee. These include:

- Implementation of the Enviro-crime strategy
- Neighbourhood management
- Area assemblies and area plans
- Domestic violence
- Safer neighbourhood teams
- Accommodation of young offenders
- Secured by design
- Housing for drug and alcohol abusers

The group agreed and made recommendations to:

- Seek clarification on the commissioning role of the board.
- Oversee the action plans currently in place.
- That regular reports should be made to the board for each priority.
- A presentation for each priority be made to the board (10 minutes for each priority, beginning with SNT’s, Enviro-crime, Neighbourhood Management related priorities).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 6</th>
<th>Neighbourhood Renewal Fund &amp; Safer Stronger Communities Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The group were provided with a summary sheet for both NRF and SSC funding and future spend. Tim gave an overview of the projects being considered though there were still some changes and decisions to be made with NRF in particular.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 7</th>
<th>Strategic Housing Partnership Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copies of the latest minutes were circulated. Dominic updated the group on recent issues discussed at the partnership: BME Housing Strategy: Strategy has been presented for consultation. NRA study will run alongside this to look at BME Housing issues. A working group has been set up and will continue to report back to this group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Shared Equity:** Equity Housing made a presentation on shared equity. Some concerned picked up from members. HMR and LSP will be setting out key benefits.

**Our Health, Our Care, Our Say:** SHP had a presentation on the implications of the White Paper and Every Child Matters on housing services, in particular strategic development.

**Business Engagement:** Preliminary report back from John Lewis on the Business Engagement Project with HMR. Next meeting formal presentation of report setting out perspective of business community in the ADF areas and making recommendations for future participation.

### Item 8
**Safer Rotherham Partnership**

Copies of the latest minutes were circulated. Tim updated the group on recent Partnership issues.

- Housing related support for drug users – working group set up.
- Police & Justice Bill – seminar coming up to look at some of the key issues coming out of the bill, Tim advised the group there were 4-5 places available and suggested several members of the group to attend and feedback. Tim to discuss with individuals.

**TH**

### Item 9
**Environment Partnership Report**

Copies of the latest minutes were circulated.

### Item 10
**AOB**

None

### Item 11
**Date of Next Meeting**

21st July 2006

Venue: TBC

Sarah
**Item Agenda**  
**Action**

1. **Presentation – Rotherham Local Development Framework**  
Helen Sleigh gave a presentation to members on the Local Development Framework.  
The core strategy is being worked on and will go to the Secretary of State in December.  
The core strategy will look forward to 2021, conform to national policy and promote sustainable spatial development.  
The newsletter and questionnaire will go onto the RMBC website on 8 May until 7 June.  
Meetings have been organised with community groups within the 7 Local Area Assemblies, Councillors, Disabled Groups and the BME Community to discuss options and complete the questionnaire.  
Questions raised included:  
- How to link planning from an education point of view.  
- Link with C& YPS through Voice and Influence.  
- The youth cabinet could be used as a source for young people’s views. Members suggested that George Simpson be the contact.  
- Members were requested to respond individually to the questionnaire.  

   **All to note**

2. **Welcome, Introductions, Apologies & Declarations of Interest**  
George welcomed members to the meeting & introduced Helen Sleigh who was presenting the LDF. Apologies were received from Frances Adams, Georgina Boyes, John Lambert, John Lewis, Chris MacCormac, Giles Pepler, Parveen Qureshi, Sonia Sharp, Sue Venton & Sue Walker.  
There were no declarations of interest raised.

3. **Minutes of Last Meeting & Action Points**  
**Item 1**
MH informed members that he had nothing further to report regarding the ‘building pathways’ project.

**Item 2**
GT informed members that a meeting had been arranged and taken place on 5 April to give Mrs Qureshi feedback regarding her bid for TEC Attributables. Mrs Qureshi found the feedback valuable.
DG informed members that he had no further information regarding the LSC tendering process. Members requested DG update members as soon as information was available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.</th>
<th>Future Structure/Focus of the LLP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members discussed the various papers presented on the future structure and focus of the LLP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues raised included:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consideration given to stronger direct employer representation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for a strong linkage to the LAA and NRF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Challenge other groups around learning opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make sure there is clear connectivity between the theme groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Linkage with the C&amp;YPS agenda needs to be kept in mind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consideration of covering the 0 – 19 agenda to encompass family learning – intergenerational learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Members requested the Chair and manager of the LSP to attend a future LLP meeting to outline LSP expectations of the LLP in the light of new circumstances for both groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB.** The Director will meet with the RALP & 14-19 Strategy group Chairs to agree a working remit for these groups and he will then amend the LLP TOR.
However, there was general agreement with the principles and proposals put forward in the Director’s recommendatory paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.</th>
<th>Rotherham’s Older People’s Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion took place regarding the paper and concerns were raised regarding having a separate strategy for older people as this will encompass people who are in work and have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DG

KF to arrange as appropriate

KF
level 3 or 4 qualifications but still require re-training. The point regarding improving opportunities for older people to undertake work related training was welcomed. Members also agreed that this strategy seems to fall out of so many other strategies.
MH is to forward these comments onto Andrew Towleron on behalf of the Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.</th>
<th>Community Cohesion – Champions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Happs tabled a paper received from Dave Featherstone requesting a champion for Community Cohesion to be identified from each of the five themed areas of the Community Strategy. Members agreed for Catharine Kinsella to take on the role in the interim period due to low attendance at the meeting until a permanent member can be identified. MH is to write to Dave Featherstone and inform him of the outcome of the discussion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.</th>
<th>Director’s Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MH informed members that he attended a presentation from VIS on the software package for the Prospectus and Common Application Process. This has been endorsed sub-regionally and will go to the next 14-19 Strategy Group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.</th>
<th>AOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date of next meeting**
Monday 5 June 2006
16.00 – 18.00
Music Factory
**ROtherham Partnership**  
**Proud Board**  
8 May 2006  
Talbot Lane Centre  
**Minutes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.   | **Introductions and apologies**  
Janet Wheatley welcomed two new members to the Board, Phil Rogers (representing Culture & Leisure) and Tom Kelly (representing Children & Young People’s Service). JW said that Mel Durham was unable to attend due to illness, and the Board sent its good wishes. |         |
| 2.   | **Minutes of last meeting**  
Agreed as a true record.  
**Matters arising:**  
Update on NRF commissioning – Debbie Heath presented, for information, an update on developments with NRF funding since the last meeting. Papers were circulated, which highlighted how the cross-cutting NRF priorities had been drawn from the LAA, which had been subject to extensive consultation. DH also circulated a table of ‘stronger communities’ indicators, which would be used to assess performance. It was noted that Proud is responsible for overseeing delivery of the cross-cutting objectives, and a NRF funded post to be located within VAR will coordinate delivery.  
In discussion, JW said that she will take the message to the Rotherham Partnership Board that cross-cutting themes need to be embedded in all themes.  
It was agreed to have regular ‘exception’ reports on the NRF targets that Proud is responsible for, and that these should be fed directly into the LSP Board. | JW, DH |
| 3.   | **Local Development Framework**  
Dominic Blaydon presented details of the alternative spatial options being developed through the LDF’s Core Strategy. They are:  
- Responding to market forces  
- Matching needs with opportunities  
- Managing the environment as a key resource  
The alternative options will be subject to consultation, and DB pointed out that this presentation is a precursor to wider consultation. The next step will be to send out a questionnaire to all Boards and other stakeholders.  
It was agreed that Proud should respond collectively to the consultation to ensure that the Core Strategy reflects Proud’s priorities. | AF/JW |
There was concern that the timescales would not permit Proud to respond, and Dominic said that he would check the dates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. <strong>Consultation &amp; Community Involvement Framework</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asim Munir presented details of RMBC’s Consultation &amp; Community Involvement Framework, which sets out the vision, aims and objectives of CCI. Sarah Whittle said that she was not sure how it would be possible to get ownership across the LSP, as other organisations have their own consultation frameworks. Kerry Albiston said that the CCI needs to link to the Compact, and asked what value it added to the Compact. Colin Bulger asked whether there is a need for a LSP wide consultation and community involvement framework. It was agreed to forward any comments directly to AM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a general point, SW requested that Board papers are not tabled, and that reports be presented in a standard format with a covering summary sheet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. <strong>Proud Work Plan</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Fellows presented a paper summarising the outcomes of the away day Board meeting in March. The Board agreed the proposals in the report, which in brief are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Refocusing the 9 existing priorities into 4 areas – achievement, cohesion, engagement and identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Merging strategic actions that are similar in intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Removing strategic actions that are not strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transferring a small number of strategic actions to other Boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reviewing the effectiveness of the measure of progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was noted that a Theme Managers meeting was being held later in May, and that this would be a good opportunity to discuss how to take forward the issues raised in the report. CB agreed that he would also discuss with Deborah Fellowes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was agreed that three (possibly 4) sub-groups should be responsible for taking forward priorities under the agreed priority areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- JW will take responsibility for developing an Engagement group, which may come out of the Compact Implementation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- TH is developing the Rotherham Marketing Group, which can take forward Identity, and possibly Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW and ZS will discuss how to take forward a Cohesion Group, building on existing structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. <strong>Rotherham Partnership update</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF reported that he had sent a response to RMBC Chief Executive’s Department in response to the consultations on the Older People’s Strategy and the Public Health Strategy, highlighting the short time scale for responses, and the need to include identity as a key issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JW reported that Vince Roberts had been appointed as the new manager of Rotherham Partnership. He will start in August.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The next RP Board meeting will discuss procurement policy, Corporate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Assessment, NRF, performance management, and South Yorkshire Investment Plan. There will be an away day to discuss Neighbourhood Management and Area Assemblies.

7. **Compact Update**  
AF presented a paper updating the Proud Board on the progress made on implementing the Rotherham Compact and the next steps.

Following discussion, it was agreed to look again at the staffing required to take forward the Compact.  
The Board asked for thanks to be passed onto the Compact Implementation Group, and Carole Brookes for the work on taking forward the Compact.

8. **Proud Website**  
AF circulated a proposed structure, which would be part of VAR’s website. The Board agreed that the names and biographies of Board members should be on the website, but photos of Board members should not.

9. **Rotherham Marketing Group**  
Note received from Tracy Holmes after the meeting: The first meeting of the re-convened Marketing Rotherham Group - chaired by Tracy Holmes, RMBC Head of Corporate Communications and Marketing - was held on Monday 10th April. Attendees were:-

- Steve Charles (Rotherham Chamber)  
- Michael Clark (Rotherham Partnership)  
- Rachael Collins (VAR)  
- Ian Coward (Rotherham NHS Trust)  
- John Foster (Safer Rotherham Partnership)  
- Deborah Fellowes (Rotherham Partnership)  
- Tanya Geddes (SY Police)  
- Charlotte Taylor (HR Media)  
- Sue Woods (SY Police)  
- with apologies from Clark Herron (Rotherham Council)

Discussions focused on the future of the LSP’s communications and marketing activity (previously out-sourced) in the light of the new network model, and the need to produce a marketing plan for the borough. Some concerns were expressed about the capacity of the Marketing Rotherham group to undertake the volume of work that is likely to be required and it was considered critical that recommendations for resource requirements would be presented alongside any proposals put forward. A further half-day facilitated session to discuss the detail will be held on Friday 19th May.

Agreed that the Marketing Group is a key group in taking forward Proud’s objectives and that Proud will receive regular updates.

10. **Community Cohesion Champion**  
A letter has been received from David Featherstone, Chair of the Community Cohesion Partnership, requesting that each Theme Board appoint a Community Cohesion Champion. Agreed that Sarah Whittle will be Proud’s Community Cohesion Champion. It was further agreed
that the CCP should report into Proud, and that it was important that the CCP met regularly.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11. **Written procedures**  
The Board agreed a formal procedure to deal with urgent issues between Board meetings. |   |

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12. **Any Other Business**  
Membership – JW pointed out that there were still gaps in the membership of the Proud Board, particularly in relation to the Police and Colleges. The Board felt that if the network model was to be successful, it was important that all key partners were represented on all Boards. JW agreed to take this forward with the Police and colleges. | JW  
Partnership Manager – JW reported that this was Andrew Fellows last Board meeting, as he was moving onto other employment. The Board thanked Andrew for his work. |

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13. **Date of Next Meeting**  
Tuesday 11th July, 9.30 – 11.30, Voluntary Action Rotherham Board Room |   |
### Introductions & Apologies

1. **Action Points from previous minutes**
   - AGREED

2. **Joint Area Review for Children's Services**
   - Sue Wilson from Performance and Quality attended the meeting and supported a presentation by Dominic around the Joint Area Review of Children's Services due to take place shortly.
   - The group discussed how they are currently considering children in their services and were asked to provide any specific examples in Rotherham to Sue.
   - Sue will provide the group with a briefing pack following on from this meeting and each member will be invited to a briefing session shortly after.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Introductions &amp; Apologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Action Points from previous minutes</td>
<td>AGREED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Joint Area Review for Children's Services</td>
<td>Sue Sarah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Sustainable Development Lead Officer**

Andrew Towlerton reported that a leader officer for Sustainable Development had been appointed and put forward the suggestion of widening the remit of the current group to include this cross cutting theme.

It would be expected that the group take responsibility for ensuring work around this theme is being done and provide reports on progress twice yearly with the support of the new officer.

Some members expressed concerns around lack of expertise in some areas and it was acknowledged that sustainable development covers a wider agenda than just the environment. Andrew agreed to bring written proposals to the next meeting for it to be discussed and considered formally.

Members of the group were asked to familiarise themselves with the community strategy priorities which may be included in this.

[http://www.rotherhamnow.co.uk/Site.now?intPage=74](http://www.rotherhamnow.co.uk/Site.now?intPage=74)  

---

5. **Local Area Agreements**

Dominic reminded the group that LAA’s targets and stretch targets need to be monitored by the groups. The focus being on pooled budgets to influence targets set.

The targets will be rated regularly along with the LSP assessment in November. The group needs to ensure targets are being delivered on and that the Environment partnership is adding value to the process and delivering on these.

Dominic agreed to bring together all Environment related targets at the next meeting to discuss further.
| 6. | **Rotherham Waterways Clean Up Day**  
Rachel updated the group around the Rotherham Waterways project taking place 6th June. A site meeting has been held to go over the finer detail and the partners have clarified the roles they will play on the day.  
Andy agreed to follow up the marketing of the event and look into a press release.  
It was agreed the sub group would continue to meet after the event to begin looking into the development of a waterway strategy and future activity in Rotherham. |
| 7. | **Green Spaces Report**  
Phill Gill reported that he has been working closely with planning around the LDF to ensure timescales are aligned. Some elements of the Green Spaces action plan can continue but other parts will have to be discussed further with the LDF in mind to ensure work is relevant.  
Phil talked the group through some of the challenges for Green Spaces and will continue to update the group. |
| 8. | **Local Development Framework**  
Dominic presented information around the Local Development Framework for Rotherham with the support of David Edwards, Planning. A presentation was made to the group around the various considerations for future planning in Rotherham and how stakeholders can have their say.  
The first stage of consultation is taking place and as part of this stakeholders have been asked to complete a choices questionnaire. Further consultation will take place throughout later in the year.  
Details of the questionnaire to follow.  
Sarah |
9. **AOB**

Phil Gill highlighted ECALs CPA due to take place w/c 3rd July. The focus being around the delivery of culture and leisure services in the borough. He added that as with the JAR, anyone can be approached and partners should be mindful of the inspections.

Phil agreed to provide some members of the group with further information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. <strong>Date of Next Meeting</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.06.06 2.00 – 4.00 pm Room to be confirmed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ROThERHAM PARTNERSHIP**  
**HOUSING FORUM**  
**6th JUNE 2006 9.30 – 11.30 AM**  
**UNITY CENTRE**  
**ACTION POINTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1.</td>
<td><strong>Introductions &amp; Apologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introductions were made and apologies recorded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td><strong>Action Points from Previous Meeting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05.04.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td><strong>Local Development Framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dominic made a presentation to the group on behalf of Planning around the ideas for the Local Development Framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The LDF will replace the current Unitary development Plan and will be made up of many documents including a Core Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Core Strategy is the main focus of this first consultation phase. The group were shown three options to a number of scenarios for further consideration:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Response to market forces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Matching needs with opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Environmental impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is likely different options will fit best for different scenarios therefore the final document may be made up of a hybrid of the three.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Members of the Housing Forum are invited to comment further on these proposals via the council website. A £100 prize draw is being offered as part of the consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A choices questionnaire has been set up and members of the group are encouraged to complete by the 16th June. The questionnaire also has room to comment on each scenario with individual suggestions. Members can complete as an</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Updates will be reported back in future meetings and there will be further stages of LDF consultation throughout the year.

Item 4  Report on Voluntary Sector Study

Dominic presented a draft report to the group on the early findings from the recent voluntary sector interviews.

He explained the study was part of RMBC’s response to KLOE for which strategic relevant and engagement of voluntary sector organisations needs to be demonstrated. The study should come up with recommendations on how to improve on engagement between the sector and the council, highlight any key issues which need addressing and look at the future of the Housing Forum.

Initial Findings:
- vol. sector make significant contributions
- are well established in Rotherham
- many examples of good practice
- main focus supported housing
- lack of recognition and engagement from RMBC

Although the Housing Forum was seen as the only vehicle for engagement between the two, it was felt it could not continue in its current form. Though it was recognised as a good information sharing group.

Early recommendations:
- setting up working groups, bilateral meetings between vol sector reps and RMBC
- The need for a BME Focus Group
- Involvement of faith organisations
- Vol sector representation on the supporting people commissioning group.
- Identify the vol sectors role in delivery
- More responsibility and ownership on the vol sector representatives involved in the Housing Forum.

Working Groups suggested:
- Domestic Violence
- Choice Based lettings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Item 5</strong></th>
<th><strong>Rotherham 2010 Update</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phil Rees gave a brief update on 2010 Rotherham.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The main focus being on the Decent Homes programme. Contractors are now in place and work is on track. Around £1m per week will be spent on the programme from now until 2010.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil agreed to arrange for a representative from Decent Homes to present to the group at a future meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 are also reviewing some of their employment and training opportunities. Work is being done to further encourage the diversity of their work force.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentiship style schemes are removing some of the basic educational barriers in favour of aptitude tests. Encouraging women and BME to apply. The number of places available on the schemes has doubled. Work is ongoing with re-engagement placements to support youths having difficulty at school to gain recognition from the scheme and formalise arrangements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 will continue to report back at future meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting between Phil and voluntary sector representatives still to be arranged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sue Wilson, Children & Young Peoples Services, briefed the**
A self assessment has been submitted as part of the review based around the five ‘every child matters’ outcomes. Inspectors will be on site next week and will be doing a neighbourhood study focusing on Rawmarsh.

Confirmation of the star rating will be announced in September. This links with the CPA so the council needs at least a 3 star rating.

Details of the people being interviewed have been confirmed and individuals should have been contacted however there may be some last minute, short notice contact made.

Copies of the self assessment brochure were handed out to members of the group.

It was suggested a representative from Social Services needs to be identified to become a regular attendee at the Housing Forum, to particularly focus in on 16/17 year old care leavers and housing issues. Sue Wilson to provide details to Dominic after the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 7</th>
<th><strong>Date of Next Meeting</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 August 2006 9.30 – 11.30 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venue to be confirmed ASAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 8</th>
<th><strong>AOB</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Stevens suggested a presentation and update on Asylum Seekers, refugees and Migrant Workers on a future agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Crowley, from the asylum project team was suggested along with a representative from Assist. Dominic to follow up for future agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carole Bishop briefly mentioned a home support / lodgers project soon to be launched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This link will take you to the website for further explanation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the scheme and may appear on a future agenda.

[www.homeshare.org](http://www.homeshare.org)
Introduction
Rachel Overfield gave a welcome and introduction to the group and briefly outlined that the emerging Local Development Framework replaces the existing Unitary Development Plan. The aim of the LDF is to be quicker in terms of process and give greater flexibility by being more responsive to change. However, it is vital to involve the community at the options stage and it is anticipated that the result of the consultation will not be as clear cut as option a, b or c (as presented) but the result is expected to be a hybrid of the presented options.

Initial Comments
- It was raised that Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Local Nature Reserves (LNR) should be denoted as a planning constraint on options A & B.
- This was accepted and HLS explained the maps were illustrative to promote debate.
- HLS also explained the technical / printing errors on the maps.

Selected Biodiversity Questions
To promote debate, most relevant to the group, the following questions were selected for the meeting. All attendees however, were offered a full questionnaire to complete outside of the meeting.

Issue 1.3 Biodiversity – all living things including, trees, plants, animals and insects
- It was raised that there was a need for local areas for children to get familiar with countryside. This links in with the English Nature guidelines on standards for access to local areas.
- There was an appreciation of the importance of habitat networks.
- Designating areas for wildlife is a positive step but they need proper management.
- Brownfield areas can in certain cases be of more natural interest that Greenfield sites.
- The possibility of entering Local Area Agreements for local area benefits was raised if projects struggling for funding.
- Simple steps could be taken by the Council to benefit wildlife and save money by not mowing verges so intensively.
- Developers should not be encouraged to “landscape” areas after development but to be more sensitive and provide natural habitat.
- The need to educate planners and developers in aspects of PPG9. This would enable expectations to be clearer from the outset.

Issue 1.2 Greenbelt
• Opinion seemed split on the greenbelt with some saying that agricultural land is poor in natural interest.
• Concern was expressed that the sprawl would mean villages would expand into each other. Losses of green belt land were regarded as the thin “end of the wedge” and would lead to its widespread erosion.
• Improving roads can lead to more development pressure
• The value of green belt land to the housing industry was discussed. It was thought green belt development is regarded as prestigious and can be sold at a premium.
• Overall the Rotherham population is not expected to increase but the demand for smaller households can mean an increased demand for housing.

1.4 Countryside and Landscape and 1.6 Countryside and Heritage Assets were discussed together.
• It was noted that Barnsley got money for its Local Biodiversity Action Plan and that Rotherham seemed to miss out on funding opportunities.
• It was debated if the value of countryside tourism to the borough was actually known and if its value was appreciated by RMBC.
• The opportunity for Ulley Country Park and the Treeton area to provide opportunities for countryside tourism/ camping was noted although such development does raise environmental concerns.
• The wording in the question talks about promotion of countryside sites - alongside any promotion should be a commitment for management of the site.
• Bob Croxton raised the offer made by YWT for mitigation for the YES Project; he was disappointed that Planning Service did not pursue this with the Yorkshire Wildlife Trust.
• Discussion around the issue of whether other local authorities insist on greater contributions to wildlife from new development proposals. Examples were given of reserves being created eg Potteric Carr Barnsley and Old Moor Wetland centre Doncaster on the back of other developments.
• How is a balance secured between tourism development and safeguarding habitats from harm?
• There is a lack of any one large agency supporting wildlife within Rotherham.
• Funding can be scarce but could be sought from lotteries or greater commitment to secure Section 106 contributions.

Issue 3.1 Efficient use of land
• Discussion was on the need for affordable housing: an example was given of a family with children who have not been housed by the council, despite being on the waiting list for years.
• Brownfield sites are not derelict land
• Each case should be considered on its own merits. This is difficult to operate in practice.
• Brown field sites will naturally develop into woodland if left unmanaged
• Out of town development encourages everyone to travel and private car travel would increase. For example, at Hellaby there are no facilities on site - people have to get in their car to go elsewhere at lunch time.
• Suggestion about making public transport cheaper.
• Rotherham town centre needs a selection of shops so people do not need to go to Sheffield.
• Participants did not envisage professional people living in the proposed new residential accommodation in Rotherham town centre as these groups would prefer to live in Sheffield.
• Residential accommodation is to be provided near the nightlife area of town – is this desirable in terms of amenity?
• The Peak Park has produced guidelines asking for surveys for bats prior to planning applications being accepted. More proactive measures could be adopted making requirements clearer to developers.

2.3 Employment Land
• Option 1 promotes travel. It is very common for workers in out-of-town work space to predominately use cars as public transport is costly, time consuming and inconvenient.
• The question was raised whether bio-mass is still viable? If it is to be promoted it should be a plant species of local origin.

2.7 Land for new housing
• Discussion entered into regarding the status quo.
• The emphasis given to wildlife in the face of development requirements within the council.
• The need for a “Dave Wood” like figure bridging planning and wildlife matters.
• The need for education and a sea change in thinking within the council.
• Understanding that the Council operates with other establishments e.g. YF that are not sympathetic to wildlife. Yorkshire Forward was accused of displaying tokenism to wildlife matters.
• The options ideally should have been passed through the Forum before they were given wider release. Habits could be harmed by some of the options.
• The opportunity to ask for brown roofs in new developments to accommodate particular bird species was noted. It was thought that brown roofs are currently seen by all parties (developers, Yorkshire Forward, the council) as new and expensive; they may become more main stream. New building should be encouraged to include bat boxes and bird boxes.

Issue 3.2 Reducing greenhouses gasses – was not completed due to time constraints.

Conclusion
• Rachel Overfield offered her thanks to all attendees and offered leaflets and questionnaires to interested parties.

**RO Overall Impression**

• The meeting was not as dynamic as anticipated. Feedback included the problems that the issues are not couched in natural history terms and thus may not appear immediately relevant to participant's interests.

• A significant issue to consider is the need for an environmental planner to operate at a strategic level to champion biodiversity and be proactive. RO covering the day to day matters but a strategic overview is possibly not being given the attention it deserves. It is important that the Council has capacity to think strategically for wildlife and be one step ahead.

• The Forum is a valuable group to pass things to for feedback and early involvement is best on anything involving site allocation. Proposals for specific pieces of land may elicit a better response than the wide ranging issues of the LDF.

• There was a view in the meeting to consider brown field sites on a site by site basis - this stresses the need for evaluating the land in the early stages before it is allocated. Desirable to have flexibility in policies to accommodate increased biodiversity that occurs on sites (that may be allocated for a use) that have remained vacant for a while.

• The Council is like an enormous tanker, which after the mining problems, has headed off to promote economic development but somehow we need to change its direction 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. Planning policy favours national scarce species which may be quite common in this area whereas some of the rarest species are ignored. Protection also needs to be given to habitats and species of wildlife value in this area. As well as looking at the detailed picture of protecting individual sites consider how the mosaic of wildlife sites in Rotherham fit together. These sites will have social/educational and leisure value also.

• The discussions raised the issue of Development Control staff training, general corporate awareness raising, keeping up with technology and good practice (such as green/brown roofs) and the need to provide evidence those things can be done better. Extra advice for developers is essential there is a need to bring biodiversity issues into the mainstream planning process. We have been in discussions with Development Control and brought up the offer of training but it has come to nothing as yet.

• The Local Wildlife Survey will be pivotal in the planning process for protection of biodiversity interests. Up to date information identifying the sites of substantive nature conservation is essential as is the need for monitoring and updating the information on a regular basis. Few people are providing botanical information of sufficient quality to be used in site assessment so that many sites have not been recorded for 20 years or more. Offering training in wildlife identification skills is a
step in the right direction and recently a grant has been obtained by RMBC to be used towards hedgerow surveying.
The workshop was well received though there were only a few members of the Biodiversity Forum present at the meeting. The participants expressed concern at the low turn out of members for the meeting. Some of the members had attended workshop meetings elsewhere.

The importance of early involvement in LDF preparation was appreciated though it was clear involvement could have been usefully carried out even earlier - in preparing the maps for the options under discussion. Feedback indicated proposals for specific pieces of land may elicit a better response than the wide ranging issues of the LDF.

There was a good level of knowledge about planning matters prior to the commencement of the meeting. Some of the participants comment on planning applications etc.

The following is a summary of the main points raised (the essence of your debate) and the issues that you consider need to be reflected in any future policy writing. This work will form part of the feedback notes (and ultimately will be included in the appendix to the final report that will be made available to all participants and also made available on the web site).

**Written contributions from the workshop.**

**Two Questionnaires handed in on the day and their preferred options for each question as follows:**
1.3 Biodiversity - C/none of these, C (comments on networks and importance of green spaces for children)
1.2 Greenbelt - C, C
1.4 Countryside and Landscape - C,C
1.6 Countryside and Heritage - C,C
3.1 Efficient use of land – C, none of these (and comments on Brownfield sites, parking and public transport)
2.3 Employment Land - none of these (and comment on Biomass), B
2.7 Land for new housing - C, C
3.2 greenhouse gasses - C, C (both responses had comments on solar panels)
4.1 Community Identity - C, C (and comments on green spaces and developer contributions)

**Summary of the main points raised within the workshop**
- Ensure there is a provision of accessible and local green space for everyone, particularly for children, this links with English Nature published guidelines
- There was an appreciation of the importance of habitat networks
- It is ok designating areas for wildlife but they need proper management.
- Brownfield areas are often good for wildlife.
• It was noted that Barnsley got money for its LBAP development etc and that Rotherham seemed to miss out on funding opportunities.
• It was debated if it was actually known what the value of countryside tourism to the borough was and if it was appreciated by RMBC.
• UCP and Treeton area present potential for sensitive countryside tourism.
• Other authority areas appear to obtain significant gains for wildlife from developments.
• Debate on the Council favouring economic development to the expense of wildlife. The Council operates with other establishments that are not sympathetic to wildlife eg Yorkshire Forward.
• Examples were given of reserves being created on the back of developments elsewhere eg Potteric Carr and Old Moor Wetland, but nothing like this had happened in Rotherham.
• It is ok designating areas for wildlife but they need proper management.
• There is a need for a figure bridging planning and wildlife matters.
• Yorkshire Forward was accused of displaying tokenism to wildlife matters.
• A significant issue to consider is the need for an environmental planner to operate at a strategic level to champion biodiversity and be proactive.
• The discussions raised the issue of Development Control staff training, general corporate awareness raising, keeping up with technology and good practice (such as green/brown roofs) and the need to provide evidence those things can be done better. Extra advice for developers is essential; there is a need to bring biodiversity issues into the mainstream planning process. (We have been in discussions with Development Control and brought up the offer of training but it has come to nothing as yet).
• Suggestion about making public transport cheaper.
• Participants did not envisage professional people in the new residential accommodation in the town centre as these groups would prefer to live in Sheffield. The residential accommodation has been provided near the nightlife area of town – is this desirable?

Planning policy considerations
• A central theme of the LDF ideally should be the natural environment and promotion of the benefits that improved environment would bring through tourism and recreational spend, attracting business, quality of life, protection of natural resources. The balance is not right at present.
• There is a need to bring biodiversity issues into the mainstream planning process.
• Other authorities have obtained substantial gains for nature conservation, and amenity by creating nature reserves on the back of developments. Suggestions for wildlife mitigation opportunities are not always taken up.
• Rotherham seems to miss out on funding opportunities to progress biodiversity in the borough.
• It is ok designating areas for wildlife but they need proper management. (Are some habitats more robust to lack of management then others and vice versa?).  
• Brownfield sites are not waste land and can be valuable for biodiversity. There was a view in the meeting to consider brown field sites on a site by site basis - this stresses the need for evaluating the land in the early stages before it is allocated. Desirable to have flexibility in policies to accommodate increased biodiversity that occurs on sites (that may be allocated for a use) that have remained vacant for a while.  
• The Peak Park has produced guidelines asking for surveys for bats prior to planning applications being accepted. We could do more proactive measures making it black and white what is required by developers. Extra advice for developers is essential.  
• The Biodiversity Forum is a valuable group to pass things to for feedback and early involvement is best on anything involving site allocation. The options ideally should have been passed through the Forum before they were given wider release, especially on specific sites.  
• The benefit of brown roofs was noted and regret at the lack of uptake in the borough expressed. New buildings need bat boxes and bird boxes to be provided.  
• Planning policy favours nationally scarce species which may be quite common in this area, whereas some of the rarest species in the borough are ignored.  
• As well as looking at the detailed picture of protecting individual sites consider how the mosaic of wildlife sites in Rotherham fit together. These sites will have social/educational and leisure value also.  
• Local and accessible green space is very important. Ensure there is a provision of accessible and local green space for everyone, particularly for children. This links with English Nature published guidelines.  
• Consider the potential for UCP/Treeton area for sensitive countryside recreation.  
• Management provision should be built into those countryside sites that are promoted (eg for more visitors etc)  
• The need for affordable housing (an example was given of a family with children who were not housed by the council, being on the waiting list for years).  
• Out of town development encourages everyone to travel and private car travel would increase.  
• Rotherham town centre needs a selection of shops so people do not need to go to Sheffield
Additional comments

1.1 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.

1.2 None of these
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.

1.3 Option C but need positive land management measures for biodiversity;
including the provision of advice to landowners on management.
- Continually update information on Local Wildlife Sites once this system
  is produced in the borough.
- Provide adequate buffers around the wildlife sites, to protect them from
  the effects of development.
- Produce specific guidance to developers on various topics on the
  treatment of biodiversity in planning.
- Make wildlife considerations more mainstream.
- Be more insistent for planning gain, and seek to accommodate good
  practice as a matter of course.
- Expand LNR series in the borough.
- Insure good measures for priority species is put in place.
- Seek to implement the LBAP actively.
- Explore green links and corridors optimising amenity benefits also.
- Update information on geological sites of value in the borough.
  Produce a Geodiversity Action Plan for the borough.

1.4 Option C
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.

1.5 Option C
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.

1.6 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.

1.7 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 encouraged 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.

2.1 Option B

2.2 Option B/C
C seems aspiration 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.

2.3 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.

2.4 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.

2.5 Option C
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 crèche work shop.

2.6 Option B. 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.

2.7 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.

2.8 Option C
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.

2.9 ANS NONE OF THESE
Farming is suffering hard times and many farmers need to diversity. 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.

2.10 OPTION C

2.11
Do not fully understand option C, does it mean that new quarries will be used to provide places 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 efficiency of use of resources.

2.12 Waste Management OPTION C
Need greater fiscal regulation to prevent waste being created and encourage recycling.

3.1 Option B ensure biodiversity valuable areas are maintained. Encourage walking and cycling. Provide accessible green space and encourage links to footpath network.

3.2 OPTION C

3.3 Option C

3.4 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).

3.5 Option C
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.
3.6 Ands Option B
Need to work together with other measures to encourage this aim.

4.1 Ans Option C
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.

4.2 Ans Option C

4.3 Ans Option C
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.

4.4 Ans Option B – 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.

4.5 Option C
Introductions
Helen gave an introduction and stated that the Development Plan guides development in the borough and that the plan is being produced under guidance from central government.

Helen gave an introduction to the options and explained the maps.

Then selected questions from the Choices Questionnaire where discussed in greater detail.

Question 4.1
Helen broke the question down into topics, including design, public safety, pollution etc and read the question out. Various topics where discussed as follows:

Pollution
It was asked what can planning do to prevent car borne pollution?

HS Planning cannot do much directly, but can encourage a better environment by for example putting industrial development along main transport corridors such as the M1 motorway corridor or planting swathes of trees to absorb some of the pollutants. Concern expressed at reports of fume related deaths in Blackburn.

Air pollution was considered to be a major problem in Blackburn.

HS said the Blackburn community is a tight knit community, but as planners one option could be to leave the area alone and not rebuild on these sites once the houses reach end of their life Blackburn could be promoted as a green zone.

HS said the various core strategy options may promote road tolls and possibly this could limit the amount of traffic on the M1 motorway. The plan period vision goes to 2021. We could do something similar to London and have road pricing in that time or higher fuel costs could limit usage of the private vehicle and create shorter journeys for the distribution of food and other goods. It was raised that we need a comprehensive transport system to support the economy but there will be problems of pollution. The canal needs to be utilised for freight purposes as it is less polluting. The canal will also be good for tourists.

Chapel Walk Mosque
Concerns were raised on the regeneration of town centre and the issue of difficulties in parking for mosque users in the Chapel Walk area. Renaissance Town Team had excluded the ethnic communities and ignored their needs and requirements. The Chapel Walk Mosque was located here before the bypass was built and a lot of the industrialists in this area are new and have grown up around the Mosque. What can Planning do to counter this? HS
said the issue of inappropriate adjoining uses in an area and car parking are
detailed issues and cannot be answered today – we are here to discuss the
vision to 2021 for new development in the Borough. But there may be
opportunities to consider the impacts of adjacent uses in the future (and at
detailed planning application stages).

The problem is about coping with the different uses in the area. There is a
haulage area now by the mosque (Chapel Walk). It was said the Council is
not interested in solving the problem. Chapel Walk mosque was one of the
first developments in the area. Subsequently there has been massive
development around it.

Non-council funded community facilities
The Council needs to know what existing community facilities there are.
These are not all funded by Council, so planners don’t always know about
them. The view was expressed that there is a need to consult the community
and knock on doors on major projects in the area to get community opinions.

Park and Ride facilities
Most people who visit tourist attractions in Rotherham live and work in
Rotherham so park and ride might not be appropriate. There is a traffic
problem near to Station Road roundabout by Lidl. Can traffic lights be
considered here?

The Local Development Framework Process
What is the aim of this workshop? HS said we are in the early stages of
producing the LDF. This is an ongoing process and there will be opportunities
to feed detail into the Development Framework in later stages.

The choices for question 4.1 were summarised as follows by Taiba Yasseen
(there was some concern that the questions were very difficult to understand):
A. Don’t want much green areas.
B. Slightly better buildings, slightly better parks.
C. Very good buildings (e.g. specific buildings for our purposes e.g.
   wedding halls, buildings that show the character of the area). How
   would you like your areas to look?

Comment to go for C with multi purpose buildings library, wedding chapels
etc.

Would like buildings to represent local cultural influences and create really
attractive areas. Also local “merchandise” / food / craft produced by ethnic
communities could be showcased in a multi cultural area, these products
could be sold, and would be an attraction to incoming visitors (and contribute
to the local economy). Wider communities do not use Asian shops at the
moment. Through white and ethnic minority business people working
together this can create greater harmony between different groups.

Rotherham Town Centre
The council needs to look at interlocking with Asian communities. For the Asian community the events in town centre do not engage their community.

People wish to encourage independent retail developments to cater for needs of the communities rather use than big shopping chains. Can't get Halal baby feeds in Rotherham.

Housing – need for big houses for big families with big kitchens.

Consider multi-cultural stalls in town centre market particularly at the special events and festivals organised by the RMBC Markets and tourism team. Make it attractive and a tourist attraction to all diverse groups.

Nobody has encouraged a multi-cultural event for the town centre.

Town centre management needs to liaise with ethnic groups. Local people have to go to Birmingham etc. for shopping. Rotherham outdoor market is disgusting. Rotherham market is not safe, it is threatening.

Drug users in the town centre are not being tackled.

The ethnic communities are quite segregated in Rotherham. Feeling, expressed by the group, that they are not welcome.

Racism exists amongst traders in the town centre. Existing traders don't want Asian traders next to them.

Participant amazed that there was no mini ‘Rusholme’ in Rotherham to appeal to local people and beyond.

Ethnic groups use local shops mostly.

Racial prejudice stifling development
Problem with application for takeaway was cited, but participant feared it was a racial matter and that was why it was refused. Want mixed businesses next to each other. An example was given of a development being refused it was presumed through racial motivation against new enterprise promoted by ethnic groups as Environmental Health had no concerns regarding the location of a takeaway and the extraction of cooking smells and the handling of food etc.

The difficulty of comprehending the Questionnaire
Problems of understanding the questions for people with english as a second language was raised.

Question 4.5
Eastwood
Problems in Eastwood (even after the SRB 2 programme of funding), the area has declined. Drug use has got worse.
Some people say the Eastwood scheme is good but others say not (this is the area located adjacent to the Fitzwilliam Road).

There are all sorts of problems in Eastwood. Drug dealers in the street, and prostitutes etc

Refugees have been moved to that area and migrants. Some refugees are lawless. This is one of the worst areas in Rotherham. Persistent criminals live there. The police are using unmarked cards to police the area.

The area is located near St. Ann’s by J. E. James Cycles. Cherry Brook area is also an area that gives cause for concern to the Asian community, (opposite fire station). Funding has not made it better but worse. There is the issue of policing too. Dalton crime has moved to this area.

It was a major project but it still presents a bad ‘gateway’ to Rotherham.

People think you can throw people together of different ethnic groups and assume they will get on but they will also have issues.

Not just refugees that are the problem but drug dealing too. We are talking about only some refugees and some asylum seekers – not all.

The existing structures e.g. Area Assembly need to be used more by ethnic communities to relate some of the problems back into the Council.

The real Issues of the Eastwood area have not been tackled. Design and access is important - a better road in to and around the area was needed but this still enables crime to be undertaken and it makes it difficult to catch the law breakers. If you change the access you will minimise routes out.
Question 1.6
A major problem in attracting ethnic groups to green areas (for example to Rosehill Park, Rawmarsh), is the issue of suitable parking. People like to park and then walk. Currently groups struggle to park. They have to park on the road and it causes a hazard.

People don’t know of the country parks, not much known about them amongst the elders of the community. Young children may visit them with their schools and this is encouraging greater use. It is too far to travel for ethnic groups who do not have access to their own cars. Special events are attractive to ethnic groups e.g. bird box building. Clifton Park is well used, and has a number of different activities such as the park, food and toilets. It was suggested that this may be because many Asian people live round Clifton park area. However, it was unsafe last year, fights etc. and needs more security cameras (or possibly park keepers).

Clifton park is a free facility. It is good for a day out. Need to improve it, little things like toilets are important. It was agreed that toilets are essential.

People feel intimidated when its busy in other countryside areas which are white dominated e.g. Rother Valley Country Park.

It is recommended that the rangers could arrange more interaction with white and ethnic groups.

Rother Valley Country Park – is used by the wider community but not Asian people.

A suggestion was made to open Halal food café in the country parks, provide food that all communities could enjoy it.

Once you start trading, you break barriers between communities. Could more trading by ethnic communities be encouraged in country parks? HS commented that there would be restrictions on trading in green belt areas.

Close

Informal note reflecting on the workshop itself
- In future organise a pre meeting to sort out how the information could be made more understandable.
- Planners perceived the language used to be a real issue for participants.
- Some participants had interpreters and this is something to consider further in the future.
- Suggestion for further visual representation of the option choices.
- Helen suggested next time consider smaller groups
- REMA as a location was fine
- There were 12-15 people attending.
- Generally felt that the event had been very worthwhile and very keen to work with Taiba (manager of Rema) again in the future.
Rotherham Chamber Meeting – 22/06/06

A welcome and introductions were made.

There was a showing of the DVD “Planning in Rotherham” to give the meeting a context of planning and a brief explanation of the Local Development Framework (LDF) and links to the Community Strategy.

HLS explained that a round of facilitated workshops had taken place but that the consultation period had been extended to accommodate the views of Chamber members.

HLS gave the background to the new LDF and explained that it replaces the current Unitary Development Plan. The new LDF gives a strategic framework up to 2021.

PGT clarified that this evenings discussion would focus on the Core Strategy and would not be so detailed as to look at individual sites.

A number of selected issues had been taken from the consultation questionnaire for the consideration of the meeting.

**Issue 1.1 Urban Renaissance**

PB asked how planning which is usually restrictive could make positive contributions to development and business. PGT explained that Planning could use compulsory purchase powers, forge partnerships, assist with funding and balance competing demands for development in the public interest.

CF raised concern that with schemes such as Manvers and Brookfield, small-scale investors are not encouraged and that only big developers seem to take large sites. There needs to be a better balance between small and large scale investors/businesses. The success of the Genesis Park units was mentioned as a successful example of a small-scale development and smaller units were needed to help accommodate the range and needs of smaller businesses, including in the Town Centre.

JW welcomed the principle of the LDF that it would provide a master plan and strategy for the Borough, because Rotherham had suffered from piecemeal development previously.

HLS outlined that land allocated for employment land but not yet taken up is often under pressure from developers wanting retail and housing. The group discussed the benefits of having a range of sites, for units of varying size and rents. A good mix in district areas is vital to sustain the local economy.

NC gave the example of Barnsley town centre and how a range of retail was successful with large anchor stores and small independents giving an interesting range for visitors with easy parking. Rotherham centre is not so distinct a centre being divided between the town centre and Parkgate.

Within the Renaissance Towns Initiative, the Chamber supported a private sector solution for the future of the Forge Island site.

PB outlined that success breeds success in town centres and that there had to be a reason to come to town. PQ said she aspired to seeing communities’ blend together
and that attractions like the Bollywood event would do much to bolster the local economy. Rotherham needs to acknowledge the different ethnic groups in the Borough and promote multi-culturalism.

There was general discussion that with former industrial sites being taken up for retail and housing that it could restrict the range of employment opportunities. There was also the point made that disadvantaged areas such as Eastwood where employment was needed that there was very little public funding available.

PGT asked the group if improvements to the public realm made a difference in influencing investment. The group said categorically that improvements did make a big difference in favour of investment opportunities.

MM detailed how improvements to such things as town centre design and public realm were important but that costs should not be prohibitive and that design guidance should be applied consistently.

RH said that master plans were all very well but that they needed to be realistic and accessible to both small and large investors. PGT agreed that the new LDF has to be realistic and deliverable.

*Overall for Issue 1.1 the group agreed option “B”.*

**Issue 2.2 Modern Economy and Issue 2.4 Local Businesses**

The group raised various issues about Imperial Buildings that there were a number of small traders who have been displaced by the new development and that situation could have been dealt with more sympathetically. PGT stated that this was due to the Council acting as landlord not planning authority – planning may not always be able to remedy decant problems or find alternative premises.

The group then discussed that Option “A” was the most flexible. The private sector will make things happen but there needs to more balance with public interest. RH said that it would be better to have a combination of Options “A” “B” and “C”. HLS explained that a hybrid option is expected and acceptable.

HLS explained that the current employment land survey would assess which sites are most valuable in terms of opportunity and provision.

CF asked in terms of planning how could Rotherham be made better. HLS explained that Pathfinder and regeneration schemes would seek to relocate firms and get better balances for the community and that CPO’s were a last resort. PGT stated how it was difficult to engage people in planning until it affected them directly.

There is a need to be pro-active in approaching new, expanding and potential businesses.

Need to keep wealth within the local economy

*The group agreed that the best answer would be a blend of Options “A” “B” and “C”.*

**Issue 1.7 Control of Pollution and 1.3 Biodiversity**
PGT explained that again Planning has a limited contribution in terms of requiring mitigation in granting planning permission and influencing siting but that the Environment Agency/Environmental Health are the experts and monitors of pollution. The example of a development being blighted by neighbouring pollution was discussed.

The group discussed and came to the conclusion that where possible negotiations and land swaps could resolve conflict, there also needs to be flexibility to react to individual requirements. The Chamber trusts public agencies not to allow pollution generating activities that will create a worse situation for local communities.

The group decided Option “A”

**Issue 2.5 Transport and access to jobs, 3.4 Sustainable Travel and 4.3 Local Transport Links**

This issue relates to strategic links, rail and canals, sustainable travel and encouraging walking and cycling.

JL said that investment in roads is critical to the economy. PGT explained the Highways Agency is ultimately responsible for motorways and trunk roads but planning would seek to promote sustainable transport solutions.

NC said that on a local level, cars are too popular and that alternatives are not viable. Also queried why the Planners are involving themselves in transportation issues?

JL said it would be better to follow the American model of road infrastructure where volume is better accommodated. Further investment in all links to Rotherham and South Yorkshire should be pursued. Infrastructure is vital to the success of the local economy. Time costs money and this is why road freight haulage is so popular.

The group discussed the value of cars to Government in terms of taxes and levies and concluded it would be highly unlikely that cars would be priced off the road.

PB stated that traffic calming schemes were largely ineffective because it forces traffic onto other roads and reduces their capacity. He also said that some people would always prefer cars regardless of what alternatives were offered.

NC said he would be more likely to use a tram on occasions rather than the car but was disappointed the tram does not come to his area.

The group discussed the lack of cohesion in transport planning in this country as highlighted by Robin Hood Airport where planning permission was granted without including funding of the M18 link road.

The group agreed that for business to survive there must be easy car access and ample parking and off-line motorway widening major. The group also felt that sustainable transport did not reflect what people actually wanted and that in the future technological improvements will provide solutions.

Central Government and Regional and local bodies responsible for transport have chosen a prescriptive path that goes against what people actually want – it is against the prevailing market forces, most individuals are entrenched in using their cars.
The group expressed disappointment with the consultation regarding the Local Transport Plan.

*In summation the group concluded Option “A” for this issue.*

**Issue 2.8 Tourism**

JS said that as Rotherham was located in the centre of England better use should be made of strategic links. There are limitations in Rotherham’s hotel provision- more were needed to support conferences and exhibitions. There should be more development at sub-regional level. As a priority business tourism should be encouraged and leisure tourism will follow. PQ said that tourist facilities needed to be supplemented with entertainment facilities. MB said that the town centre was crying out for leisure tourism and the YES Project should help meet some of that demand.

The South Yorkshire Tourism Destination Management Initiative was mentioned and the group felt that all districts within South Yorkshire should adopt a more co-ordinated approach and join forces.

*The group agreed a combination of options “A” and “B”.*

MS thanked all attendees for their interest and honesty around the table.

PGT invited attendees to complete questionnaires and mentioned that formal statutory consultations will take place in due course and looked forward to the continuing participation of the Chamber in developing the LDF.

HLS concluded the meeting offering her thanks for contributions that would be incorporated into the consultation feedback report to be made available on the Council’s LDF website in the near future.
Introduction
Steve Ruffle welcomed everyone to the workshop, introductions then followed.

It was explained that for this workshop Parish Councils, Community Partnerships and other key community groups who would have an interest in the Local Development Framework (LDF) had been invited to take part. The workshop had been organised to raise awareness about the LDF, to instigate discussion about various options that were being promoted and give an opportunity for groups and individuals to put their views forward.

It was explained that this workshop was part of a larger consultation process currently taking place and will be an ongoing process. For this workshop the following will take place:-

- An introduction to the LDF and options being proposed;
- An opportunity to discuss this through a number of questions taken from the Choices questionnaire and relate to local issues;
- Opportunity for questions and comments

Noel Bell, Forward Planner, then presented the Local Development Framework, the Community Involvement Document, the options being proposed and the questions to be discussed in detail. He expressed that for this session 9 issues have been plucked from the Choices questionnaire for discussion: these being

- Biodiversity
- Control of pollution
- Modern economy
- Land for new housing
- Utility Infrastructure
- Sustainable Travel
- Water Management
- Creating a Strong Community Identity
- Local transport links

The group then split into two groups and a discussion then followed each question (See attached paper for flip chart notes). Please note that 6 of the above issues were covered by the Helen Sleigh facilitated workshop (the three issues not specifically covered are denoted by italics) and all nine were covered by the Noel Bell facilitated workshop.

During the introduction it was pointed out that a fundamental error had been made in the leaflet at Option C in which Helen apologised for and stressed that at this stage no decisions had been made.
Summary and Issues raised

Noel expressed that notes will be distributed on the outcomes of this workshop to attendees within the next few weeks. A more general, borough-wide report will be prepared in due course taking into account the questionnaire responses as well as incorporating the original feedback notes. This will then be placed on the RMBC website.

Workshop 1 – Facilitated by Helen Sleigh

Prior to the discussion of the selected questions the workshop discussed the status of the new community proposal at Waverley, whether it should be known as Waverley or is it Orgreave,/ Catcliffe? The group expressed concern that a decision has been taken and that local people’s views have not been fully considered.

Issue 1.3: Biodiversity
Interaction between different uses and local biodiversity.

Concern that areas of green should not be lost. Some discussion was had regarding the proposal by UK Coal to build on what was originally proposed as a country park.

Migrating birds – the YES development proposals at Rother Valley Country Park may impact on migrating birds. The restored Waverley Advanced Manufacturing Park supports different species of birds (including skylarks).

Encourage other wildlife
Concerns over volume of housing proposed by the Waverley masterplan – 3,500 homes. How will this impact on the environment in terms of pollution, traffic congestion? Reducing habitats?

Quality of life will this be compromised by the proposals for a new community at Waverley?

Cost of maintenance of sites such as Country Parks. The Council finds it difficult to maintain country parks because of their cost hence the Yes proposals and would not take on the long term management and maintenance of greenspace at Waverley.

Option B favoured/realistic option

**Issue 1.7: Control of Pollution**

Air pollution big issue in this area – currently unacceptable levels from the Parkway and the motorway what impact will all this new and proposed development have in the area?

Light/noise pollution from new development proposals and from the current road system. A feeling that a new community at Waverley could only make a difficult situation worse.

Airport study

Encourage environmentally friendly development – don’t want to pollute environment further

Waverley site – green policies for its long term usage should be promoted.

Extra HGV movements – for instance to the Tinsley site are already noticeable in this area (600 – 900 HGV movements per day) if more development occurs how much worse will the situation be? How practical will it be to support even more lorry movements in the area?

Concern about people using the area as a rat run to get between Sheffield and Rotherham

New strategies needed i.e. car sharing

Need to change people’s thinking about public transport and other traffic management measures

People’s circumstances may change for instance the cost of fuel may prevent people from using their cars as much as now.

Reliable transport needed to get people out of cars – integrated transport
Environment and pollution control policies – do private companies have to comply?

Companies should incur charges if they pollute the environment. Need for tight controls of companies otherwise they take advantage.

What do future generations want? The spatial vision is to 2021.

Support for what has happened on the Waverley site to remove the contaminated land and restore it.

Support for environmentally friendly buildings that support wildlife in the area – such as roofs that will support some breeds of nesting birds.

Not wanting to stop developments but would like to achieve B (with added value). Need for stronger policies to reduce pollution.

**Issue 2.2 Modern Economy**

Creating local jobs

Contact with schools and industries

Quality jobs needed for the people who live in this area not just graduates who have recently moved to Sheffield. Need to have proper training and retraining opportunities related to the industries moving onto the AMP.

Opportunity for companies to talk to young people

Encourage young people to stay in area

Build closer links between Brinsworth Comprehensive and Waverley site

Cost of recruiting externally – use local people to fill vacancies

Apprenticeships

Encourage awareness in public of potential employment opportunities

Need for a quota of quality local jobs for local people not just ancillary jobs. Need to generate enthusiasm in the local communities for working in Advanced Manufacturing Park.

**Issue 2.7: Land for new housing**

Brownfield versus Greenfield sites – Waverley is brownfield

Regenerating area and creating communities
Sites at Thurcroft/ Kiveton Park/ Rawmarsh /Thorpe Hesley that are all Greenfield but allocated in the current Unitary Development Plan. These sites may be removed in the future

Support local facilities for local people – concern expressed that Treeton was perceived as rural and didn’t have such a good transport infrastructure (i.e. public transport services as the other settlements locally and that access to Waverley is limited

Implications of 3,500 new households on existing facilities. Will new libraries schools, churches, medical facilities etc. be provided to support a new community?

Treeton – limited development likely to occur in the future at Treeton but keen to maintain existing facilities and a more integrated transport system to enable access to jobs and other facilities and services such as hospitals.

Community gain from the developments at the AMP and from a possible new community.

There is a need to meet housing demands each year

Railway line should be better used to provide stations for use by people who live locally; also discussed the potential of rail freight in the area.

Waverley site will meet some of the borough housing needs if built in the future.
**Issue 3.4: Sustainable Travel**

Encourage employers to provide transport i.e. buses so that people can easily get to work.

Public transport for elderly and disabled

Linking in of communities

Waverley site needs to integrate and link with adjacent communities

Increase in community size e.g. Treeton but still lack of facilities

Planning Department need to be stricter with larger companies about their contributions to this important issue.

Better access from rural areas to jobs and services and other facilities

**Issue 4.3: Local Transport Links**

Transport in Rotherham should be free and claimed back through CTax as previously carried out in Sheffield.

Public transport big issue in this area

Increase level of service to encourage people out of cars

Poor bus service – hit and miss

Decent buses needed

Cost of fares too high

Encourage cycling – need more cycling paths as used in other towns and safer paths for children

Car parking is becoming a bigger issue
Long term vision for the management of traffic and the integration of public transport

Catcliffe/Treeton/Brinsworth seen as not viable – off the map

Treeton – rural village

Role of community transport

Integration of services

Encourage employers to have wash/shower facilities so more people can cycle / run
Congestion charges – money should be used to improve facilities

Subsidy as encouragement
Workshop 2 – Facilitated by Noel Bell

The options chosen were generally B & C, although for questions 2.2 & 2.10 a hybrid between options B & C was preferred. For questions 1.3 & 4.1 there was a split in consensus between options B & C. Prior to the commencement of the discussion, questions were raised as to how the influence of opinions made within the workshop would be balanced against regional and national targets and influences.

1.3 – Biodiversity
- It was recognised that different developments would have different impacts upon biodiversity but that it was important to put in place measures to protect and improve wildlife sites and habitat networks.

1.7 – Control of Pollution
- Although new jobs are needed, development bringing these new jobs causes pollution. The impact of traffic on other areas needs to be assessed when creating new developments.
- A lot of ill health (such as asthma) in the area causes great concern
- Option B to create a stricter control of new development to lessen pollution was not considered a strong enough policy. As such development should be stopped where necessary to significantly reduce or remove pollution risks. Sewage was said to be very bad in Orgreave and the potential developments at Waverley would cause more concern regarding sewage.

2.2 – Modern Economy
- It was felt that the hi-Tech Manufacturing Park is not offering many jobs, but that more hi-Tech jobs are needed. It shouldn’t be assumed that only low level jobs will be required as there is a skilled workforce available. It was felt that development is leaning towards too many of the same type of jobs being generated e.g. call centres and retail.
- These hi-tech industries can reduce pollution and ensuring this is the case needs to be part of the new development framework.

2.7 – Land for new housing
- No development should be built on greenfield sites as suggested in Option C, but concern was expressed at the desire within this option to build at higher densities as the spaces between dwellings is too small at present.
- The preferred option excludes the consideration of the possibility of developing a new community at Waverley.
- Planning for green spaces should be an integral part of residential developments.

2.10 - Utility Infrastructure
- Development of network extensions only where it can be displayed that there is no negative impact on health.
- Use of new technologies should be also promoted in the LDF.
• The time taken for such works and how well different companies coordinate work also impacts on the community.

3.4 – Sustainable Travel
• It was felt that people need to use cars should be recognised i.e. no road pricing to be introduced. Public transport can be difficult with people’s working patterns, such as evening working.
• Public transport was felt to be unacceptable and in need of big improvement.
• Problems include – not enough carriages on trains at peak times, not enough buses running and becoming too full and all buses to Sheffield now passing through Meadowhall.
• The preferred option of travel would be the tram but not sharing busy roads.
• Roads need to be managed better at busy times.
• Also when building new housing developments no extra buses are being provided leading to more people and not enough public transport.
• Sustainable travel should also extend to rural areas such as villages as well as town centres.

3.5 - Water Management
• Concern was raised about the flood risks at Catcliffe. It was agreed that there should be stricter control so that no development is allowed in the high flood risk areas. It was felt that there are enough options to build elsewhere.

4.1 – Creating a strong community identity
• Waverley (if its development were to take place) should be seen as a Community on its own but must have its own amenities.
• Future development could have an impact upon the existing communities in that amenities such as doctors/dentists could be overcome and this issue needs to be fully considered.
• Some suggested it was important to retain all existing open spaces whereas others were willing to lose less valuable poorer quality open spaces if the revenue from the sale of this land for development could be used to improve the remainder.

4.3 – Local Transport Links
• Public subsidy is crucial to supporting more extensive public transport services to all communities.
Introduction
Janice Curran welcomed everyone to the workshop, introductions then followed. She explained that for this workshop Parish Councils, Community Partnerships and other key community groups who would have an interest in the Local Development Framework (LDF) had been invited to take part. She explained that the workshop had been organised to raise awareness about the LDF, to instigate discussion about various options that were being promoted and give an opportunity for groups and individuals to put their views forward.

She expressed that consultation will be an ongoing process and for this workshop the following will take place:
- An introduction to the LDF and options being proposed;
- An opportunity to discuss this through a number of questions taken from the Choices questionnaire which relate to local issues;
- Followed by the opportunity to fill in the complete Choices Questionnaire which was to be made available at the end of the workshop.

She also made attendees aware that another date had been organised for the 5th June, 7.00 p.m. at Catcliffe Memorial Hall for those who could not be present at this workshop.

Noel Bell, Forward Planner, then presented the Local Development Framework, the Statement of Community Involvement, the options providing the catalyst for discussion in taking forward the Core Strategy and the specific questions to be discussed in detail. He expressed that for this session 9 issues have been identified as being of particular local significance from the Choices questionnaire and will therefore form the basis for the workshop discussion: these being
- Biodiversity
- Control of pollution
- Modern economy
- Land for new housing
- Utility Infrastructure
- Sustainable Travel
- Water management
- Creating a strong community identity
- Local transport links

A discussion then followed for each question (please see attached paper for flip chart notes)

Summary and Issues raised
A number of issues were raised about the consultation process, these being the short notice given for this workshop and the deadline for questionnaires to be received by. Gordon Payne expressed that there was a twelve week consultation process – reflecting the Compact between the Community Sector and RMBC and wanted to know why this hadn’t happened in this case. Noel explained that there was a deadline for this initial consultation period but there will be further opportunities for people to get involved both in shaping the Core Strategy and in other documents that will form the LDF.

Jane Austen questioned whether the neighbourhood community/parish plans had been used to inform the LDF. We are aware of community planning / parish planning that has happened across the borough and by working through the community planning officers we are hoping to bring together the two processes. It is important that issues of local importance are reflected in the emerging LDF.

Noel expressed that notes will be distributed on the outcomes of this workshop to attendees within the next few weeks. A more general, borough-wide report will be prepared in due course taking into account the questionnaire responses as well as incorporating the original feedback notes. This will then be placed on the RMBC website.

The predominance of options were either B or C although for questions 1.3, 2.2 and 3.5 a hybrid approach was the general consensus preferred way forward and for 2.10 the current baseline position was deemed the most desirable.

**Issue 1.3: Biodiversity**

- Existing green areas (habitats & wildlife) must be sufficiently protected
- Biodiversity must be built into the Waverley site as part of the restoration process
- Exploration should be made of the opportunities to enhance fallow agricultural land to enhance biodiversity
- It is important to retain and strengthen biodiversity sites taking into account the realisation that the maintenance of such sites could potentially be a problem and development could be used to address this.
• Concerns over volume of housing proposed by the Waverley masterplan 3,500 homes. How will this impact on the environment in terms of pollution, traffic congestion? Reducing habitats?

• Enough residential developments in certain parishes

• Quality of life is enhanced by improved biodiversity

• Inappropriately located businesses such as those in the green belt have possible detrimental impacts on biodiversity

• Enhancement of fallow agricultural land could be explored

• Biodiversity needs to form an integral part of employment opportunities e.g. YES Project
Issue 1.7: Control of Pollution

- Air quality issues are of paramount importance given M1 and Parkway being in close vicinity
- Planning applications should have supplementary information attached addressing potential health impacts of the development
- Volumes of traffic need to be reduced
- Option C was chosen as it was felt that it would be appropriate where necessary to stop new development to reduce or remove pollution risks.
- Soil pollution issues in Rother Valley?
- How does air pollution affect planning decisions?
- Extra HGV movement is a major cause of pollution particularly if further development takes place at Tinsley
- Health Impact Assessments should be advocated
Issue 2.2 Modern Economy

- Would like to see the planning system promote policies to encourage local people to be employed & closer ties with schools
- No more warehouses/shed type developments if possible
- The numbers employed in the high tech industries are generally low but is important that such businesses are encouraged to locate within the Borough to try and ensure that graduates stay or are attracted to the area
- The area is now attracting new hi-tech industry e.g. Waverley site
- It is a long term project to alter the make-up of the Borough’s economy particularly given stiff competition from outside the Borough to attract suitable businesses
**Issue 2.7: Land for new Housing**

- It is important that the community gains from any future housing development - Section 106 & Planning Gain Supplements (if introduced)

- Option B was considered the most realistic option but with a greater emphasis on providing affordable housing

- Important that the number of dwellings (i.e. density) on a site does not become excessive

- Different types of homes should be developed to regenerate areas and create communities and ensure that the skilled/more affluent do not move away

- Impacts on local schools need to be considered

- No pathfinder in this area

- Waverley site

- Schooling – surplus capacity

- Need to tighten up on number of dwellings developed on one site

- Rotherham’s required housing supply each year is dictated by the regional spatial strategy
Issue 2.10: Utility Infrastructure
Issue 3.5: Water Management (Issues considered together)

- The planning system should encourage developers to use more environmentally sustainable housing materials and building types.

- Flooding concerns in that more hard development taking place will increase runoff and therefore flood risk – the impacts of this should be considered when proposing development.

- Encourage use of natural resources e.g. solar energy – create a policy that suggests a certain number of dwellings in a development should meet certain standards of use of renewable energy.

- Important to utilise natural resources.

- Waverley housing – flooding concerns due to increase in water run-off of hard development.

- Confusion around lots of different suppliers and the implications of this for delivery.

- Advice from Environment Agency is sought on applications with potential flood risk implications.
Issue 3.4: Sustainable Travel

- Measures should be put in place that to encourage affordable transport options as opposed to making car travel/parking more difficult and costly. It was, however, recognised that households now have more cars and this is unlikely to change in the future with potentially roads becoming even more gridlocked than they are at present.

- Options should be explored to reopen train stations and routes

- Greater public transport access should be provided for rural areas with improved bus times

- Deregulation of bus service resulted in a deterioration of quality of service
Issue 4.1: Creating a strong community identity

- The impact of Waverley on the existing communities must be fully considered
- Waverley’s future integration and its links with the existing communities will be dependent upon the scale of residential development that is eventually proposed
- Small scale play areas should be created as a focus for family meeting places and community interaction creating a sense of ownership
- Maintenance of greenspaces due to anti-social behaviour remains a problem. Issues of cost must, however, be fully considered
Issue 4.3: Local Transport Links

- Maintenance of footpaths must be improved to encourage walking and links with road crossing facilities (e.g. Mansfield Road)
- Conditions should be applied to developers to undertake this
- Recognition that cycle lanes have been underutilised
- Traffic & gridlock issues are significant & public subsidy is required to support more extensive public transport services
- YES Project & Waverley Site railway stations should be considered
Following a round of introductions, Ryan explained the intentions of the meeting. It was explained that the group would discuss a selection of questions around local issues taken from the full questionnaire. It was hoped that discussion around these topics would assist people when completing the questionnaire.

The Group discussed each question and the following summarises the main comments and preferences given:

**Q1.2. Greenbelt issues**
There was an appreciation that greenbelt serves several functions, such as to prevent urban sprawl; it is not just a reflection of the quality of the landscape.

There was general agreement that there should be minimal loss of greenbelt land with some people favouring option C, to increase greenbelt land. There was also some support for allowing some development of greenbelt land in selected, sustainable settlements. Overall however there was no agreement on a preferred option.

In relation to land to the west of Maltby it was noted that the land contains minerals which may be required in the future and this should be taken into account.

All of the group requested wider consultation.

**Q2.4 Local businesses**
There was general agreement that there was a need to provide for local employment opportunities. The majority went for option C, with 2 votes for ‘other’.

There was some discussion around the future nature of employment and that there is likely to be less demand for pure employment sites and more demand for mixed use type development. This reflects the shift towards jobs which can be carried out in residential areas with little impact on people’s amenity, and also that many jobs are also based in locations such as town centres.

**Q2.5 Transport and access to jobs**
There was a general feeling that attempts to restrict car use or parking spaces were not realistic or desirable.

There was discussion around the problems of achieving improvements to public transport when there was little that the public sector can do to influence the private bus companies. Issues such as the cost of bus fares and the need to improve public transport routes and destinations were also raised. The group thought that there are no incentives to use public transport.
There was some appreciation of the benefits arising from Robin Hood airport, although the environmental impacts of air travel were also raised.

Option A was generally favoured; with parts of B and C. Links to Manchester airport were not supported.

**Q2.6 Town and local centres**
There was insufficient time to fully consider this question; however there were comments made regarding poor local town centres and poor bus services into Rotherham town centre. There was some support for improving town centres and a concern at a lack of public sector investment, particularly in Rotherham town centre. Doncaster was pointed out as a centre where they had got things right.

None of the options were considered suitable.

**Q3.1 Efficient use of land**
There was general support for concentrating new buildings on previously developed land.

There was little support for reducing parking requirements, relating back to previous discussions about how realistic the ability to reduce private travel is.

There was also a concern expressed regarding the move towards higher density developments and the impact that this can have on the character of local areas.

The group was generally in favour of option C with reservations about high density.

**Q3.4 Sustainable travel**
Comments were made regarding the provision of infrastructure and that developers should ‘put something back’ into the community. There were concerns raised about the cost of putting new infrastructures into place, and it was suggested that adequate infrastructure to support developments (such as road improvements) should be put in at the time of development and not afterwards.

It was also suggested that more investment should be made in walking and public transport infrastructure as opposed to cycling. The group thought that there should be better working with the SYPTV to improve public transport.

The majority chose option C with 2 votes for B.

**Q4.2 Local service infrastructure**
Concern was expressed at the ability to influence anything when decisions had already been made – for example the Private Finance Initiative programme dictated the location of schools and leisure facilities rather than the planning process.

There was some support for option C and a desire for facilities within communities, but also firm views expressed that none of the options were suitable.
General comments
There was concern expressed at whether the Council would take proper account of people’s views or whether we had already made our minds up. People made the point that with other Council led schemes there was little consultation, or a perception that the outcome had already been decided. Ryan pointed out that the requirements for preparing and consulting on the Local Development Framework are set out in planning guidance and legislation and that all workshop notes and questionnaires would be analysed and taken into account.

There was some concern expressed at the use of the three options and the potential that they could lead people to just choose one rather than suggesting their own options. Ryan indicated that the questionnaires allow for people to suggest other options and encouraged people to make use of this if they have alternative views and ideas.

Everyone was asked to fill in the questionnaires on line if possible, but hard copies were handed out for individuals to pass on to their respective groups.

People were reminded to indicate on their completed questionnaires that they had attended this workshop so that we can ensure that responses are entered into the £100 prize draw.

The group were advised that they would be receiving feedback from the workshop in approximately one month. The outcome of this consultation would be to develop a preferred option, with further consultation planned for July/August. It is likely that similar workshop events will be held as part of this consultation. Workshop participants will be kept informed of progress and opportunities to be involved again.

The group were thanked for their time and contributions.
LDF core options workshop.

Feedback on the Wentworth North Area Assembly Area meetings held on 22/05/06 and 05/06/06

Because of the diverse area covered by the Wentworth North Area Assembly it was considered necessary to hold two meetings, one in Wath and one in Swinton to give the community a choice of dates and venues. The format for each meeting was the same, with the planning officer reading out a selected issue (8 issues chosen for this area) to get discussion going. The salient points of the discussions were recorded to assist with the choice of a preferred option.

The issues chosen for discussion at these two meetings were:
Issue 1.1 Urban Renaissance
Issue 1.3 Biodiversity
Issue 1.6 Countryside and Heritage Assets
Issue 2.3 Employment Land
Issue 2.9 Rural Economy
Issue 2.6 Utility Infrastructure
Issue 3.6 Safeguarding Natural Raw Materials
Issue 4.4 Housing Choice.

The Wath meeting was held in the Montgomery Hall on 22/05/06 with a 6:30pm start. 9 people turned up for this event. It became apparent at the introduction stage that some people had attended to find out what was planned for Wath, but were happy to contribute to the discussions once the purpose of the meeting had been explained.

As each issue was discussed the group tended to bring it down to a local level, which they were more comfortable with before considering the strategic implications. This seemed to work well and enabled everyone to contribute to the proceedings.

The main comments made under each issue were as follows:

Urban Renaissance,
People already live in Wath Town Centre but more residential properties might be beneficial. The town centre (Wath) currently is a no go area after 6:00pm with youth nuisance problems. There is a safety issue in the town centre and better policing is needed to enhance the quality of life of residents and businesses.
The Swinton Bridge area should be redeveloped for housing.

5 responses opted for option B
Biodiversity
There are reports of rare species of birds and insect at the Old Moor Wetlands Centre, which is a source of local pride. Biodiversity should be used to promote the economic benefits of the area.

4 for option C and 2 for option B

Countryside and Heritage Assets
There is a need to protect the countryside and heritage sites, should open up the old canal network (Dearne and Dove) to promote tourism.

1 For option B, 4 for C and 1 for “None of these”.

Employment Land
Need to ensure the sustainability of the Green Belt.
Need wider job choice – too may call centres and temporary/ part time jobs.
More efficient bus service and improved transport links needed.

6 for option C

Rural Economy
Didn’t really bottom this one, became a discussion of Greenfield verses brownfield.

6 for option C

Utility Infrastructure.
Supply needs to meet demand, can existing sewers in Wath area cope with all the new development in the area.

4 for C and 2 for B

Safeguarding natural Raw Materials
Broad discussion about recycling, why people don’t recycle and what the council does to promote recycling. More recycling points needed, located for convenience. There is a need for more education on recycling. Example given of Park Road Infant School being demolished and materials used for secondary aggregates.

4 for C and 2 for B

Housing Choice
This produced considerable discussion and agreement on the following points; New development is putting a strain on existing services, police, fire, doctors etc.
What has been done to reduce flooding of new properties around Manvers Lakeside?
Roads around Manvers are already congested, cannot cope with extra 1000 houses.
Better housing needed for the elderly so that families can stay close, local housing for local people – affordable housing.
Increase need for leisure activities
Area has good motorway links
Must keep and improve rural areas and concentrate on brownfield not Greenbelt.

3 for C and 1 for B

Some response sheets were left blank.

The meeting lasted 2 hours and at the end everyone seemed to have found it a useful process. The room was good, the caretaker very helpful and refreshments provided.

The Swinton meeting was held in Swinton Civic Hall on 05/06/06 at 6:30 and was attended by 5 people. The same format as the Wath meeting was used and the points discussed were as follows:

**Urban Renaissance,**
The Borough’s plans need to be ambitious.
Tesco is killing off town centre competition
There is a need for local shops to serve local areas.
The town centre should cater for a mix of age groups
It is problematic reaching the jobs in the Dearne Valley by public transport.
It is important to get the infrastructure in place before letting development begin.
People don’t recognise Council boundaries – some think Meadowhall is in Rotherham.
A new road link to Doncaster airport is needed.
Comprehensive development throughout the borough – no specific centres.

3 responses were for option B and 1 for none of these.

**Biodiversity**
Agreement over Rotherham’s Green Belt policy but feel that unsightly green belt sites could be developed in return for other green areas being included in the Green Belt.
Surveys to be undertaken on each proposed site – not only SSSIs or areas covered by legislation.

2 for B, 1 for C and 1 for none of these.

**Countryside and Heritage Assets**
The council actively attracts people into areas with walk leaflets etc. where roads cannot cope – causing congestion and hassle for residents. Joined-up thinking is needed in RMBC.
Is Wentworth the only place worth visiting in the Borough? Better public transport needed to areas like this. Need to make areas more attractive. Set up an infrastructure to ease access to these areas.

1 for A, 1 for B 1 for C and 1 for none of these

**Employment Land**
When the pits closed in Wales top class transport was provided to help residents commute to access jobs elsewhere. Flexibility is needed in the application of mixed use areas, Housing choice can be an important factor in industrial location. Set up a transport infrastructure so that all areas are able to benefit

1 for B, 1 for C and 1 for none of these

**Rural Economy**
Agricultural land is classified as greenfield but old pit yards are also Greenfield (possibly means Green Belt). The council should use biodiesel – create a market. Horses are profitable – are farmers farming horses for meat and glue? Council to lead in promoting the need for diverse crops Rural communities need better facilities and services, and low-cost housing to keep area dynamic and more than just a weekend retreat for out-of-towners. Lobby central government re local schemes - bio fuels, willow coppicing etc.

1 for A, 1 for B and 2 for none of these

**Utility Infrastructure.**
People buy houses for a short time them move on so may not want pay back of energy efficiency. The environmental impact of running a house is last thing to be considered when buying a house. In Wath it was traditional to collect rain water for washing because the tap water was so hard. Need legislation to make people use rain water.

1 for A, 1 for B, 1 for C and 1 for none of these

**Safeguarding natural Raw Materials**
There will be opposition to waste transfer sites near homes. The council should operate a green waste recycling system Waste treatment should create jobs. Let’s have nuclear power. Council to lead in increasing recycling - sustainability

1 for b and 3 for C

**Housing Choice**
Better quality not higher density.
Agree with mix of house types and tenures on one site
Government “one housing policy fits all” is not good for Rotherham.
Need open space in developments and areas of plants and trees to break up
the development
Communal areas also needed.

1 for b, 2 for C and 1 for none of these.

It was a very small group so everyone got the chance to contribute.
Sometimes it was difficult to keep everyone to the point but their anecdotes
were interesting. They were pleased to have the chance to participate and
would like to do so again later in the process.
There were 19 people attending the workshop.

**Q.1. Countryside and Landscape**

Green belt needs protecting
What will South Yorkshire Forest play in this?
SYF is part of a network of community forests which have worked to achieve environmental improvements around towns and cities within their areas to make them more attractive places to live, for businesses to locate and for residents to enjoy. SYF is a partnership, with Sheffield City Council and Rotherham MBC providing its core funding. The SYF plan area does not cover the whole of the borough, it is everything west of the M18 within the Borough. The SYF Partnership has brought grant aid into the borough for environmental improvements.
Stewardship scheme for farmers

**Q.2. Population and migration**

Everything interlinked with Planning
Plan for an ageing population
Increase in population by new births – only consideration for increase in population growth
Increase jobs, increase population
Encourage high tech industry
5 redevelopment areas - Waverley, Dinnington, Templeborough, Aldwarke and Manvers
Universities of Sheffield specialise in metallurgy – encourage students to stay in area by Waverley being high tech business park

**Q.3. Modern Economy**

Five redevelopment areas
Rotherham is central M1/M18 links that’s why it is attractive to businesses
Land needs to be available but in right area – Manvers is nearly full
Very little manufacturing industries mainly distribution
Small town centre developments – living in town centres
Rotherham town centre needs redeveloping
Reniassance
RIDO – attract new business into the area
Need to make sure workforce have the right skills
New houses being built but up for sale again within a year.
Rotherham affords itself to commuter living because of the type of development allowed at the moment.

**Q.4. Utility Infrastructure**

When new planning applications are received have to consult with the utility companies, Environment Agency
Can the Council stop utilities from using extensions – only under certain circumstances, e.g. sewers could not cope with development
Developers have the right of appeal

**Q.5 Waste Management**

Recycling industry - rubbish
Fly tipping on the increase
Rules of the tips need addressing now not down the line
Landfill sites are more in demand when there are fewer of them
Burn rubbish to create energy
Start with education in schools
Raise penalties for fly tipping and pursue people who don’t pay
Combined heat and powers works work well in Europe – now much cleaner/efficient.

**Q.6 Water Management**

Soakaways
Drain-aways
Additional washlands being developed at Manvers
Possibility of using “grey” water for toilet flushing

**Q.7. Creating a strong community identity**

Design/quality of buildings key
Buildings of high quality architectural design
Staff with skills to negotiate with Architects
Curb number of dwellings they put in a area
Over development – builders get greedy
Community/Parish Plans show what people want
Planning Policy Guidance – “one size” does not fit all
Create good quality/good size accommodation for childless couples and single people
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ISSUE 1.7 POLLUTION

- Areas of Blackburn and Richmond Park area effected by pollution from M1.
- Monitored Air pollution station at Blackburn
- Area of Wortley Road around entrance to Bradgate Lane is a problem.
- Needs to be sustainable development – should not place new developments in these polluted areas unless cleaned up
- Increased waste recycling at Meadowbank area.
- Better usage of lighting – looked at seriously and needs to be part of plan
- Use of land – housing development, potentially creates pollution. Expected developments in technology could help to minimise this.
- Should not compromise future generations
- Option C favoured because of risk involved.
- Need to have risk assessments – for developments to cover criteria in options B and C.
- Stricter requirements to ensure people are not affected and where affected the risk is removed. There may be delays before effects on health become apparent.

Agreed: Option C (but apply the precautionary principle; forego development if necessary)

ISSUE 2.4 LOCAL BUSINESSES

- Ideal location – motorway network
- Business need to access transport network as well as communities
- Housing and business – noise pollution
- Problems with people travelling to promote career – skills / training links and the community anchors for the area (Schools, libraries, service centres).
- People need to have the skills to access job opportunities locally.
- Attracting and retaining new business
- Open schools acceptable to the community
- Option C neglects lesser / neglected areas. Make provision for new but protect existing communities.
- Need to get people to jobs – Waverley and Dearne Valley examples
- Public money to sustainable business that have ‘got a chance’ of survival e.g. rugby club.
- Protect site usage from selling off. Flexible to respond to market change.
- Need to protect jobs, sustain jobs and encourage development.

Agreed: Option B (but need to protect jobs, sustain jobs and encourage development, particularly in the most needy communities).
ISSUE 2.5 TRANSPORT / ACCESS TO JOBS (refers to strategic transport links to jobs rather than transport in isolation)

- Main problem is getting people out of cars.
- Prices/condition of vehicles/poor services of public transport preventing this
- Needs investment in public transport infrastructure – historically lacking funding
- Option A did target to improve road and canal network and to make affordable and reliable
- Against widening motorway
- Links to job opportunities / need to consider the environmental concerns for future generations.
- Favoured more investment in public transport
- Financial incentives to change behaviour

Agreed: Option B

ISSUE 2.12 WASTE MANAGEMENT

- Waste recycling plants
- RMBC will go for cheapest option – may not be right choice
- Expensive but need to make investments
- Need to tackle the waste at the source
- Consider waste as a raw material – may be an economic opportunity.

Agreed: Option B

ISSUE 3.2 REDUCING HARMFUL GREENHOUSE GASES

- More recycling / renewable sources
- Power supply needs to meet demand

Agreed: Option C

ISSUE 3.3 SUSTAINABLE LOCATIONS

- Individual preferences – where people want to live
- Leisure activities – important part of people’s lives
- Changing peoples behaviour and how they travel to and from locations
- Need for facilities locally for people

Agreed: Option B

ISSUE 4.3 LOCAL TRANSPORT LINKS

- Blackburn Community Partnership has changed bus service provision
- Needs to connect communities – walkways / cycle ways / links between communities to allow for facilities to be accessed by different communities.
- Issues of public subsidy – e.g. bus service provision.
• More efficient bus service

Agreed: Option C

ISSUE 4.5 AREA OF LOW HOUSING DEMAND

• Housing developments are built for profit
• Option C – because older housing is still in good condition and only needs updating interiors.
• Needs affordable housing for the elderly and so that families can stay close around people
• For what communities want to see.

Agreed: Option C – Because it delivers sustainable communities

Concluding Remarks

• Good discussion, understanding and level of debate, the group were generally happy to reach a consensus.
• There was a general preference for B/C options.
• Sustainable communities (Babtie Study) – should not prejudice need to remedy areas of deprivation and recognise local identity issues.
• Development should be foregone where uncertainty over the pollution it may cause.
Urban Renaissance

Enhancing the shopping and commercial areas and building more housing in town centres – renewing worn out buildings and places

Current position – the Unitary Development Plan does not emphasise urban renaissance but recently planning activity has been undertaken for Rotherham Town Centre under the Renaissance Towns Initiative

Question 1.1 PLEASE TICK ✓ YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR THE FUTURE

Option A – Allows developments proposed by the private sector that contribute to urban renaissance and renewal. Projects could be developed in any of the Borough’s town centres – but there may be little intervention by the public sector

Option B – Comprehensive urban renaissance/renewal schemes developed in Rotherham, Wath, Dinnington and Maltby town centres

Option C - Comprehensive urban renaissance/renewal schemes developed in Rotherham Town Centre only

None of these

(your option or additional comments)

Your Notes

- Concerns were raised with option A that large developments like Meadowhall could appear if this option was selected.
- Residents feel investment in the Rotherham Town centre needs to be encouraged.
- Parkgate and the Town Centre need to be linked via public transport, at present this is not co-ordinated.
- Co-ordinated transport systems including pathways are needed.
- Transport and parking needs to be focused on.
- A mix of all three options is required.
- Quality of developments needs to be good no prefabricated buildings.
- Small community shops are needed for older residents.
Historic Built Environment

Buildings and places

Current position – Historic buildings and places are adequately protected by the Unitary Development Plan including the listing of buildings and the designation of Conservation Areas, Ancient Monuments and Historic Parks and Gardens.

Question 1.5 PLEASE TICK ✓ YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR THE FUTURE

Option A – Development should not be unduly restricted except in the most sensitive cases where the historic built environment will be protected……………………………………………………………………………..

Option B – As the current position, but include stricter controls and policies to conserve listed buildings (including those at risk) and increase management of existing Conservation Areas……………………………………………………..

Option C – As Option B, and consider listing further buildings and assess the potential for approving new Conservation Areas and improving their management…………………………………………………………………………..

None of these…………………………………………………………………………..

(your option or additional comments)

Your Notes
- It was felt that the introduction to this question needed to be amended.
- The town’s character comes from its history. We should modernise the old buildings not replace with new plastic styled buildings.
- It will reflect badly on the town if we loose its history.
- There are very few places in South Yorkshire which are advertised as a place to visit.
- Rotherham has sold a lot of its heritage.
- People will not come to Rotherham if there is no parking and good transport links.
- Barnsley is a good example of a successful town centre.
- Building flats will not help Rotherham town centre.
- Specialist shops are needed in the town centre to encourage people to visit.
- Option C is preferred.
Population and migration

The people who live in Rotherham

Current position – The current Unitary Development Plan provides for a small increase in population through new births but people are leaving Rotherham to live elsewhere.

Question 2.1 PLEASE TICK ✓ YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR THE FUTURE

**Option A** - Plan for a large increase in population with new people coming to live in Rotherham..........................................................□

**Option B** – As current position in continuing to plan for a small increase in population from new births but accept some people will still leave Rotherham to live elsewhere.........................................................□

**Option C** – Plan for a stable population neither getting smaller or larger..□

None of these.......................................................................................................................... □
(your option or additional comments)

Your Notes
- Industries are leaving Rotherham, how will we employ any further residents if we increase the population?
- The population changes can not be planned, the population changes due to other factors eg employment.
- Rotherham is nice for its green space if the population increases we will spoil the green spaces.
- An option for a smaller population should be provided.
- HMR Pathfinder will work to increase the population as improvements are made.
- Option A is not realistic.
Local Businesses

Current position – The current Unitary Development Plan promotes the development of small businesses and managed workspace within local communities helping to reduce the need to travel to find work.

Question 2.4 PLEASE TICK ✓ YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR THE FUTURE

**Option A** – Job creation is the major priority with location of employment but industry to meet local needs, is of secondary (lesser) importance.................................................................................................................................

**Option B** – Make provision for new local jobs/enterprises in the most sustainable communities........................................................................................................................................

**Option C** – Protect all local jobs and essential sites, particularly in communities with the greatest employment needs........................................................................................................................................

None of these.....................................................................................................................................................

(your option or additional comments)

**Your Notes**

- There used to be sharp divisions between housing and industry.
- Industry should be around residential areas so residents do not need to travel for employment.
- Consideration and forward planning is needed for people travelling to work via car with the placement of future industry to prevent traffic problems.
- People may not wish to live near industry and businesses.
- Motorway access etc needs consideration for industrial sites.
- The local authority should help new businesses get started.
- Park shelter belts would be nice to screen industry from the housing.
- Size of the businesses needs consideration in specific areas.
Land for new housing

Current position - The Unitary Development Plan provided enough land to meet the housing supply requirements (including affordable homes) laid down in the Regional Spatial Strategy. But now there is a greater emphasis on building new homes on brownfield (land used before).

Question 2.7 PLEASE TICK ✓ YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR THE FUTURE

Option A – Continue to build on Greenfield sites (those sites that have not been built on before) but increasing interest in the more attractive brownfield sites. Limited developer interest in improving house design and mixing private and rented housing on the same site. Great interest in developing Waverley…………………………………………………………□

Option B – Building on brownfield sites and promoting urban living within Rotherham Town Centre with limited development of some Greenfield housing sites in locations where there is already a range of services and facilities and good transport links (by public transport, cycling and walking) to other places and jobs. Consider the possibility of developing a new community at Waverley that includes industry, housing, local shops and services. Better design, higher densities (more houses built on a given piece of land) and more affordable housing within mixed communities…□

Option C – No housing on greenfield sites and the promotion of urban living at higher densities on brownfield sites (that have been used before). Emphasis on housing regeneration schemes within Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder areas (in Rotherham urban area and the majority of the north of the Borough). Greater requirement for affordable housing, better design and energy efficient housing…………………………………□

None of these…………………………………………………………………□
(your option or additional comments)

Your Notes

• Development in peoples back gardens (brown field sites) is causing a lot of problems in Rotherham.
• Improve areas such as Canklow to prevent people moving to better areas which have no spare land, therefore houses are built in back gardens.
• Energy efficient housing is needed in Rotherham.
• More precise information about what we mean with reference to Green field and brown field sites.
• Care needs to be taken when re-using land eg health and safety.
• Type of buildings and their design needs consideration.
• More affordable housing is needed for young couples to get onto the property ladder.
Sustainable locations

That are viable (support a range of activities) and accessible (close to major transport interchanges).

Current position – The Unitary Development Plan seeks to reduce car travel and harmful emissions by encouraging more conveniently located development.

Question 3.3 PLEASE ✓ YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR THE FUTURE

Option A – Development spreads beyond the edge of settlements resulting in growth in car travel, commuting and harmful emissions. .................................................................

Option B – Concentration of development in the main urban areas and the most sustainable communities .................................................................

Option C - Concentration of development in the main town centres and adjacent to public transport interchanges ........................................

None of these .................................................................................................................................

(your option or additional comments)

Your Notes

• Building near transport interchanges will be noisy.
• Better transport system is needed, all buses take you to the town centre rather than where you need to go directly.
• Public transport needs to be more affordable to encourage people to use it.
• Cycle lanes are not widely used.
• Encourage corner shops.
• People who work in the town centre park cars outside the town and cause problems on residential streets.
Creating a strong community identity

Current position – There is some recognition of the importance of design, green spaces, environmental quality and public safety in the Unitary Development Plan.

Question 4.1 PLEASE ✓ YOUR PREFERRED OPTION FOR THE FUTURE

**Option A** – Some exceptional projects developed in favourable market conditions but generally design is of average and open space will most likely be reduced……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………☐

**Option B** – Improved design of buildings and places through targeted public investment (including Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder and Renaissance Towns Initiatives) and improved quality and management of the best open spaces……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………☐

**Option C** – High quality design of buildings and places is essential to improve community identity. Strong protection of all open spaces (across the Borough) and improvements funded by contributions from developers………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………☐
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Introduction
Andrea Mason welcomed everyone to the workshop, introductions then followed. She explained that for this workshop Parish Councils, Community Partnerships and other key community groups who would have an interest in the Local Development Framework (LDF) had been invited to take part. She explained that the workshop had been organised to raise awareness about the LDF, to instigate discussion about various options that were being promoted and give an opportunity for groups and individuals to put their views forward.

She expressed that consultation will be an ongoing process and for this workshop the following will take place:
- An introduction to the LDF and options being proposed;
- An opportunity to discuss this through a number of questions taken from the Choices questionnaire which relate to local issues;
- Followed by the opportunity to fill in the complete Choices Questionnaire which was to be made available at the end of the workshop.

Noel Bell, Forward Planner, then presented the Local Development Framework, the options providing the catalyst for discussion in taking forward the Core Strategy and the specific questions to be discussed in detail. He expressed that for this session 9 issues have been identified as being of particular local significance from the Choices questionnaire and will therefore form the basis for the workshop discussion: these being

- Green Belt
- Countryside and Landscape
- Historic Built Environment
- Countryside and Heritage Assets
- Tourism
- Rural Economy
- Minerals – Mining & quarrying
- Sustainable Locations
- Local transport links

A discussion then followed for each question (please see pages 3 and 4 for details of the main issues raised).

Summary
A number of issues were raised about the consultation process, these being although appreciation of the opportunity to be involved at the early stages was acknowledged cynicism remained as to the extent to which comments put forward within the Workshops would be taken on board. Questions were also raised that although the leaflet provided information in a way which was
understandable to the lay person, to what extent were attempts made to publicise this to everybody in the Borough. Explanation was given that this consultation was only one step in a fairly lengthy process and that the resources available could not justify its distribution to every household in the Borough. With regard to planning applications, people felt that they needed to be involved prior to an application being submitted and if a decisions goes against what objectors believe then reasons should be provided as to why this was the case.

Noel expressed that notes will be distributed on the outcomes of this workshop to attendees within the next few weeks. A more general, borough-wide report will be prepared in due course taking into account the questionnaire responses as well as incorporating the original feedback notes. This will then be placed on the RMBC website.

Options chosen were generally B & C, although for 2.9 the baseline position was preferred and hybrid options (taking elements of B & C) were desired for 1.6, 2.8 and 3.3.
Main Issues Raised

1.2 – Green Belt
- Emphasis on ensuring that any loss of the Green Belt is limited to small scale release but this should be done as a last resort. Given that household formation is increasing it was felt that some flexibility should be retained in the future to allow for this but local input should dictate the scale of development that should be allowed.
- The character of rural settlements must not be diluted/diminished by any future development.

1.4 – Countryside & Landscape
- The significant number of heritage features, ancient woodlands etc within the area were felt to significantly enhance the quality of life and recreation opportunities for local people and would not anyway wish to see them diminished.
- It was unanimous that a comprehensive assessment of the landscape character supporting policies to protect this should be undertaken.

1.5 – Historic Built Environment
- A number of attendees lived within conservation areas and as such were reasonably happy with the status quo regarding their protection. However, the consensus reached was that the new LDF could be used to apply stricter controls to conserve listed buildings and increase/improve the management of the existing Conservation Areas.

1.6 – Countryside & Heritage Assets
- It is important to balance the need to attract visitors which provides cash to improve, protect and manage these sites against the danger that this may destroy what they come to see. Promotion and information should be developed for all sites to attain improvement, protection and management that will be necessary for the most sensitive sites.

2.8 - Tourism
- Comments were similar to those raised above for 1.6 in that development linked to sensitive countryside & heritage assets needs restrictions. The Canal was felt to be an untapped resource that could be exploited further. Option A needed restrictions but the baseline position was not felt to exclude such major new attractions therefore a hybrid of B and C was felt to be the best way forward in that it enhanced promotional activity whilst seeking to manage this to avoid harm to the most sensitive sites.

2.9 – Rural Economy
- The UDP baseline position was felt to support the rural economy and its future diversification and also provides the appropriate condition in that support is only provided where there are no harmful environmental or other impacts.
2.11– Minerals - Mining & Quarrying
• The limiting of new workings strictly to encouraging the use of recycled materials was felt to be too much of a constraint and unrealistic and as such no concerns were expressed about the expansion of existing quarries provided it was acceptable from an environmental and local resident amenity perspective. Recognition was made of the targets set at a regional level.

3.3 – Sustainable Locations & 4.3 Local Transport Links (Issues Considered Together)
• Development should be concentrated within the main town centres and adjacent to public transport interchanges but consideration should be made for development to be also concentrated in the most sustainable communities. It is important to maintain rural settlements & activities. This could be helped by subsidy without which public transport services would prove to be unsustainable. Emphasis on future investment should be on bus services and creating a co-ordinated public transport system as opposed to walking and cycling routes which are often underutilised and the adverse topography largely prejudices against. As such Option C for question 4.3 was the preferred way forward but removing the emphasis on creating new and improved cycle links.
Notes from the meeting

Introductions were made then Helen gave an overview and background of the plan and how it will impact on the future of Rotherham and how it will look.

Richard raised there had been no consultation with residents in Dinnington before the Police station was closed. He reported the delays in Police attending a crime were unacceptable, Hellaby is the nearest station.

Lizzie asked if documents would be produced in Plain English so people are not intimidated by jargon. Helen explained some documents can be and others, because of legislation, unfortunately may not be.

Keith raised an issue from visually impaired people saying words can often be analysed wrong leading to the wrong meaning.

Helen and Eric explained that large print or language interpretation will be available on request. A large print size of the questionnaire and leaflet was provided to Keith at the access liaison group meeting on 08/06/06 and the questionnaire subsequently completed and returned.

Val and Eric suggested the maps should be overlaid so all options can be seen together. Helen explained the problems with this.

Richard expressed that he felt central government were trying to ‘snap up’ land that should be left for development (green field sites). Helen explained central government are changing their policies on this and are encouraging development to take place on land that has already been used (brown field sites).

Lizzie asked if Responding to Market Forces meant, the encouragement of development on green field sites? She felt that the recent trend for developers to build apartment blocks, has driven up the price of existing bungalows, so dramatically that what could have been ‘afforded’ two years ago, is now beyond the price
range of many. Richard agreed that bungalows should be more available/affordable for disabled people.

Eric explained the leaflet could clarify what the options mean and how they will impact.

Lizzie suggested that the questionnaire should be sent out prior to the meeting. Helen and Charlotte explained why this had not been done as it was felt that seeing 30 questions without having some introduction to the issues raised would put people off attending the workshop event.

Discussions began about planning applications for apartments, the group felt this didn’t meet the needs for 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.

Val mentioned that if shops and industry were blended with housing it would improve transport and mean less commuting to shops and work.

It was discussed that some new housing estates are not geared for public transport and are therefore not accessible to people with mobility difficulties.

Mohammed gave his apologies and had to leave the meeting having completed the questions selected for the workshop.

Lizzie suggested another meeting to go through the answers to the questionnaire but the group suggested they press on and complete them at this meeting.

Keith again raised the issue of unreliable, inconvenient and unplanned public transport. Richard expressed that the limited public transport is totally unacceptable for disabled people. Examples were discussed including an ill timed bus service to Clumber Park, that did not coincide with connecting services. Further discussion took place around untimely services for evenings, weekends and bank holidays.

Lizzie commented that we need to forward plan and prepare for there being more disabled people to provide for. Demographics
show there will be more disabled people because people are living longer and becoming disabled through age.

Richard suggested we produce a simplified map, Helen explained why the maps had been designed this way and that the outcome at the end of the consultation would just be one map.

Keith suggested transport issues should be resolved before any other plans for the future.

Discussions took place about the options and A, B and C to clarify the questions. The group began completing the 8 questions of the questionnaire.

Richard felt that developers and the council should work together to protect our heritage. The group asked for clarification on the term ‘Local Service Centres’ which Helen gave they then asked that the term be changed to 'shopping areas' in line with plain English.

It was said that shop owners and services need to have a raised awareness of disabled users and access.

Some group members decided to take their questionnaires away with them to give them more consideration. Helen is going to attend the ALG on 8th June 2006 to collect them and offer any support.

Helen thanked the group for their input and valid points that she will keep in mind.
Alan outlined the reason for this meeting.

Peter Blunn stated that the Statement of Community Involvement should be accepted by the community and would like to know where the consultation was done. Employees working on the LDF assume that the community have accepted it. Peter went on to say that the Annual Monitoring Report is part of the LDF and published by RMBC and they are just assuming the community agree with it. Alan stated he would take the concerns back and let Peter know the outcome.

Q.1. Countryside and Landscape (1.4)

The green belt needs protecting
The forces governing the landscape in the countryside is primarily not planning led but agriculture led
Building should be under stricter control in the countryside, areas will melt in to each other if not
The materials used in building are important.
There is a shortage of housing for young people with children.
What was Landscape Character Assessment.? (This is a tool for identifying features that give a locality its sense of place and pinpoint what make it different from its neighbouring areas).
Match development with the landscape

Q.2. Population and migration (2.1)

It was explained that there was a small decline in population.
Increase jobs, increase population, jobs and population are linked.
There are 5 redevelopment areas - Waverley, Dinnington, Templeborough, Aldwarke and Manvers
Increase in Town Centre population
How do you make change from Greenfield to brownfield?

Q.3. Modern Economy (2.2)

Land needs to be available but in right area – Manvers is nearly full
Very little manufacturing industries
Need to make sure workforce have the right skills
Recycling is market led
Q.4. Utility Infrastructure (2.10)

When new planning applications are received planning has to consult with the utility companies, Environment Agency etc. There was a suggestion that water supply should not be exclusively sufficient quality to drink but differentiated with lower grade water for toilets etc. Bottled water brings problems with pollution in transportation.

Q.5 Waste Management (2.12)

Discussion on where our waste in Rotherham goes.
No Market for some recyclable items
Fly tipping on the increase
Rules of the tips need addressing
Landfill sites are more in demand when there are fewer of them
Burn rubbish to create energy
Start with education in schools
Raise penalties for fly tipping
Could the New Stubbin site be used as a Landfill site
Charges are too expensive at Landfill sites that’s why rubbish is dumped in the countryside and Fitzwilliam Estates have to pay to clear it
Skips have been stopped in the community should be re-introduced
The European Union is demanding targets in recycling and the UK will be fined if these are not met.

Q.6 Water Management (3.5)

Soakaways
Drain-aways

Q.7. Creating a strong community identity (4.1)

Design of buildings and poor materials which have a short life
Buildings of high quality architectural design
Curb number of dwellings they put in an area
Over development – builders get greedy
Protect any open space; all open spaces are important to the people who live near them
Every new house built increases Council tax to the Council
Poor building design and use of poor materials bring problems
All open spaces are important to the people who live near them.