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**Purpose**

On 20 May 2013 the Council commenced consultation on a further Draft of the Sites and Policies Document which included its preferred development sites or Allocations and its first draft of Development Management Policies that will be used to guide future decision-making on planning applications.

An integral part of this included the proposals for the Bassingthorpe Farm Broad Location for Growth which has been promoted in the Core Strategy as a sustainable urban extension to support growth in the wider Rotherham Urban Area.

To support the impending Core Strategy Examination, the Council committed to presenting to the appointed Planning Inspector (and other interested parties) an insight into the representations received specifically relating to Bassingthorpe Farm during (the now closed) consultation on the Draft Sites & Policies document (May 2013). In due course the Council will prepare a full Feedback Report to the 2013 consultation.

Accordingly, **Annex 1** seeks to provide an overview of the key planning issues put forward during the consultation period, categorised according to the nature of comments (whether objection, support or observation) and broadly illustrating the status of the consultee as local resident or representing an organisation such as the Environment Agency.

The issues (and those for the other settlement groupings in Rotherham) were reported to the Local Plan Steering Group meeting of 13 September 2013.

To provide context to the scale of response **Annex 2** provides detailed statistics of the number of individual representations submitted for the various chapters and appendices of the draft Sites and Policies document. Accompanying these is a tally of the numbers of standard representations and petition signatures submitted to the Council.

It is also important to note that the Rotherham Core Strategy: Consultation Statement (Ref: RSD11 in the Examination Library) makes numerous references to the representations received regarding the proposals for the Bassingthorpe Farm broad location for growth, that emerged during the consultation activity undertaken in the preparation of the Core Strategy. This is available to view at:


Production of a Concept Framework to guide future development at Bassingthorpe Farm has been prepared in partnership with the two landowners, RMBC and Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estates, along with planning consultants Signet Planning. ATLAS of the Homes and Communities agency has helped to facilitate the process.

The Concept Framework and supporting studies have been made available through the Local Plan Bassingthorpe Farm webpage and the Concept Framework (Ref: KSD06 in the Examination Library) along with its supporting Heritage Impact Assessment 2013 (Ref: LEB38) and Viability Appraisal 2013 (Ref: LEB36) has been
submitted to the Planning Inspector. Consultation was undertaken jointly by the Council with Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estates into the detailed proposals. Annex 3 provides a record of the Bassingthorpe Farm Stakeholder Consultation which took place on Tuesday 7 May 2013.

Crucial to the delivery of the Consultation and Community Engagement Action Plan (endorsed by the Local Plan Steering Group on 19 April 2013), was employing drop-in sessions to provided opportunities to share information regarding the proposed development sites with local communities. An event for those with a particular interest in the Bassingthorpe Farm proposals was held on Saturday 29 June 2013 with exhibition material produced by Signet Planning being on display.

The drop-ins schedule & attendance numbers for each event are included in Annex 4 and serve to demonstrate how the numbers who visited Greasbrough Town Hall compare to those elsewhere. For the sake of completeness, the exhibition boards and a sample Bassingthorpe Farm comments form are included as Annexes 5 & 6 respectively.
### Annex 1: Overview of the Bassingthorpe Representations Received to the Draft Sites and Policies May 2013 Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bassingthorpe Farm</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of response</td>
<td>Bassingthorpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Bassingthorpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Local concerns of significant note include the loss of greenbelt, trees, hedgerows, farmland and wildlife – (it is considered the Council has a duty to protect woodland &amp; wildlife under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan), watercourses, recreational use and footpath access. Impacts of development are identified as being a significant reduction in the production of local food, agricultural capacity, biomass, livelihoods of the tenant farmers, increased risk of flooding by destroying the natural drainage, creation of urban sprawl with the loss of the natural break from other nearby communities, CO₂ pollution and carbon footprint increases caused by more and unnecessary new housing, inflated profits for the developers, the LaPortes chemical company would not be a healthy environment to live near to (especially for LDF159 – land south of Munsborough lane), due to historic mine workings as well as the former recycling site, the land may be unstable and dangerous to build upon, there is the danger from overhead power cables (particularly around Carr Hill) and the phone mast to anyone living under or nearby to, an overcapacity for local schools and doctors and a lack of central government resources to fund any required improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- It is also argued that the plans do not have the support of the local people – over 6000 letters of objection submitted previously in 2009, why should the area be expected to accommodate some of Sheffield's housing requirements?, who would occupy the homes and that brownfield sites (ideas raised include Barbot Hall, Wath Manvers, Templeborough, former B &amp; Q site, as well as utilising the Silverwood site) should be regenerated first with empty homes utilised. Reference is made to a legal case between 1995 and 1997 of the residents of Fenton Fields who successfully fought to prevent development on land adjacent to their properties; heritage impacts on Wentworth Woodhouse and the position of English Heritage regarding this; preservation of the view of Rotherham from Constitution Hill; loss of allotments on Clough Bank; concern at employment areas being located adjacent to new homes &amp; a scepticism that there is a market for them as there are vacancies elsewhere; what are the exceptional circumstances that justify this proposal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discrepancies are highlighted between the Concept Plan and the proposed development sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassingthorpe Farm</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of response</td>
<td>Consideration should be given to using Neighbourhood Planning arrangements in order that more collaborative working takes place with communities. There is a wish that information submitted previously is presented to the appointed Inspector of the Core Strategy and that a DVD produced by local residents (submitted to a Planning Policy Officer) is included in reviews of the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LDF793 (Land north of Harry Croft) also raised specific issues that it runs alongside a Zone 3 floodplain. Housing development, it is argued, will increase runoff surface water which may extend into the area of proposed housing. There is no evidence that the soakaways will allow Greasbrough Dyke to cope. The widespread extent of former mine works within the site pose ground stability, mine water and gas issues. Scrooby Street is too narrow to route traffic from the proposed development and routing traffic onto the B6089 is not feasible or safe due to the dangerous junction with Harold Croft and poor visibility exiting Rossiter Road. Unacceptable disruption of an important wildlife habitat and potential heritage issues associated with Wentworth Woodhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rotherham Archaeological Society object as the area includes Listed Buildings (Bassingthorpe Farm, Glossop Lodge and Barbot Hall are all Grade II listed) and historic parklands associated with Wentworth Woodhouse which are nationally important and whose integrity and setting should be protected. There is an Ancient Woodland adjacent to the site generally to the west, a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) to the south, and both a Local Wildlife Site and a Candidate Local Wildlife Site within its boundaries. There are Tree Preservation Orders within the boundaries, as well as hedgerows, footpaths, a bridleway and allotment gardens. All would suffer adverse impacts if large scale development was allowed. Development on these sites will create a new urban sprawl that would result in the coalescence between Rotherham and Greasbrough. The important view from the town centre would be visually impaired. Accordingly they wish for sites to be retained as green belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust state that LDF767 (north of Henley Rise and Clough Bank) is adjacent to LWS116 and contains some similar habitat. Therefore they would like to see it remain as part of the green belt, not allocated for development. Surveys are required for this site. For LDF765 (Bassingthorpe - south of Bassingthorpe Lane) Whilst the location of the Employment Development Site has little direct impact on Local Wildlife Site (LWS 067 and LWS 068) etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bassingthorpe Farm</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of response</strong></td>
<td>116), the proximity of it to the LWS should be considered in the context of the wider ecological network and green infrastructure. It is acknowledged that the site is already developed but there is no evidence that the site has been assessed for biodiversity quality or the possibility of net biodiversity gain in the redevelopment of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CPRE state that their view is that local communities must be fully involved in the preparation of strategic options and masterplans for urban extensions, and that they must explicitly provide for affordable housing, sustainable design and construction and green infrastructure. Urban extensions must also support and complement local amenities and the sustainability of neighbouring existing settlements, rather than place pressure on them. CPRE has been approached by local residents in the area who feel that their own voices have not been listened to when they have raised doubts and objections about the merits of the proposed urban extension: in particular they believe that the location has been selected on the basis of willing landowners and developers, rather than on an objective assessment of sustainability. They also argue that there are good brownfield sites nearby that could be more appropriately developed instead. In terms of harming the character and purpose of the Green Belt, CPRE would specifically object to the allocation of site LDF 0162 (Land north of Scrooby Lane Greasbrough), which would completely cut-off the green wedge and allow Greasbrough and Parkgate to join together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Consultants (on behalf of the Newbold Family) consider that the proposals for Bassingthorpe Farm have been formulated without adequate assessment of the potential impact such a development will have on the buildings and settings of Grade I listed Wentworth Woodhouse, it associated Grade 1, Grade II* and Grade II listed structures, the Grade II* Registered Park and Garden, the wider designed historic landscape within which these heritage assets are located and the historically designed views and vistas associated with the Wentworth Woodhouse estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <strong>NB English Heritage who make reference to LDF159 (land south of Munsbrough Lane), LDF160 (Land north of Barbot Hill Road), LDF162 (Land north of Scrooby lane), LDF764 (land south of Barbot Hill Road), LDF765 (south of Bassingthorpe Lane), LDF769 (Land south of Greasbrough Road and west of school lane) and LDF793 (Land north of Harry Croft) and the impact which development of these sites might have upon the heritage assets in the area is currently being evaluated as part of the Bassingthorpe Farm Heritage Impact Assessment. Until the results of that Study are finalised, English Heritage opposes these allocation because of the possible harm</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of response</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Support            | Bassingthorpe  
- Fitzwilliam Estates & Signet Planning support the general Broad Location for Growth Area for proposed housing, mixed use and employment allocations as they consider that they are all an integral part of a key sustainable urban extension to the Main Urban Area of Rotherham to deliver the required level of growth within the Plan Period. They are also of the view that the evidence base work has demonstrated that there are no significant constraints and therefore a significant degree of certainty can be attached to its delivery.  
- A local resident suggests that they like the proposed cycle paths, which will hopefully alleviate some of the expected increase in traffic on the main roads around Greasbrough (especially Rotherham to Barnsley Road) which (in their view) are already congested during rush hours. |
| Observation        | Bassingthorpe  
- Rotherham Naturalists Society hope the woodland at Bassingthorpe Spring will be preserved and properly managed, with a wish to see a green corridor kept as there is currently one from Fenton Road down to Clough Road, Thorn Hill and Rotherham Town centre that is frequently used. They also hope the development will follow the plans of paragraph 1.17  
- A consultee suggests that this is a very large site and contributes a significant % towards the housing requirements for Rotherham. Given the current state of the land and the lead in period to development it will be 3/4 years before the first phase of development takes place. There would have to be several developers producing an average of 25 dwellings per year per site to achieve the 1700 dwellings within the plan period and this seems very optimistic given its location and the output required.  
- Environment Agency state that a small proportion of the proposed urban extension lies within Flood Zone 3. They recommend a sequential approach is taken with the Urban Extension to site any new development away from these higher flood risk areas. For LDF162 (land north of Scrooby lane) and LDF793 (land north of Harry Croft), the site is within the zone at risk from reservoirs as it is immediately downstream of a reservoir. The majority of the urban extension is within Flood Zone 1. There must be no increase in surface water runoff from the area and appropriate attenuation & long term storage measures employed. Risks associated with the former Laporte Closed Landfill Site and the historical landfill site at Clough Quarry are also...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bassingthorpe Farm</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of response</strong></td>
<td>considered. Advice is given that Yorkshire Water will need to provide sufficient capacity in the receiving sewers and sewage treatment works to ensure that there is no deterioration in water quality in the Greasbrough Dyke and River Don as a result of the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The Coal Authority state that reference should be made to the legacy of past coal mining activity and potential opportunities for prior extraction of remnant shallow coal within this Broad Location for Growth and request that these issues are acknowledged within the supporting text at paragraphs 1.15 to 1.19 of the Sites &amp; Policies document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sport England can not and will not support the release of any land for housing which is currently used or was formally used for sport unless the land in question is shown to be surplus for sport through a robust assessment, such as the methodology found on Sport England website which is nationally recognised. Also there should be sufficient sporting facilities to support the new housing; playing fields and built sports facilities e.g. swimming pools and sports halls. <em>NB This assertion is made in relation to numerous settlement groupings across Rotherham.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details of the representations received for Bassingthorpe Farm are available at:
[http://rotherham.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/sp/draftsandp?pointId=652513184232#section-652513184232](http://rotherham.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/sp/draftsandp?pointId=652513184232#section-652513184232)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter:</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Support with conditions</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1 Introduction</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2 Where are we now?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3 How have we Identified Site Allocations?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 Integrated Impact Assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5 Designations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6 Policies Map</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7 Development Management Policies</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendices:**

- Proposed Development Sites in Rotherham Urban Area: 322, 13, 2, 43, 380
- Bassingthorpe Farm (Broad Location for Growth and Concept Plan): 69, 4, 0, 7, 80
- Proposed Development Sites in Dinnington, Anston and Laughton Common: 89, 8, 0, 8, 105
- Proposed Development Sites in Wickersley, Bramley and Ravenfield Common: 55, 6, 2, 12, 75
- Proposed Development Sites in Wath, Brampton and West Melton: 10, 6, 3, 19, 38
- Proposed Development Sites in Kiveton Park and Wales: 96, 4, 1, 10, 111
- Proposed Development Sites in Maltby and Hellaby: 54, 16, 3, 9, 82
- Proposed Development Sites in Aston, Aughton and Swallownest: 45, 4, 1, 12, 62
- Proposed Development Sites in Swinton and Klinhurst: 6, 0, 3, 6, 15
- Proposed Development Sites in Catcliffe, Orgreave, Treeton and Waverley: 7, 1, 2, 11, 21
- Proposed Development Sites in Thurcroft: 5, 0, 1, 5, 11
- Proposed Development Sites in Non-Green Belt Villages: 78, 6, 2, 9, 95
- Methodology: Identification of Site Allocations: 2, 1, 0, 1, 4
- Glossary: 0, 0, 0, 2, 2

**TOTAL:** 999, 129, 70, 269, 1,467

% 68.1%, 8.8%, 4.8%, 18.3%

*Note this only includes individual comments and excludes all standard letters and petitions.*
### Individual Representations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support with conditions</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard Representations (form letters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of representations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDF0462 (Dog Kennels Lane, Kiveton Park, Gypsy &amp; Traveller Site)</td>
<td>1477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF0475 (Chapel Way, Kiveton Park)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF0476 (Lambrell Avenue, Kiveton Park)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF0480 (Stockwell Avenue, Wales)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinnington (various sites)</td>
<td>891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harthill (various sites)</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF0233 (Lathe Road, Whiston)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF0237 (Shrogswood Road, Whiston)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassingthorpe Farm</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF0793 (Harry Croft, Greasbrough)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Number of signatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF0462 (Dog Kennels Lane, Kiveton Park, Gypsy &amp; Traveller Site)</td>
<td>1,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF0110 (Brecks Lane, Brecks)</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF0785 (Moorhouse Lane, Whiston)</td>
<td>928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Notes of Bassingthorpe Farm Stakeholder Consultation Event
Riverside House, 7 May 2013


Introductions were made and HS explained the Bassingthorpe Farm Project Management Structure and the Task and Finish Groups that have been set up to prepare and deliver the Concept Framework to support the submission Core Strategy and its Policy CS1. Policy CS1 identifies Bassingthorpe Farm as a Broad Location for Growth. JH discussed the need for a proportionate evidence base to support the Core Strategy at its Examination in Public. Note: the Core Strategy was submitted 06/06/2013.

Presentation by JH

JH handed out draft documents and plans to the group relating providing summaries of the draft Concept Framework and explained the purpose of the summary report as a key document for the project. This is only a small element of what is a very detailed document and of the work done to date. He also informed the group that this location is identified as a broad location for growth in the Core Strategy. JH explained that the role of the concept framework is to make clear the aims of the proposals and to explore the constraints on site, suggest ways to mitigate the known constraints, and to ensure this scheme is an attractive development and creates a sustainable and mixed new community. The Project Structure brings together the landowners Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estates and RMBC with RMBC’s Planning Policy team and Atlas as facilitators for the project.

It is proposed that there will be 92 hectares of development land and 47 hectares of greenspace. Viability is emerging as a key issue that requires significant further discussion between all parties concerned specifically with respect to the phasing of infrastructure delivery including new highway infrastructure and other supporting social and physical infrastructure including greenspace and educational facilities.

Vision

JH presented the summary and explained the vision for the scheme with its green infrastructure led approach and the creation of strong links to existing services and facilities in the town centre and Greasbrough and the need to integrate new development with existing communities. Key issues for the scheme are the creation of green corridors, provision of a wide range of house types designed to fit into the area sympathetically, transport/traffic links, topography, cycle and walking links and high quality design and character.

Constraints

There are several constraints to the site and various studies have been undertaken that aim to demonstrate to the Planning Inspector - appointed to undertake the
Examination in Public into the Core Strategy - the feasibility of the project. JH discussed the constraints such as the visual impact on listed buildings and the requirements for appropriate landscaping; JH discussed the fixed and flexible constraints, he identified the location of dykes, sewers, the landfill tip, pylons and outlined the challenging ground conditions left by previous mining activity. He went on to discuss the green infrastructure plans and potential relocation or partial relocation of allotments. It wasn’t thought that there would be any significant archaeological constraints associated with development the site but this is an area that may require further exploration.

Green Infrastructure

JH discussed the importance of Green Infrastructure to the whole scheme and explained the key areas of landscaping enhancements along road frontages and potential to protect sensitive views.

Movement framework

High on the list was the pedestrian and cycle routes that are proposed to link to businesses, other services and facilities located in Rotherham Town Centre, Wingfield Business College, and the wider countryside. There is a need to integrate the site with local communities through the provision of good links and provide freedom of movement throughout the area with potential accesses considered at Henley Rise, Fenton Road and a possible new link at the proposed Bradgate Quarry site development.

Placemaking

The teams have worked hard to understand the character of local area neighbourhoods; consideration has been given to extending existing communities into the Bassingthorpe Farm area as well as creating new character areas within the broad location for growth. The proposed new character areas are:

- Rotherham Urban, an extension of the inner urban area;
- Bassingthorpe Farm Urban Village, which creates a hub integrating the listed buildings;
- Car Hill to the east of Greasbrough and
- Cinderbridge Riverside which links to the conservation area and promotes low density development to enhance the parkland setting of the Registered Parks and Gardens at Wentworth Woodhouse.

There may also be opportunities for further works to be undertaken to Fenton Road to “reclaim the street” and develop new housing that fronts onto the road.

Land Use

Careful consideration has been given to the mix and location of land uses within the area. It is proposed to retain a green wedge along the south-eastern boundary of the site that abuts the Barbot Hall Industrial Estate. It is proposed to retain this land as farmland but consideration will be given as to how best to embrace the environment, manage farming activities and link into the wider countryside.
Concept Plan

This section underpins all the framework plans and gives indications as to the type and scale of development that is proposed.

Next Steps

The team acknowledges that there is still work to be done in preparing this site for delivery. More technical work/studies will be required to resolve all of the outstanding issues and ensure that the site can be developed in the future. The next step (following the EIP) is to prepare a masterplan and Design Code. Prior to submission of the Concept Framework to support the submission Core Strategy, the group wanted to take advice from the statutory stakeholders that will enable them to improve on the work already done, to discuss the proposals as presented and receive any suggestions for improvements to the Concept Framework.

Questions and Answers

AG thought that the concept plan was quite good in principal but wanted to talk to the technical experts at the Environment Agency first.

GK said he thought that this area was flexible as the site falls from top to bottom therefore no pumps are needed to disperse the surface water. There may be a need for the creation of dry basins and wetland areas and creating a cascade effect to manage the water run off to slow progress. GK suggested that the rate of flow should be 5 litres per second per hectare. He thinks there is plenty of scope to manage the water so that it improves the area from a place-making and bio-diversity perspective as well. New SUDS legislation and the creation of SaBS will come into force in due course and it must be remembered that there will be on going management of water and streams.

JH asked about the ownership issues of the outfall areas.

GK thought that there may need to be compensation payments to enable access; he also confirmed that the flow will most likely be split into various outfalls possibly three not just one. Maybe wetlands would be advantageous to the area and should still be looked at or possible feature balancing ponds that will form part of the place-making credentials for the site. Greasbrough dyke is a problematic area but the principal of the engineering works likely to be needed is fine however there is more work needed to understand the potential resultant flood risk from new development in this locality, but the site has a lot of flexibility. There need to be various water storage facilities at the top, middle and bottom of the hill.

AG said that he echoed what GK was saying about balancing the water flows, slowing down the rate of fall across the site and giving greater consideration to the existing water courses.
GK then commented that it was not all about getting the water from A to B but also about the water quality and engineering works that will be required these issues should be taken into consideration as preparation of the masterplan progresses.

CJ stated that the on going management of water is a significant consideration due to the potential for other things to be carried down stream. There are currently problems of invasive species within the existing watercourses from Himalayan Balsam and Japanese Knotweed and these will need to be tackled.

HS raised issues regarding provision of green roofs and rainwater /greywater recycling and suggested that in due course the group should look at potential opportunities to design green roofs and rainwater recycling into the masterplan and design code.

CJ thought that the extra construction needs of the green roofs was outweighed by the saving in heating and cooling of the buildings.

JH commented that there were obviously costs with some of the ideas that were being discussed and the trade off of costs need looking at in the context of scheme viability and the rising standards for the ‘Code for Sustainable Homes’ – through proposed changes to building regulations.

CJ thought that the next step would be to consider what GK was saying about wetlands/dry basins and the impact of those ideas when consulting on the proposals in June.

JH would like to use ecology, landscaping and placemaking to resolve the issues and asked if more grey water recycling could be used so that less water storage was needed.

GK was aware of the drainage systems and informed the group that next year the local authority would be adopting the new SUDS system and he thought Yorkshire Water were also going to adopt the system so the Bassingthorpe Farm project would then be subject to SUDS.

JH asked about the renewable energy issue and whether it should be noted in the concept plan. There may be opportunities to look at opportunities for energy creation from the watercourses. The watercourses could provide natural opportunities for heat loops and energy exchange processes to be investigated further.

HF/HS said they were aware of the issue and that Paul Evans/ Jayne Lomas would be engaging with the Project Working Group about this issue in due course.

HF thought there was a sustainability framework prepared by PE and it would be looked at and the key issues considered in further details as the masterplan and design code are progressed.

GK said there were several key issues re: the water courses to decide on and it was important not to get the sensitive areas wrong. Water quality is also a major concern.
and the quality of the water will need to be improved. In the future the Groups need to consider the Water framework Directive which will assess water quality but it has ‘knock-on’ effects regarding improvements to ecology.

JH asked about the potential for flooding in the area.

GK said that the area around Greasbrough had flooded before and it was not the drainage but the sewer capacity that had been the problem.

HS/GK/ ABL/ and David Stark will be meeting Yorkshire Water and will ask about the flooding issue then.

AG /GK left the meeting.

Heritage Impacts

JH showed IS the view printouts and informed him that the key views were from the high ground

IS is concerned about the impact the views will have on the listed buildings especially Wentworth Woodhouse and he doesn’t think the HIA has demonstrated well the significance of these issues and potential solutions. He asked how the mitigations can be put in place without the impact being explained explicitly. One of the things he would like to see is the ZTI view.

JH thought that the HIA could draw out the views further particularly regarding the visibility of the broad location for growth from Wentworth Woodhouse and the registered park and gardens.

IS asked where the proposed views were taken from?

JH said that he had graded the views on assumptions and the proposed development.

IS asked if the visibility was from ground level and that despite the proposed development being on the edge of a large urban area it had a rural feel and he wants to make sure this is preserved. The HIA has not demonstrated that this feeling of rurality would be protected. He wondered to what extent the rural setting of the parkland was integral to its value – this is a significant heritage asset and it ‘sits in a rural bowl’. The broad location for growth is going to impact on the heritage asset but how harmful will this impact be? And, can it be mitigated? The HIA needs to explain why the rural character is special to the parkland.

JH acknowledged more testing was needed regarding the views from Wentworth Woodhouse to the site and these issues do required further consideration.

IS wondered if more planting would disguise the development and reduce the impact on Wentworth Woodhouse? There is potential to renew some old trees and plant more which may go some way to mitigating the impact on Wentworth Woodhouse and the associated parks and gardens.
CJ thought that planting could provide cover for areas that were already eyesores, and could also deliver benefits to the mitigation package for Wentworth Woodhouse.

HS informed the group that Fitzwilliam Estates owned the Wentworth Woodhouse Parkland and that IS had read the Heritage Impact Assessment but she did not pick up the reference to the landscape studies undertaken by Smeedon Foreman. This needs to be rectified in the HIA.

JH thought that the heritage of the area had been considered as a stand alone item and not integrated into the wider work already undertaken. He thought it just focused on the buildings and parkland. JH acknowledged that these issues would need to be rectified.

IS asked if any of the other listed buildings both within and outside of the Study Area could be harmed by the development? IS noted that the Wentworth Woodhouse was an internationally important building with the parkland being nationally important. He thought that as a strategic consultee of the area they could assist and advise the project partners how to plan the project to help mitigate the views of new development proposals. He also wanted the ZTVI study to be integral to the HIA and the Local Plan so that English Heritage would have more confidence in the scheme and its delivery in the future.

HS explained that some of the requests for change were more appropriately dealt with in the Local Plan but was not sure at what level, and that no more could be added to the Core Strategy at this time given its submission on the 6th June 2013. However greater details can be included within the Sites and Policies Document if needed. If not the emerging masterplan and design code will pull together the key mitigation measures and opportunities for enhancements. IS the Local Plan needs to have sufficient controls in place to reduce the severity of any potential future harm to these very important assets.

IS stressed again that Wentworth Woodhouse was an internationally important building and that the development should not impact on this building. He also said that the HIA had started to tease out the issues but had not gone far enough to mitigate the harm and when asked by JH if this should be in the concept plan, IS replied yes. IS also requested that the group recognise the significance of Wentworth Woodhouse and take the necessary measures to ensure the robustness of the spatial strategy and use the opportunities to enhance the views in this area.

JH suggested that a conservation management plan would show the sensitive areas and any potential mitigation and provide clarity to a heritage framework.

IS commented that the heritage of the area was a way of selling the site with its links to Wentworth Woodhouse. He thought the group were underselling its value and that English Heritage was looking at the project with a friendly eye but it had several holes that others including the Planning Inspector will pick up on.

JH discussed Bassingthorpe Ancient Woodland being another potentially sensitive area. CJ thought that were opportunities to mitigate this and make things better.
IS told the group he had met with Anthony Barber Lomax of Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estates and Latham’s Architects originally but not on a regular basis and although a lot of work had been done by them he thought it was not well set out and needed to better illustrate the proposed mitigation.

HS wanted a clear process agreed regarding this aspect of the project and suggested that regular updates from Latham’s are essential. This is not yet in place and work should be done to resolve this issue to ensure that the concerns raised by English Heritage are considered in detail and dealt with.

IS confirmed that the masterplan should demonstrate that the proposed new development at Bassingthorpe Farm is not in conflict with Wentworth Woodhouse, the Park and Gardens and its wider rural setting. IS suggested that a Conservation Management Plan would be essential to guide future development in this area. Heritage Framework Plans should be included within the emerging Concept Framework illustrating the parameters for future masterplans and design codes, setting out the principles for development and mitigation as well considering links to the wider area. The HIA is vague and needs to “sell the benefits” of the proposals at Bassingthorpe Farm.

The key gaps in the Heritage Impact Assessment and the work undertaken to date are summarised below.

The landscape is essential to the preparation of a robust mitigation strategy and more work needs to be done on the Wentworth Woodhouse zone of theoretical visual influence to enable the preparation of such a strategy. Consideration should be given to the setting of the house and the parkland with its outward views not just the inward ones.

At the moment English Heritage oppose development of part of the scheme (in the Cinderbridge Riverside area) because of its relationship with the wider landscape.

Housing allocations immediately outside the Park gates, along with the associated impact on the rural setting of the park are a cause of significant concern to English Heritage.

The area near Glossop Lodge would also need mitigating landscape treatment consideration should be given to retaining the tree belt buffer and retaining the rural character of the whole area.

Barbot Hall was okay as it had major belts of trees but there could be further opportunities to enhance the landscaping around it. There could also be opportunities to enhance the area around the farm buildings. The HIA considers the area that will be retained and not developed, to safeguard the open aspects from the farm. IS thought this was too vague and it should be more explicit.

Plans should show the mitigation proposed and demonstrate how landscaping could reduce the harm to the wider area and listed buildings. A Heritage Framework would assist in demonstrating this in greater detail.
Next Steps

Discuss with Fitzwilliam Wentworth Estates and RMBC Asset Management, the comments received and provide a clear route forward. The principals as to how to proceed require determination.

IS thought that the Core Strategy could more thoroughly demonstrate that it had considered the Heritage Impact of the proposed development of Bassingthorpe Farm in its wider heritage landscape setting. IS did not have confidence yet that the Wentworth Woodhouse and Park and Gardens would not be harmed. He confirmed that he is still willing to work with the group so that they can get to a position where he can withdraw his objection to the scheme and to the Core Strategy.

There is a need to talk to FWE / RMBC about the wider parkland and the improvements to the Concept Framework that will be required in due course. It was acknowledged by the people present that the Concept Framework will have to be submitted as it is at the moment but the discussions at the meeting will be taken into account later and presented to the Planning Inspector at a future date. It was also decided not to upload the draft HIA at this time but to await its completion following on from the further work discussed in the meeting.

Character Area CB1, proposed for development, is the most sensitive part of the scheme and mitigation will have to be looked at if there is to be some development in the area. Consideration needs to be given to mitigating or removing this area as a platform for future development entirely.

The Project Working Group will need to debate the potential early wins at Bassingthorpe Farm but IS thinks that the sensitive areas and concerns he has raised in his feedback and contributions today need addressing now by the Planning Authority in progressing its Core Strategy to adoption.

There was discussion about the potential mitigations and how to drill down into the sites to see what the opportunities for mitigation are. JB has some concerns about Barbot Hall.

IS thought the group should look at safeguarding the Cinder Bridge area and views and impacts on Barbot Hall remembering that Wentworth Woodhouse is a key heritage asset and that sufficient time should be devoted to finding ways to preserve this area.

The following is an extract of an email (08/05/2013) sent to FWE to outline the further work that is required of the HIA:

- Ian’s general comment was that the draft Heritage Assessment was underselling itself and did not convey the amount of assessment work that had actually been done.
- More specifically, his concern related to providing a more rigorous assessment of the impact which the development might have upon Wentworth House and its parkland. The Report should give greater attention to the Zone of
Theoretical Visual Influence from the first floor of Wentworth Woodhouse towards the development. It became apparent that whilst ZTVI have been undertaken in relation to the landscape work this had not been used for the heritage assessment. The question is whether this could be adapted for the purposes of the heritage assessment. Ian was also keen to understand the sensitivity created by the close proximity of development to the setting of the Parkland as well as in relation to the rural approaches into the Parkland particularly the route from Glossop Lodge.

• Ian requested that the Heritage Assessment should articulate more clearly the character and setting of the Park particularly having regard to its context within its surrounding landscape – he made reference to it being in a ‘rural bowl’.

• Once the degree of impact had been established and how harmful this was likely to be, the Heritage Assessment should start to identify a clear mitigation strategy. Ian made reference to not only identifying mitigation within the Study Area itself but also whether there was any possibility of identifying positive benefits that link specifically into the Conservation Management Plan for the Parkland (i.e. delivering and contributing to the objectives of the Parkland Conservation Management Plan).

• Further review of the Heritage Assessment based on Ian’s comments. Ian is happy to work with Lathams to guide them because ultimately he would like to get to a position where he is able to support the broad location for growth.

• Latham’s should work closely with Smeeden Foreman Landscape Architects, to explore the Zone of Theoretical Visual Influence of the development in respect of the impact on the Wentworth Woodhouse and Parkland Estate.

• Latham’s should work closely with Signet Planning in terms of developing the Concept Framework Plan.

• Preparation of a Heritage Framework Plan which shows the sensitive areas and high level mitigation measures that could overcome the heritage issues.

If the proposals demonstrate that a robust assessment of the impact of the development on Wentworth Woodhouse and Parkland together with illustrating any mitigation measures is integrated into Planning Policy, then Ian would most likely support the proposal.

In terms of the development parcels, the discussions at the meeting went as follows:

• CB1 – this parcel is the biggest problem for Ian given it abuts the rural parkland and would significantly interfere with reducing the rural approach to the Parkland from Glossop Lodge. In order to justify this parcel of land, we will need to consider in more detail the heritage implications. We may need to look at reducing the extent of this development parcel or drilling down further with regards to the mitigation measures that could be introduced.

• CB3 – Ian was not as critical of this development parcel but the ‘stand-off’ distances from Glossop Lodge may need to be refined.

• CH1 – Ian was keen to secure a northern vista from Barbot Hall Farm and again this development parcel may need to be refined to accommodate this requirement.
• MU4 – Ian was comfortable that Bassingthorpe Farm could be successfully integrated into the community hub of the development with a suitable re-use.

It is clearly important that the Heritage Assessment becomes more integrated into the overall Concept Framework and we should also continue to use the goodwill of Ian and work with him to establish a strong position which can be defended should objections be raised through the local plan process.
Annex 4: Drop Ins Schedule (June / July 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Event Time</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Attendance Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>30th May</td>
<td>Consultation Drop in</td>
<td>2.30 - 6.30pm</td>
<td>Wickersley Community Centre</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>4th June</td>
<td>Consultation Drop in</td>
<td>2.30 - 6.30pm</td>
<td>Anston Parish Hall</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>6th June</td>
<td>Consultation Drop in</td>
<td>2.30 - 6.30pm</td>
<td>Rawmarsh High Street Centre</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>10th June</td>
<td>Consultation Drop in</td>
<td>2.30 - 6.30pm</td>
<td>Maltby Full Life</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>13th June</td>
<td>Consultation Drop in</td>
<td>2.30 - 6.30pm</td>
<td>Aston Parish Hall</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>17th June</td>
<td>Stakeholders consultation</td>
<td>10:00- 12:30</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>18th June</td>
<td>Consultation Drop in</td>
<td>2.30 - 6.30pm</td>
<td>Wales Village Hall</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>20th June</td>
<td>Consultation Drop in</td>
<td>2.30 - 6.30pm</td>
<td>Dinnington Resource Centre</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>25th June</td>
<td>Consultation Drop in</td>
<td>2.30 - 6.30pm</td>
<td>Broom Lane Church Hall</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>27th June</td>
<td>Consultation Drop in</td>
<td>2.30 - 6.30pm</td>
<td>Ravenfield Parish Hall</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>29th June</td>
<td>Consultation Drop in</td>
<td>1.00 - 5.00pm</td>
<td>Greasbrough Town Hall</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>3rd July</td>
<td>Stakeholder natural environment</td>
<td>6 - 9pm</td>
<td>Clifton Garden Room</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>5th July</td>
<td>Consultation Drop in</td>
<td>2.30 - 6.30pm</td>
<td>Wath Montgomery Hall</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10th July</td>
<td>Consultation Drop-in - MyPlace</td>
<td>2.30 - 6.30pm</td>
<td>Myplace, St Ann’s roundabout</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Attendance: 1501
Annex 5: Display boards produced by Signet Planning for exhibition at the Consultation drop-in on 29 June at Greasbrough Town Hall

- Board 1: Where are we in the process?
- Board 2: Concept Plan
- Board 3: What could it look like?
- Board 4: What are the benefits?
FEEDBACK: IN JULY 2009 YOU TOLD US

"Greasbrough is mentioned in the Domesday Book, this development will spoil its history and character"

"I object to the loss of more agricultural land. How will we feed the increased population?"

"Developing the land will cause the Cinder Bridge area to flood again"

"I object to the loss of Green Belt land. This area of countryside is what makes Rotherham a nice place to live"

"We will lose our green spaces. Where will we walk, cycle or ride?"

"I object to the pressure this will put on the road infrastructure. At peak times traffic around Rotherham Town Centre is a nightmare!"

"How will this benefit the area?"

"Valuable hedgerows and wildlife habitats will be lost"

VISION STATEMENT

Responding sensitively and positively to the historic and natural landscape to create a series of sustainable urban extensions to existing communities on the edge of Rotherham Urban Area

DESIGN OBJECTIVES

1. Create a network of multi-functional, accessible & well connected green spaces

2. Manage traffic impact and promote the use of public transport

3. A range of house types, sizes and tenures that fit in with the local area.

4. A mix of employment buildings to meet market and local needs.

5. A ‘High St’ within Bassingthorpe Urban Village including a primary school, local shops (e.g. convenience store, pharmacy), pub/restaurant, community & recreational uses.

6. Use the existing watercourses (e.g. Clough Stream & Greasbrough Dyke) to drain water in a sustainable way.

7. A network of pedestrian, cycle and green links within the site and to the town centre.

8. High quality design and new housing areas with distinctive character.

9. Link existing communities with adjoining new development.

10. Respect the buildings and parkland with heritage value.
**Bassingthorpe Urban Village**

"A new mixed use residential community with a traditional character offering panoramic views over the surrounding countryside and Rotherham townscape."

The High Street will be the centre for all services and facilities including shops, primary school, healthcare & community buildings. It will reflect the traditional appearance of the Urban Village and be a pedestrian orientated space with an emphasis on public transport corridor. Taller mixed use buildings and townhouses would be used to feel like an important street.

**Barbot Hill**

"An enterprising community providing places to live & work with traditional housing respecting the context of the listed buildings, Barbot Farm & Barbot Hall."

**Cinder Bridge**

"A high quality, low density, residential area reflecting the rural-urban fringe setting and fronting the enhanced waterside corridor" (Greasbrough Dyke)

**Clough Bank Urban Living**

"A compact & contemporary residential community with direct links to the town centre and strong connections to Clough Streamside."
GREEN SPACE
60% of the site remains undeveloped
An increase in Public Open Space
New "Green Ring" Circular Walk
through the site & around Greasbrough
An increase in Public Footpaths
30% of the site retained for agriculture
Existing Wildlife Habitats expanded & enhanced
Over 20% net gain of Allotments
New Complex of Outdoor Playing
Pitches: 12 Mini Soccer, 10 Junior
Pitches & 2 Adult Pitches
New Equipped Play Areas at
Bassingthorpe Farm & Barbot Hill

OPEN SPACE NETWORK

NEW HOMES
Circa 2,400 New Homes delivered on a
phased basis. Broken down as follows:
- Clough Bank: 697 Homes
- Bassingthorpe Urban Village: 1,147 Homes
- Barbot Hill: 369 Homes
- Cinder Bridge Waterside: 215 Homes

A range of tenures and house types
including:
- Terraced Properties & Townhouses
- Semi-Detached Properties
- Detached Properties
- 'Linked Detached' Properties (connected by
  walls/archways etc)
- Bungalows

Flexible Housing - new homes with an
adjoining building to be used as a
studio/workshop/office or playroom.

TRANSPORT
A new road link & bus corridor
between Fenton Road and Car Hill
Bus Routes extended into the site
Pedestrian and cycle routes separated
from busy roads in safe, attractive
green corridors.

Dedicated Cycle Routes from Car Hill
(near Barbot Hill) south west to the Town
Centre and north east to Parkgate.

LOCAL FACILITIES
The creation of Bassingthorpe Urban
Village will include the delivery of
a significant number of new services &
facilities to the wider community, with
these including:
- Primary School
- Local Shops (Convenience Store, Pharmacy etc)
- Health Centre & Community Building
- Sports Complex (Change Facilities & New Pitches)
- Community Allotments (linked to the Primary
  School & Community Building)
- Pub/Restaurant (conversion of Bassingthorpe Farm?)
- Business Units (Small Scale/Start-up)

WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?
Reviewing Your Comments
Summer 2013: Over the next couple of months, your responses
and views will be carefully reviewed as well as other emerging
technical information.

Planning Process
Autumn 2013: Further changes and options may be tested to
demonstrate the suitability of the site at high level before the
Concept Framework Plan Report is presented to an independent
Planning Inspector who will assess the Bassingthorpe Farm
proposals as part of the emerging Rotherham Local Plan Core
Strategy which is intended to guide development for the next 15
years.

Masterplanning/Design Code
Ultimately if the Concept Framework work is accepted by the
Planning Inspector this will form the basis of the preparation of a
detailed Masterplan and Design Code to bring forward the
Bassingthorpe Farm Broad Location for Growth in a coordinated
way. This will involve a detailed examination of further technical
information. It will also investigate and test in more detail the
phasing and delivery of essential infrastructure to enable the
creation of viable sustainable communities.
Annex 6: Sample comments form for Bassingthorpe Farm Public Exhibition
## BASSINGTHORPE FARM

### COMMENTS FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### APPROACH

1. Our approach is to extend out from the existing communities of Henley and Greasbrough (The Clough Bank, Barbot Hill & Cinder Bridge areas) and link the existing & new areas together. What do you think about this?

2. A new ‘Urban Village’ at Bassingthorpe will also be created south of Munsbrough Lane which would be the centre for services & facilities (schools, shops etc). What do you think about this?

### FACILITIES AND SERVICES

3. The proposals indicated a ‘High Street’ at Bassingthorpe Urban Village (with shops, schools, health & community use). Do you think this is the right level of local facilities and are they in the right place?

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT & MOVEMENT

4. To minimise car use, a bus corridor will be created between Fenton Road and Car Hill so bus services can be re-routed through the development. New pedestrian & cycle links to key destinations such as Wingfield Business & Enterprise College, the Town Centre and Parkgate are to be created. Do you agree with this approach?

5. Links to the Town Centre, the Railway Station, future ‘Tram:Train’ and the Bus Interchange would be improved as part of the proposals, and a new pedestrian & cycle route to the town centre (away from busy roads, the Vitrex site etc) via Rodger Street and Thorn Hill Recreation Ground is proposed. What do you think about this link?

### MEETING LOCAL HOUSING REQUIREMENTS

6. Board 4 ‘New Homes’ provides information on the proposed house types. What types of housing would you like to see? (terraced or detached? 2 or 3 bedroom?)
CHARACTER

Four separate character areas have been created, each with a unique and distinctive style and appearance (shown on Board 3 – Clough Bank, Bassingthorpe Urban Village, Barbot Hill and Cinder Bridge). What do you/don’t you like about them?

WORKING WITH THE SITE AND ITS CONTEXT

From the outset the approach has been to retain, enhance and widen the ‘river corridors’ along Clough Stream and Greasbrough Dyke? Do you agree with this approach?

There are a number of listed buildings in the surrounding area of Bassingthorpe Farm and we are working closely with English Heritage to protect them. What do you think to the proposal to keep and convert the Bassingthorpe Farm building? (potentially to a pub/restaurant).

PUBLIC SPACES

Green corridors along Clough Stream and Greasbrough form part of a wider ‘Green Ring’ (a circular walk) around Greasbrough (enhancements to Fenton Road) and through the site. What do you think about this?

Within a ‘Sports Complex’ at Bassingthorpe Urban Village we are proposing 12 ‘Mini Soccer’ pitches, 10 Junior Pitches and 2 Adult Pitches. What do you think about the amount of sports provision?

There will be an over 20% net increase in the amount of allotments delivered as part of the proposals. Do you think this is adequate/Will they be used?

RETURNING THIS FORM

If you wish to make further comments please do so on additional sheets of paper, fastened together securely.

The deadline for comments on the proposals is 5pm on 29 July 2013. All the material presented at the exhibition and further technical reports are available on the council’s website www.rotherham.gov.uk/localplan

Please return forms by email to planning.policy@rotherham.gov.uk or by post to Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, Planning Policy Team, Riverside House, Main Street, Rotherham, S60 1AE