THE COUNCIL’S OPENING STATEMENT

MATTER 1: REQUIREMENTS, VISION, STRATEGY, OBJECTIVES AND SUSTAINABILITY

ISSUE 1: HAS THE COUNCIL COMPLIED WITH ALL THE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS, AND IN PARTICULAR THE DUTY TO CO-OPERATE, AND ARE THE CORE STRATEGY’S PROPOSALS FOR SUSTAINABLE GROWTH DELIVERABLE, CLEAR, SUFFICIENTLY JUSTIFIED, EFFECTIVE AND CONSISTENT WITH ALL RELEVANT NATIONAL POLICY?

1.1 What measures has the Council taken to comply with the duty to co-operate, with which local authorities has that co-operation taken place and what has been the outcome of that co-operation? What documentary evidence is there of that co-operation, and what evidence is there in the Core Strategy of the effectiveness of that co-operation?

1.2 Have there been any discussions at any time with a nearby Borough or District to accommodate any unmet need, and has any nearby Authority requested the Council to meet any of its needs? And what was the outcome of any such request? For example, are any arrangements or understandings in place between the Council and Sheffield City Council? In which ways has the Council acted as a “good neighbour” in matters of town and country planning?

1.3 Are all cross-boundary issues satisfactorily addressed?

1.4 Is the plan period, 2013-2028, the most appropriate one? Should it be longer? Should it be unspecified, i.e the next 15 years?

1.5 Does the Core Strategy adequately set out the main characteristics of the Borough, its main assets, problems (including various aspects of deprivation), its attractions, challenges and opportunities? How should the dispersed settlement pattern be regarded?

1.6 Subject to discussions in more detail at subsequent Hearings, is the vision for the Borough and the 17 Strategic Objectives realistic and achievable?

1.7 In general terms, and subject to later discussions, does the Core Strategy adequately take account of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)? Has the timescale for its preparation through its various stages allowed sufficient regard to be had to the Framework and, if not, what are the likely consequences?

1.8 Has the Core Strategy been positively prepared and, if so, in which ways? Subject to more detailed discussions with regard to housing, employment and retail, does it fully meet the objectively assessed development needs of the area? And does it do so with sufficient flexibility to adapt to change? And what might be the consequences of any insufficient flexibility?
1.9 What are the physical and environmental constraints to development in the Borough? To what extent does the Core Strategy take account of the Framework paragraph 112 concerning the best and most versatile agricultural land?

1.10 Have exceptional circumstances been demonstrated to justify any alteration to Green Belt boundaries? Is the matter adequately considered in the Core Strategy, or is too much reliance being placed on the Sites and Policies DPD? Should any additions or deletions be made to the locations identified in Policy CS4 for broad extent of changes? Are paragraphs 5.2.11 and 5.2.41 consistent?

1.11 Are the proposals for safeguarded land justified, with particular regard to the areas of search?

1.12 Have any reasonable alternative options been assessed to achieve the economic, social and environmental objectives in a sustainable way? Has the correct balance been achieved between these 3 dimensions? Does the Core Strategy set out the most appropriate strategy against reasonable alternatives? Why are the chosen locations for growth the most sustainable?

1.13 How relevant to the Core Strategy is survey material which informed the Regional Strategy?

1.14 Is there a clear vision for the future pattern of development with particular regard to housing, employment and transport proposals? Should any settlement be added to any level in the hierarchy?

1.15 Should the Core Strategy identify land at Bassingthorpe Farm as a broad location for growth? What are the constraints to its development, and how could they be reduced or overcome? What are its sustainability credentials? What is the basis of the estimate of 2,400 dwellings? How would its development assist the regeneration of Rotherham town centre (see Fact Sheet No 4 – CSP/17) and the objectives of Rotherham Renaissance?

1.16 Does the pattern of development, particularly the settlement hierarchy, promote the use of sustainable modes of transport? Subject to the discussion on Monitoring and Implementation, to what extent can the Council implement the various transport proposals and expectations? Should the distribution of growth be slanted more towards Sheffield to reflect the close association of the City and the Borough?

1.17 Are the Core Strategy’s proposals to deliver sustainable growth clearly articulated and adequately justified? Does it adequately set out how much development is intended to happen where, when and by what means it will be delivered?

1.18 Is there enough emphasis on good design, bearing in mind that it is indivisible from good planning? Are the references to design sufficient to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness and integrate new development into the natural, built and historic environment?

1.19 Are the proposed measures to tackle climate change justified, effective and adequately in line with the policy in the Framework of meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change? In particular:
a) Does the Core Strategy set enough and sufficiently specific targets, for example in respect of sustainable building requirements?

b) Are its climate change measures clear, effective and adequately justified?

1.20 Does the Core Strategy provide a suitable basis for the delivery of a sustainable future that balances economic, social and environmental interests (including a radical reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution and providing resilience to the impacts of climate change) and does it adequately support the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure (Framework paragraphs 6, 8, 17 & 93)?

1.21 Are all forms of renewable energy given adequate consideration?
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Matter 2: Affordable Housing and Other Needs

Issue 2: Is the Core Strategy effective in meeting special housing needs, including for affordable homes and for gypsies and travellers?

2.1 Is the Core Strategy’s approach to affordable housing sufficiently justified and consistent with national policy?

2.2 Is the threshold of 15 dwellings justified by the evidence?

2.3 What are the prospects of grant aid, and how might this affect viability and the consequent % of affordable homes and tenure mix?

2.4 Does the Core Strategy provide sufficient guidance on the application of viability testing on a site-by-site basis?

2.5 Is sufficient clarity provided about how affordable housing policies will be carried forward into other development plan documents?

2.6 Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the Core Strategy’s affordable housing policies and targets are realistic? Does the Council have a target for affordable housing; if so, is it 35% and how does that compare with the 25% in Policy CS7? How close could any target come to the estimated annual affordable housing need of 1,155 dwellings?

2.7 What is the Council’s track record in the delivery of affordable housing during the last 5-10 years or so?

2.8 Does Policy CS7c allow for market housing on rural exception sites, and to what extent does that accord with national policy?

2.9 Does the Core Strategy adequately provide for the special needs of the elderly, especially with regard to housing?

2.10 Does it provide satisfactorily for the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople and, if so, for which period? Is there any unmet need; if so, what is it, and what is the evidence that demonstrates it? Should any unmet need be left to a subsequent plan?

2.11 Should the Core Strategy include a more specific criteria-based policy for assessing proposals for sites for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople?
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Matter 3: Housing – General Needs, Deliverability, Density and Quality

Issue 3: Is the Core Strategy effective in meeting local housing needs, including the provision of an appropriate mix of housing of suitable type and quality and at suitable densities?

3.1 Upon which population and household forecasts does the Core Strategy rely, how relevant and up-to-date are they and how does it take account of their implications in assessing housing requirements for the Borough? Has migration been adequately taken into account and, if so, what are its implications?

3.2 To what extent have landowners and developers been involved in the preparation of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), and to what extent do these Assessments meet the requirements of the Framework paragraph 159? Are these documents sufficiently up-to-date? Has the SHMA been prepared in accordance with Practice Guidance?

3.3 Can the proposed housing requirement of 12,750 dwellings (net) at an annual average of 850 dwellings during 2013-2028 be justified? Does it meet the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the Borough and as part of the housing market area, as the Framework requires? And which is that housing market area?

3.4 Why the difference between the RSS requirement of 1160 net dwellings annually (2008-2026) and the provision in the Core Strategy?

3.5 How relevant is the South Yorkshire Growth Point target of 1,788 additional homes?

3.6 To what extent does the proposed amount of housing accord with the Government’s intention to boost significantly the supply of housing?

3.7 Why is it that the trajectory at page 41 of the Focused Changes shows completions below the annual requirement during certain years up to 2018-19 but substantially above it during the latter part of the plan period? What are the implications for a 5 year supply of housing land? How robust is the evidence for this trajectory? In particular, is the phasing set out in Policy CS6 necessary?

3.8 Does the Core Strategy identify, and provide a mechanism for, an annual updating of a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years worth of housing against housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the housing market?

3.9 What has been the record of housing delivery against the requirements of various plans? Has any under-delivery of housing been so persistent that it calls for an increase in that buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land? And what is the evidence for that persistence during which period?
3.10 Does the Core Strategy identify a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-17? Is this requirement of the Framework the basis for the reference to phasing in Policy CS3?

3.11 Does the identification and delivery of land for housing rely too much upon the adoption of the Sites and Policies DPD and what is the programme for this DPD? Which are the key sites considered critical to the delivery of the housing strategy during the plan period, e.g strategic site allocations, broad locations or any other greenfield releases?

3.12 What importance does the Council, through its Core Strategy, attach to the re-use of previously-developed (brownfield) land (pdl)? Is it sufficiently clear that any such redevelopment should be on “well-located” pdl? Should there be a “local brownfield target” and, if defined, is it likely to be achievable and what evidence is available at present to justify it? Is contamination likely to be a major constraint in bringing forward pdl?

3.13 What has been the record during the previous 10 or so years in achieving housing development on pdl? Does the Core Strategy give sufficient attention to the contribution which “windfalls” might make throughout the plan period to housing requirements?

3.14 Does the Core Strategy clearly and consistently set out what amount of development, in terms of number of units and definition of sites, will take place in the locations identified in the settlement hierarchy? And is the precision of the stated figures supported by the evidence base?

3.15 Does the evidence base identify a sufficient level of housing supply to meet and exceed expected requirements? For example, is it clear from the evidence how the housing land supply figures have been broken down into relevant components, and is this evidence base sufficiently up to date with particular regard to:

1) completions
2) commitments – extant planning permissions
3) existing development plan allocations that have not yet been implemented and remain available (excluding those with extant permissions)
4) housing supply anticipated to come from sites to be allocated in future DPDs (excluding those with extant permissions)

3.16 Does the Local Plan adequately promote a wide choice of high quality homes, promote wider opportunities for home ownership and self-build and provide for the creation of sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities?

3.17 Does the Core Strategy adequately support a suitable mix of housing sizes and types? Does it adequately identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand, or will subsequent plans address that requirement? Should there be any provision for car-free housing schemes?

3.18 What policies, proposals and resources does the Council have, and to what extent have they achieved success, in bringing back vacant dwellings into residential use? Can it be agreed that any such programme does not increase the stock of housing?
3.19 Is there any (more) scope for housing in town centres, and what would be the effect of any such additions on housing land supply?

3.20 Should there be a policy to resist inappropriate development in residential gardens where that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area (Framework paragraph 53)?

3.21 What measures are being introduced, and how are they being funded, to improve the energy efficiency of the existing housing stock and thereby reduce fuel poverty? Should the Core Strategy include any further relevant reference to this matter?
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Matter 4: Infrastructure and Monitoring

Issue 4: Does the Core Strategy provide satisfactorily for the delivery of development, particularly its required infrastructure for public transport and other services, and convincingly demonstrate adequate monitoring of its provision and measures designed to rectify any shortcomings?

4.1 Has there been an adequate assessment of the quality and capacity of infrastructure for transport, water supply etc as required by the Framework paragraph 162?

4.2 Does the Core Strategy plan positively for the development and infrastructure required in the Borough to meet the objectives, principles and policies of the Framework? Is there a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure, including for sustainable transport, is deliverable in a timely fashion?

4.3 Is there sufficient reference in the Core Strategy to the possibility of more park and ride sites? What realistic prospect is there of such further sites?

4.4 Does the evidence base convince that there is, or will be, sufficient energy resources, including gas, electricity and water, to support the scale and distribution of envisaged growth?

4.5 Does the Core Strategy include sufficient provision for reducing the risk of flooding, and in this respect is it in accord with the Framework including its Technical Guidance?

4.6 Are the various indicators and targets sufficiently precise? Has the Council and/or its Core Strategy got justified, effective monitoring systems in place? What mechanism is there to monitor the delivery of the strategy? What would be the composition and status of any group appointed for such monitoring and the making of any consequent recommendations? What provisions are in place, or could be put in place, if need be to get the strategy back on track?

4.7 Does the Core Strategy include sufficient provision for setting out how the proposed development, and the infrastructure upon which it relies, will be delivered? If so, should it include reference to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), Section 106 Agreements and reference to the nature of such agreements as was expressed in Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations which referred to the negotiation of private agreements and the seeking of planning obligations? For example, is Policy CS22a in accordance with national policy?

4.8 Is the Council a “charging authority” with regard to the CIL? If not, is it likely to be so at some stage during the plan period, and what would be the implications for the provision of infrastructure?

4.9 In respect of infrastructure requirements, has an appropriate balance been struck between the amount of detail set out in the Core Strategy and the supporting documents? What is the status of the Infrastructure Delivery Study (IDS)? Is it a “living document”, to which various bodies will continue to contribute?

4.10 To what extent are the policies and proposals in the Core Strategy aspirations rather than a deliverable, confidently funded plan of action? At a time of economic
uncertainty and austerity, is the Core Strategy and the IDS setting out false hopes? Should a greater note of caution be introduced in an early page?

4.11 How secure is the funding for the infrastructure needed for the various development proposals? To what extent are the funding bodies committed to the Core Strategy policies and proposals? To what extent have they been involved in its preparation? Should they be invited to any Hearing, particularly this one?

4.12 What is the current position concerning the Rotherham – Sheffield Tram Train trial? Is the scheme likely to go ahead? Is there a list of planned schemes to ensure that public transport services and infrastructure are provided in line with planned development, as mentioned by SYPTE.
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Matter 5: Employment, Economic Development and Town Centres

Issue 5: Is the Core Strategy’s approach to economic development, the protection of employment land and viability of town centres clearly articulated, sufficiently justified and in line with national policy?

5.1 Does the Core Strategy set out a clear economic vision and strategy for the Borough which positively and proactively promotes sustainable economic growth and suitably responds to any relevant wider opportunities for growth? Does it take sufficient account of the Government’s commitment to securing economic growth as set out in the Framework?

5.2 Does it ensure, as far as it can, that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support economic growth and innovation? In its preparation of the Core Strategy, has the Council worked together with neighbouring authorities, the Local Enterprise Partnerships and the local business community, in accordance with the Framework paragraph 160? How has the Core Strategy been influenced by that co-operation?

5.3 Is the scale of the provision for employment land supported by a robust evidence base, is it consistent with the proposed level of housing and what is the basis of any such consistency?

5.4 Are the proposals for new office space appropriate? If implemented, what benefits would they bring and could they damage the employment prospects of neighbouring authorities and result in any more commuting into the Borough? Could they result in less commuting out of the Borough?

5.5 Is there sufficient protection for existing industrial and warehousing floorspace in the Borough for the requirements of start-ups and other enterprises needing low rent premises?

5.6 Is the Core Strategy’s stance and policy on employment land protection clearly defined and adequately justified? Does it accord with the Framework paragraph 22 that the long term protection of sites allocated for employment where there is no reasonable prospect of their being used for that purpose? Would alternative uses of such land and buildings be considered? Have land allocations been regularly reviewed as a basis for the Core Strategy’s approach?

5.7 Does the Core Strategy provide clear guidance on the acceptability (or otherwise) of housing development on sites currently used or allocated for employment? If not, how could this be clarified?

5.8 Is the hierarchy of centres defined in Policy CS12 realistic and justified? Should any changes be made to it?

5.9 Does the Core Strategy accord with the policy in the Framework of ensuring the vitality of town centres? Are the thresholds in Policy CS12, particularly with regard to the Impact Assessment, realistic and justified?

5.10 Have the needs identified in the Retail and Leisure Study been suitably accommodated in the Core Strategy and, if not, why not? Are they consistent with the need for
regeneration? Would the extension to Rotherham town centre envisaged in Policy CS13 be consistent with the regeneration of the town centre? Does the Core Strategy include enough detail for any such extension?

5.11 What measures will be introduced to promote and ensure the vitality of Rotherham and Dinnington town centres, and what funding is in place for them? Could any existing markets be retained and enhanced?

5.12 Will there be a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism etc development in the town centres? Is there sufficient acknowledgement of the importance of the evening economy?

5.13 To what extent does, or can, the Core Strategy support innovation, skills and enterprise by adopting a positive approach towards places of higher education and training and any other bodies (maybe hospitals) involved in the promotion of a knowledge-based and more diverse economy? And to what extent is the Council promoting this objective? How important are these and other institutions as drivers of the local economy?

5.14 Does the Core Strategy promote a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to ensuring that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and expanded communities, and what is the Council’s track record in securing improvements in the quality and accessibility of schools, colleges and universities?

5.15 Does the Core Strategy provide enough encouragement for tourism? How could it be better promoted as part of the local economy? Could it do more to draw attention to such places as Registered Parks and Gardens, industrial architecture and other places of historic interest, including the Minster?

5.16 Does it take sufficient account of the increasing trend towards working at/from home, and to what extent does, or can, the Core Strategy support the expansion of electronic communications networks?

5.17 Can the use of maximum parking standards for non-residential uses be justified (Policy CS14 (e))?
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Matter 6: The Built & Natural Environment

Issue 6: Does the Core Strategy provide sufficient protection, preservation and enhancement of the built and natural environment and introduce measures of sufficient force to mitigate any potentially adverse effects upon these interests?

6.1 Does the Core Strategy pay sufficient attention to heritage assets, including Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and Registered Parks and Gardens? Does it convincingly demonstrate the Council’s intention to protect and enhance these interests? Does it set out a positive, proactive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment? Does it adequately consider the qualities and local distinctiveness of the historic environment?

6.2 Does the Core Strategy convincingly set out how the architectural heritage of town centres will be conserved and, where need be, enhanced to provide a sense of place and a focus for the community and for civic pride and activity? What is the Council’s track record here? Are any Listed Buildings or other heritage assets at risk and, if so, what is proposed for them?

6.3 Does the Core Strategy adequately encourage new uses for vacant or derelict buildings, including historic buildings?

6.4 In which ways does the Core Strategy contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution?
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Matter 7: Dinnington, any other locations for Housing and other matters including Recreation, Leisure, Culture and Minerals

Issue 7: Is the Local Plan sufficiently in accord with national planning policy with regard to suitable land for housing and other matters including recreation, leisure, culture and minerals

7.1 Is the Dinnington East broad location for growth suitable, being in accordance with principles of sustainability? Would an extension to the west of Dinnington be better? On what basis is the estimated number of dwellings made?

7.2 Will there be sufficient provision for allotments? Is there an increasing demand for them? Is there a robust and up-to-date assessment of the need for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision, including public rights of way? And is there adequate provision for the protection of existing facilities?

7.3 Which measures are in place, or will be put in place, to achieve a comprehensive range of recreation facilities across the Borough? What scale of new provision is expected, and is it realistically achievable during the plan period?

7.4 Would any policies or proposals in the Core Strategy unduly sterilise mineral reserves? To what extent does it accord with the Framework paragraphs 145, 146 and 147? Should it indicate any further Mineral Safeguarding Areas?

7.5 Has the legacy of mining in the Borough been sufficiently considered? Are records of previous mining activity reliable? Is there an assurance that potential land allocations and other policies will not lead to public safety hazards?
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