

## Comment

<b>Consultee</b>	Mr Ryan Shepherd (538989)
<b>Email Address</b>	ryan.shepherd@rotherham.gov.uk
<b>Company / Organisation</b>	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
<b>Address</b>	Planning & Regeneration Riverside House Rotherham S60 1AE
<b>Event Name</b>	Draft Dinnington Neighbourhood Plan
<b>Comment by</b>	Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (Mr Ryan Shepherd - 538989)
<b>Comment ID</b>	DNP29
<b>Response Date</b>	20/12/19 12:47
<b>Status</b>	Processed
<b>Submission Type</b>	Web
<b>Version</b>	0.2
<b>Files</b>	<a href="#">RMBC Schedule of comments on Dinnington NP document.pdf</a> <a href="#">Appendix 2 - Strategic Policies in Rotherham (Jan 2019).pdf</a> <a href="#">Appendix 1 - Dinnington Ward Profile 2017.pdf</a>

**Q1. To which document do your comments relate?** Neighbourhood Plan Draft Submission Version

**Q2. Do you wish to?** Object

**Q3. Please provide your comments below making clear which part of the document you are referring to (specifying relevant paragraphs, tables, figures, boxes or appendices).**

Refer to attachments:

RMBC Schedule of comments on Dinnington NP document

Appendix 1 - Dinnington Ward Profile 2017

Appendix 2 - Strategic Policies in Rotherham (Jan 2019)

**Q4. Suggested modifications. If you consider that amendments should be made then it will be helpful if you could put forward any suggested wording changes.**

Refer to attached RMBC Schedule of comments on Dinnington NP document

**You may also upload any supporting documents to support your representation.** [RMBC Schedule of comments on Dinnington NP document.pdf](#)

**Q5. Do you wish to be notified of the Council's decision under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulation 2012 whether to accept the Examiners' recommendation? (please tick)**  Yes, please notify me of the Council's decision

## Rotherham MBC comments on the Dinnington St John's Neighbourhood Plan Submission Draft (December 2019)

### Introduction

In preparing its comments the Council has had regard to the basic conditions that neighbourhood plans must satisfy<sup>1</sup>. It has also had regard to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; February 2019<sup>2</sup>), in particular:

*Paragraph 13: ...Neighbourhood plans should support the delivery of strategic policies contained in local plans or spatial development strategies; and should shape and direct development that is outside of these strategic policies.*

*Paragraph 16: Plans should:*

- a. be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development;*
- b. be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable;*
- c. be shaped by early, proportionate and effective engagement between planmakers and communities, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators and statutory consultees;*
- d. contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals;*
- e. be accessible through the use of digital tools to assist public involvement and policy presentation; and*
- f. serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant).*

*Paragraph 29: Neighbourhood planning gives communities the power to develop a shared vision for their area. Neighbourhood plans can shape, direct and help to deliver sustainable development, by influencing local planning decisions as part of the statutory development plan. Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies.*

The comments also take account of the accompanying Planning Practice Guidance<sup>3</sup> (PPG), in particular:

*How should the policies in a neighbourhood plan be drafted?*

*A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence. It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared. (Paragraph: 041 Reference ID: 41-041-20140306)*

The comments in this document are focused on the submission draft neighbourhood plan. Comments are provided separately on other submission and evidence base documents.

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#basic-conditions-for-neighbourhood-plan-to-referendum>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework>

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>

## Schedule of comments

This schedule is in two parts:

- Table 1 (page 2): provides a summary of the Council's comments focused on the Community Actions and Development Management policies.
- Table 2 (page 4): contains the Council's detailed comments on the neighbourhood plan, including Community Actions and Development Management policies. Page and paragraph numbers are given wherever possible to clarify the relevant part of the draft neighbourhood plan to which comments refer.

The schedule of comments is accompanied by two appendices:

- Appendix 1: RMBC Ward profile 2017 – Dinnington Ward
- Appendix 2: RMBC strategic policies for the purposes of neighbourhood planning

**Table 1 – a summary of the Council's comments focused on the Community Actions and Development Management policies**

Policy / action	Concern	Proposed modification
Community Action 1: Future Housing Allocation.	Object on the basis that it is unclear how the action as worded could be implemented.	Delete
Policy H1 housing mix	Object on the basis that the requirements have not been justified, that it would be difficult to apply to smaller schemes, and that it may increase the number of apartment type developments.	In the absence of robust evidence then the detailed requirements regarding housing mix should be deleted.  Amend to apply only to major schemes of 10 or more dwellings.
Policy H2	It is unclear what "agreed Rotherham MBC standards and management arrangements" refers to.  The last paragraph relating to Article 4 Directions is not a relevant consideration when determining planning applications.	Clarify reference to agreed standards and management arrangements.  Delete final paragraph and include as a separate community action point.
Policy HLC1 community facilities	Broadly replicates Policy SP62 Safeguarding Community Facilities, however is weaker and less robust.  It is unclear why the particular community facilities have been identified, particularly when other community facilities within the parish are not included.  There is a danger that retaining the public houses in this policy would result in a weaker, less robust policy being applied than Policy SP63 of the Sites and Policies document.	Re-word to identify those specific community facilities of value and clarify that Policy SP62 (which is NPPF compliant) will apply to any proposals involving the loss of these facilities, and that Policy SP63 will apply to those proposals relating to public houses.

Policy / action	Concern	Proposed modification
Policy HLC3 ACVs	There is some concern that the designation of an Asset of Community Value carries limited weight as a material consideration in determining a planning application, similar to other legal / civil matters such as land ownership.	Should the policy be retained then there may be a need to provide additional guidance regarding the evidence that may be required by applicants in order to demonstrate that the existing use is not viable.
Policy STC1 Dinnington town centre	The Council is concerned that this policy contains no locally specific elements.	It is suggested that the policy is deleted and cross reference made to existing Local Plan policies, or that the policy is revised to provide more locally specific guidance. Should the policy be re-worded then consideration should be given to how it would operate in conjunction with the local plan policies for town centres and shopping frontages.
Policy STC2 town centre	The date of the Interim Planning Statement referred to is incorrect. Furthermore the Council is currently updating this guidance.	Amend to read: Having regard to the Rotherham Interim Planning Statement Shopfront Design Guide (2006), or any subsequent replacement.
Policy STC4 shops outside town centre	The Council considers that the requirement in criteria b) for marketing for 6 months would undermine Local Plan Policy SP62 'Safeguarding Community Facilities' which would apply to shops outside of defined centres, and contains more detailed and stringent marketing requirements.	Amend the policy to reflect the requirements of Policy SP62, or alternatively amend to identify that Policy SP62 will be applied in specific circumstances.
Policy NE1 Green Belt	This policy repeats national and local policy and provides no further locally specific guidance.	Delete and include as a separate community action point.
Policy NE2 local green spaces	The Council objects to the proposed Local Green Space sites and considers that they are not appropriately justified with respect to the guidance in NPPF.	Delete policy and supporting text.
Policy NE3 Biodiversity	The Council considers that the policy does not add anything locally specific to the Local Plan policies regarding biodiversity and wildlife and is far weaker.	Reword the policy around identifying the specific locally significant and important features that should be protected, or alternatively delete the policy.
Policy BED1 – Local Heritage Interest	The Council expresses concern with the descriptions of the location of the sites proposed, and also with the inclusion of the following buildings / structures:	A clearer description of the sites (including their address where relevant) should be given to enable the policy to be implemented.  Consider whether the 5 sites to

Policy / action	Concern	Proposed modification
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Front of the Old Brewery</li> <li>• Handsworth Woodhouse Co-op Buildings</li> <li>• Old Dentists</li> <li>• Middleton Institute</li> <li>• Silverdales Social Club</li> </ul>	the left are sufficiently justified for inclusion.
Policy BED2 – Design and Infrastructure	The Council consider that there is further scope for a more effective policy to be created by focusing on guidance specific to the Parish. Part 2 is wide ranging and it is considered that it would be difficult to assess proposals against this policy.	<p>The new point 1(i) is noted however the wording of ‘they’ should be removed for consistency purpose.</p> <p>Reconsider the wording of the policy as a whole.</p>
Policy BED3 developer contributions	The council objects to this policy as it is concerned that it may affect the Local Planning Authority’s ability to negotiate Section 106 contributions with developers as part of determining planning applications. Furthermore as worded it would apply to all applications, including small developments (for example, 1 or 2 homes).	The Council considers that a more appropriate approach would be for the policy to establish how the parish Council will seek to prioritise spending of their proportion of CIL monies on local infrastructure. If retained the policy should be amended to apply to major developments only (10 or more dwellings, or the creation of 1,000 sq m or more of floorspace, or where a site is of 1 hectare or more.)

**Table 2 – detailed schedule of comments**

Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
Throughout document	<p>It would be helpful and assist officers in implementing the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) if the document had paragraph numbering. This would enable reports by planning officers to refer to specific paragraphs rather than page numbers.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the consistency of wording – i.e. consistent use of capitals (e.g. Parish or parish, Health and Wellbeing).</p> <p>In terms of policies, they would be better presented with accompanying references and links to existing Local Plan policies. At present there appears to have been little attention paid to the policies proposed and how they fit with, overlap with or would operate with other plan policies. This could result in unintended consequences, such as superseding stronger policies which could result in greater risk of development coming forward which the community may not support.</p> <p>It is disappointing that there is an undercurrent of negativity towards the Council throughout the document. There is also a concern that negatives</p>

Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
	<p>about the area are highlighted disproportionately throughout the document yet it identifies ‘Dinnington is an attractive place to live’. Whilst respecting that there may be different views held, the NP would benefit from being drafted in a more positive light.</p> <p>It is also noted that statistics which have been provided previously appear to have been disregarded. The 2017 ward profile is attached as an appendix (appendix 1) to these comments.</p> <p>There is an over-arching concern that many of the policies are simply stating what is already being done, and that there are a number of proposals that do not seem to be joined up with the necessary partners. In addition there is a concern that the plan does not sufficiently reflect the funding or resources required to implement aspirations. For example, it is agreed that new community facilities, employment sites and residential areas need access to public transport, walking and cycling; however there is nothing in the plan which demonstrates how this will be achieved.</p> <p>There are numerous links to webpages and documents on Rotherham Council’s website. These are now out of date following the Council’s refresh of its website, and should be replaced with up to date links.</p> <p>The titles of Community Action boxes are currently illegible and should be in a legible font colour having regard to the background colours used.</p>
<b>Foreword</b>	
	<p>There is a concern that an overly negative picture is being painted from the outset which could be misleading.</p> <p>The headlines include reference to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A decreasing life expectancy</li> <li>• A worsening Health situation for all</li> <li>• At best an Educational achievement picture that is static at a low base</li> </ul> <p>There are concerns that some of these issues are relevant for part of the Parish (namely the two central super output areas) but outside of those two areas the rest of Dinnington is usually equal to or better than the Borough averages.</p> <p>The Dinnington Ward Plan published in 2017 (see appendix 1) included the following:</p> <p><b>Health</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Across the ward in general, health issues are equal to or ranked better than the Borough average.</li> <li>• Life expectancy in the central Dinnington area is lower than the borough average for both men and women at around 70 for men against a Borough average of 76 and 77 for women against a</li> </ul>

Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
	<p>Borough average of 80.</p> <p><b>Education</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key Stage 2 Level 4 in Reading, Writing &amp; Maths 2014: 70% (Rotherham 77%, England 78%) 5+ GCSE inc English &amp; Maths 2014: 64% (Rotherham 55%, England 53.4%).</li> <li>• Primary attainment in 2014 was below the Rotherham and national averages but secondary attainment was above average.</li> <li>• Highest Level of Qualification (2011 Census): Degree or diploma 19.9% (Rotherham 17.4%, England 27.4%) No Qualifications 27.7% (Rotherham 29.8%, England 22.5%)</li> </ul> <p>Better than Rotherham average:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Premature deaths** from cancer (2010-2014) 90 (Rotherham 115)</li> <li>• Obese children (aged 10-11 years) (2012/13-2014/15) 18.9% (Rotherham 22.0%, England 19.0%)</li> <li>• Elective hospital admissions for knee replacement (2010/11-2014/15) 101 (Rotherham 118)</li> <li>• Incidence of lung cancer (2010-2014) 117 (Rotherham 132)</li> <li>• Emergency hospital admissions for CHD (2010/11-2014/15) 106 (Rotherham 116)</li> </ul> <p>Worse than Rotherham average:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hospital admissions for injuries in 15-24 year olds (per 10,000) (2010/11-2014/15) 178.1, (Rotherham 133.7, England 139.5)</li> </ul>
p.4 – 1st para.	It is disappointing that this paragraph seeks to score political points through a subjective opinion rather than positively introducing the neighbourhood plan.
<b>1.0 Introduction</b>	
p.6 – 3 <sup>rd</sup> bullet point	Consider changing ‘the right type...’ to ‘the appropriate type...’?
p.8 – 4th para.	It is suggested that reference to transportation / connectivity could be included.
p.8 – 5th para.	<p>With regard to strategic policies, the Council has prepared a note identifying strategic policies for the purposes of neighbourhood planning. A copy is included for information at appendix 2, and it is also available on the Council’s website:</p> <p><a href="https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/554/strategic-policies-in-rotherham-january-2019-">https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/554/strategic-policies-in-rotherham-january-2019-</a></p>
p.9 – 4th para.	The Council notes the content of this paragraph and is concerned that this is not reflected in practice in a number of areas. Further comment is provided later in relation to specific policies; however the Council considers that the draft plan does replicate / duplicate existing planning policies and in some cases risks introducing weaker policies which may have unintended outcomes should they be implemented.
p.9 – 5th para.	The last sentence of this paragraph is a subjective opinion and should be deleted. The Inspector examining the Core Strategy was satisfied that the



Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
	Council had demonstrated the exceptional circumstances required to review and amend the Green Belt boundary. The Sites and Policies document has subsequently defined the borough's Green Belt boundary and contains a suite of policies relating to development within the Green Belt, as well as policies relating to windfall sites and previously developed land. Following adoption of the Core Strategy and the Sites and Policies document it is considered that there are no further areas requiring clarification or agreement.
p.9 – 6th para.	Please see the comment in the main response form regarding the SEA / Habitats screening report.
p.11 – 3rd para.	Should refer to as 'the Parish' or 'Dinnington St John's Parish'
<b>3.0 Vision and key issues</b>	
p.12 – 1 <sup>st</sup> bullet point	See later comments regarding housing. The Local Plan makes appropriate provision for housing within Dinnington, as confirmed by the Inspector's report following examination of the Core Strategy: <a href="https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/309/rotherham-core-strategy-inspectors-report-and-appendix">https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/309/rotherham-core-strategy-inspectors-report-and-appendix</a>
p.13 – 3rd bullet	With regard to this bullet point, the Council considers that leisure centre facilities are available in other parts of the borough, accessible by public transport.
<b>4.0 Plan policies</b>	
p.14 – 5th para.	The sentence should be reworded for clarity. Suggested amendment: "It is important to note that when using the Plan to form a view on a proposed development all of the policies contained in it, alongside other Local Plan and national planning policies, must be considered together."
p.15 – 2 <sup>nd</sup> para.	This seems to be an odd statement without any context to support it
<b>4.1 Housing</b>	
Chapter 4.1	In terms of general comments regarding housing in the draft plan, the recommendations in the 2017 Area Profile reflect the themes/issues in the neighbourhood plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need for more variety of social and affordable rented accommodation, particularly smaller units i.e. 2 bed flats – undersupply of 2 bed housing.</li> <li>• Explore opportunities to bring empties back into use as social / affordable housing.</li> <li>• Increase choice for first time buyers and aspiring home owners, new build entry level housing.</li> <li>• Develop a range of housing to meet the needs of an ageing population.</li> </ul>
p.15 – where are we now and where do we want to be	This section is presented as factual (i.e. 'Where are we now'), whereas the words in the second bullet point 'The scale of the proposed housing is considered by many to be too great.' are an un-evidenced opinion and should be deleted. There is no evidence that the scale of proposed housing in the Local Plan is too great – examinations of both the Core Strategy and Sites and Policies documents have supported the Council's strategy which makes appropriate, suitable and sustainable provision for housing and other development in this settlement grouping.

Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
	<p>The inclusion of the need for smaller homes is welcomed however the supporting paragraph should identify how to achieve this without encouraging apartment development.</p> <p>Furthermore, whilst the bullet points refer to the needs of the 'local community' and 'local housing' the draft plan should also recognise that housing provision within the Parish contributes to meeting the borough's overall housing needs and requirements.</p>
p.15 – 1 <sup>st</sup> para.	<p>Consideration should be given to revising the first sentence given that the draft plan does not seek to introduce more housing allocations than as set out in the Local Plan or amend the location of these sites.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Council does support aspirations as regards energy efficiency and passive house design, which will benefit all households.</p>
p.15 – 2 <sup>nd</sup> para.	<p>This paragraph makes reference to health issues arising; however any assertions should be backed up by evidence. What specific energy efficiency measures are referred to? What evidence is there to support the impact on health? If this is an issue how has the draft plan responded to it?</p>
p.15 – 4 <sup>th</sup> para.	<p>Reference is made to 'a large number of properties that are of a low standard and again are not conducive to a healthy lifestyle and communities'. Again, on what evidence is this assertion made?</p>
p.16 – 4 <sup>th</sup> para.	<p>Object to the un-evidenced assertions in this paragraph. The paragraph should be reworded or deleted. The neighbourhood plan must conform to the strategic policies of the Local Plan, including the amount and distribution of housing set out in Core Strategy Policy CS1. This policy was supported by Sustainability Appraisal (included in the Integrated Impact Assessment) accompanying production of the Core Strategy. As previously highlighted the Inspector examining the Core Strategy agreed with the Council that the housing provision with the Dinnington, Anston and Laughton Common settlement grouping was appropriate and sustainable.</p> <p>There is no evidence provided to support the claim that Dinnington is providing 'more than its fair share' or that Dinnington is not a sustainable and suitable location for the scale of development proposed. As such the plan should be amended to correct these factual errors.</p>
p.16 – 5 <sup>th</sup> para.	<p>The paragraph refers to 'already stretched infrastructure, especially roads and services such as schools, medical facilities and leisure and other community facilities.' – again on what evidence / basis are these assertions made?</p>
p.17 – 2 <sup>nd</sup> para.	<p>This paragraph is misleading as it implies that the only determinant of creating sustainable communities is the proportion of growth in relation to the existing population. Through the Local Plan the Council has prepared a sustainable strategy based on a range of factors including existing facilities, the ability of a community to accommodate further growth in a</p>

Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
	sustainable manner, and a settlement's role in relation to the wider area.
p.17 – 6 <sup>th</sup> para.	Reference to the NPPF definition of windfall sites is incorrect and out of date. It should be updated to reflect the revised definition in NPPF (2019). The exact wording should be 'Sites not specifically identified in the development plan.'
p.17 – 6 <sup>th</sup> para.	As set out in the Sites and Policies document, the Council has incorporated an element of windfall site allowance in meeting its housing requirements within Rotherham (refer to Sites and Policies document Table 7 Meeting objectively assessed needs, paragraph 4.9, and the note under table 9 Targets, permissions and development site residential numbers as at 31 March 2016).
p.18 – 4 <sup>th</sup> para.	Delete penultimate sentence. There is no robust evidence to support the assertion that the Parish should take a lower proportion of growth. As previously indicated the housing requirement for the settlement grouping set out in the Core Strategy meets local needs but also contributes to meeting the overall borough requirement. Furthermore planning for less housing would mean that the neighbourhood plan would not be in conformity with strategic policies of the Local Plan.
Community Action 1: Future Housing Allocation	<p>It is welcomed that this is now identified as a Community Action rather than a development management policy. However concerns remain with the wording (see below) and how this can be implemented as a Community Action. It is recommended that this is deleted.</p> <p>The approach appears to replicate Local Plan policies which set out in more detail where new housing development may be acceptable, including Policy SP1 Sites allocated for development, Policy SP11 Development in residential areas, and SP17 Alternative uses within business, and industrial and business areas.</p> <p>As drafted the approach does not provide sufficient detail nor a locally specific approach, nor does it appear to respond to any particular evidence or have regard to its relationship with Local Plan policies. In particular there is no justification provided to for an approach to support only windfall developments of 'less than 10 dwellings'.</p>
p.18	<p>The supporting wording should provide greater context in terms of cross referencing to relevant local plan policies – i.e. Policy CS7 Housing mix and affordability.</p> <p>The Council has previously provided updated ward profiles prepared by Strategic Housing.</p> <p>Also see comments in the response form on the Housing Needs and Characteristics evidence document.</p>
Policy H1 housing mix	There is no clear justification provided for the specific policy requirements that at least a third of new homes in a development of more than two dwellings should have one or two bedrooms, and that no more than 50% of new homes in a development of more than one dwelling should have 4 or more bedrooms.' What is the justification / evidence for the third and 50%

Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
	<p>approaches? In the absence of robust evidence then these requirements should be deleted.</p> <p>The Council considers that the policy would be difficult to implement for minor schemes (i.e. less than 10 dwellings) and that a more appropriate approach would be to amend the policy to clarify that it applies only to major schemes of 10 or more dwellings.</p> <p>The Council also expresses concern that the requirement of 1 or 2 bedrooms may just result in a significant increase in the number of apartment developments that may not necessarily deliver the type of housing that the neighbourhood plan seeks. It may make it difficult to also deliver on the aspirations for lifetime home provision?</p>
p. 20	<p>The Council recognises affordability issues but in context, Dinnington is more affordable than other areas of the borough and does have a decent level of turnover of market sales. (The lower quartile house price to income ratio in Dinnington Ward is 6:1 compared to Rotherham 7:1, higher than average turnover last five years and lower than average house prices)</p> <p>The first paragraph under 'affordable housing' refers to 'a figure which is beyond the means of many local people'. Where is the evidence to justify this, showing the relationship between housing costs and local income levels?</p>
p.21, 2 <sup>nd</sup> para	<p>It is worth noting that although bids on council houses in Dinnington Ward are lower than average, 2 bed bungalows and 3 bed houses are the most popular.</p> <p>Within Dinnington Ward, it is estimated that the level of social housing has increased by 1.5% between Census 2011 and 2018 (*figure from a 2018 study by BRE commissioned by Strategic Housing team). Right to Buy sales have been below the Rotherham average for the past three years.</p>
p.21, 5 <sup>th</sup> para	<p>The Council considers that this paragraph should be re-phrased. The Council operates choice based letting to those on the housing register, so it would be impossible to prove how many on the list would wish to live in Dinnington. The Council is aware that demand, through number of bids made on council homes in the Ward, is below the Rotherham average. Demand is however increasing year on year in Dinnington and Rotherham as a whole.</p> <p>The conclusions for (smaller, i.e. 2 bed) affordable housing are in line with the Council's strategy.</p>
p.23 – Policy H2	<p>Parts c and d of the policy overlap to some extent with Policy SP55 design principles, but appear to be appropriate.</p> <p>Part d refers to agreed Rotherham MBC standards and management arrangements. It is unclear what this is referring to, and clarification / explanation should be provided.</p>

Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
	The last paragraph relating to Article 4 Directions should be removed from the policy as it is not a relevant consideration when determining planning applications. It could be included as a Community Action in a separate box.
<b>4.2 Health, leisure and community facilities</b>	
p.24 – bullet points	<p>Bullet point three – where is the evidence to support the assertions regarding performance against health indicators? What data is referred to and what is it compared against?</p> <p>There are concerns with the inclusion of contradictory statement within the plan. For example, “Dinnington has some health, leisure and community facilities which serve the Parish and the wider area.” contradicts with “Dinnington plays an important role in providing health facilities over a wide area, including doctors’ surgeries, chiropodists, dentists, pharmacies and related services.” (p.29)</p> <p>What are the facilities considered lacking and what evidence supports this?</p>
p. 25 – 1 <sup>st</sup> para	<p>It refers to average life expectancy decreasing in Dinnington – where is the evidence to support this assertion?</p> <p>Whilst the Council supports the retention, enhancement and provision of sports and recreation facilities there is a concern that existing facilities in the area are not appropriately recognised in the draft plan.</p> <p>The issue regarding access to a swimming pool is concerning; as previously indicated “The School of swimming and fitness” located on Brooklands Way, Dinnington provides public and school sessions.</p> <p>In relation to other leisure facilities, it is concerning that the neighbourhood plan does not recognise the existing facilities which are close by. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Intershape’ Monksbridge Road and recently opened premises on Ryton Road, Anston.</li> <li>• a number of local leisure and park facilities contrary to what is inferred, such as East Street multi-use games area, Davies Park, Triangle Park, Resource Centre sports pitches and bowls, High School pitches and facilities, Coronation Park and Dinnington Rugby club.</li> </ul> <p>The multi-use games area at East Street is available to the public free of charge and is widely used by young people and a major resource maintained by RMBC.</p>
Policy HLC1 community facilities	This broadly replicates Policy SP62 Safeguarding Community Facilities, however is weaker and less robust. Also as set out in the ‘strategic policies’ note, the Council considers that Policies SP62 and SP63 are strategic policies to which the neighbourhood plan should conform.

Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
	<p>The Council advises that rather than duplicating the Local Plan policy approach it would be better to identify those specific community facilities of value and clarify that Policy SP62 (which is NPPF compliant) will apply to any proposals involving the loss of these facilities. Any re-wording could retain reference to any decision being in consultation with the Parish Council.</p> <p>With regard to the facilities identified, it is noted that other existing important health, leisure and community facilities are not included such as : Coronation Park, New Street Dentist , Laughton Road Dentist, East Street MUGA, JADE Youth centre, New Life Church, Salvation Army Hall, Indoor Market, Royal Elephant Restaurant, The Venus Restaurant, The Hall veterinary practice St. Leonards Close, The Swimming Pool and the Rother Valley College of Further Education.</p> <p>It is not clear on what evidence or justification the facilities identified in the policy have been chosen. There is a concern that those facilities not identified would be at a disadvantage by not benefitting from the protection of this policy.</p> <p>‘St. Joseph’s Court Community Centre’ should be shown with a bullet point.</p> <p>It would be helpful if the sites were mapped.</p> <p>Several public houses are included on the list – it is recommended that these are deleted. This is because the Local Plan contains a specific policy on the loss of Public Houses (SP63) which is more robust. There is a danger that retaining the public houses in this policy would result in a weaker, less robust policy being applied to any future proposals for a change of use. Alternatively, the public houses listed could be included in a separate section of the policy which clarifies that Policy SP63 will apply to any proposals involving the loss of these pubs.</p>
Policy HLC2 new facilities	<p>This appears to be a reasonable policy and includes some locally specific content.</p> <p>Criterion b. refers to ‘active travel’ – what does this refer to? A definition should be provided.</p>
Policy HLC3 ACVs	<p>The Council has policies which provide a proportionate and flexible approach to proposals involving the loss of community facilities, such as SP38 Protecting Green Space, SP62 Safeguarding Community Facilities, and SP63 Loss of Public Houses.</p> <p>There is some concern that the designation of an Asset of Community Value carries limited weight as a material consideration in determining a planning application, similar to other legal / civil matters such as land ownership. Notwithstanding this, should the policy be retained then there may be a need to provide additional guidance regarding the evidence that</p>

Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
	may be required by applicants in order to demonstrate that the existing use is not viable.
<b>4.3 Employment, education and skills</b>	
Chapter 4.3	As a general comment the Council is concerned that issues around education and employment are painted negatively. Activity is taking place to improve education and employment. From the local junior and High Schools to the Further Education College and involving third parties such as JADE and local businesses.
p.34 – 3 <sup>rd</sup> para.	Typo ‘it means...’
<b>4.4 Shops and town centre – section number incorrectly titled 1.4 in document and should be amended</b>	
Policy STC1 Dinnington town centre	<p>The Council is concerned that this policy contains no locally specific elements. As such it is suggested that the policy is deleted and cross reference made to existing policies, or that the policy is revised to provide more locally specific guidance. Should the policy be re-worded then consideration should be given to how it would operate in conjunction with the local plan policies for town centres and shopping frontages.</p> <p>By way of context, the Local Plan identifies a town centre boundary for Dinnington (Sites and Policies document, Appendix 1, map 9) within which there are three distinct areas and policy approaches: primary shopping frontage, secondary shopping frontage, and other areas within the town centre but outside of the primary and secondary frontages. The acceptable uses in each of these three areas vary. (See Sites and Policies document policies Policy SP 19 Development Within Town, District and Local Centres, Policy SP 20 Primary Shopping Frontages, and Policy SP 21 Secondary Shopping Frontages.</p>
Page 37, 2 <sup>nd</sup> para	<p>With regard to the urban design proposals summarised in the bullet points the following points are highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an overarching desire to ensure that any changes do not place unwarranted restrictions on traders and help to attract new businesses.</li> <li>• The proposal to extend the one system to New Street is not supported. The current arrangements provide access to shops and there are concerns that alternative proposals could negatively impact upon trade.</li> <li>• Use of public art is supported.</li> </ul>
p.37 , 1 <sup>st</sup> para	Reference is made to the design information being available on the website; however no information on the document title is given. The supporting text should make clear which document is being referred to. It is noted that the cover of the actual document is titled “Dinnington – Design Support). It appears that this same document is referred to in Policy STC2 as “Dinnington Town Centre Design Support Document (2017), despite this title not being used in the document itself. Unless this town centre guide is a different, unpublished, document, then a consistent and accurate document title should be used for clarity.
Policy STC2 town centre	This policy is generally fine although repeats some local plan policies and provides no locally specific guidance except in reference to the Design

Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
	Guide.
Policy STC3 shop fronts	<p>There is already a shop front design policy (Policy SP59) which it would be beneficial to reference and the Shopfront Design Guide which is due to be updated as a Supplementary Planning Document. Whilst there is some overlap the policy as worded generally seems fine.</p> <p>It is welcomed that the policy includes reference to the Interim Planning Statement on shop front design, although the 2016 date is incorrect, it should be 2006. The Council is updating this guidance and intends to adopt it as a supplementary planning document in due course; therefore it is suggested that the policy be amended as follows:</p> <p>Having regard to the Rotherham Interim Planning Statement Shopfront Design Guide (2006), or any subsequent replacement.</p>
Policy STC4 shops outside town centre	<p>The Council considers that the requirement in criteria b) for marketing for 6 months would undermine Local Plan Policy SP62 'Safeguarding Community Facilities' which would apply to shops outside of defined centres. Criteria d) of this policy requires:</p> <p>"the site or premises have been marketed to the Council's satisfaction for at least 12 months and included both traditional and web based marketing, and regular advertisement in local, regional and / or national publications as appropriate"</p> <p>The Council is concerned that the neighbourhood plan policy would result in application of a weaker policy approach to protecting community facilities in the form of local shops.</p>
Pages 40 - 42 Hot food takeaways including Policy STC5 hot food takeaway	<p>The Council supports the proposed Policy and approach to hot food takeaways. The Council is preparing a Healthy and Equal Communities Supplementary Planning Document which includes a similar approach to hot food takeaways which would apply borough wide. It may be helpful to make reference to this SPD.</p> <p>The font colour of the policy title should be amended to be legible against the dark background.</p>
<b>4.5 Natural environment</b>	
p.43 Introduction	Typo on second line – should read 'provides'
p.43 – 44, Green Belt	The Council has adopted Development in the Green Belt Supplementary Planning Guidance which could be referred to. This is being updated and will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning document in due course.
Policy NE1 Green Belt	This policy repeats national and local policy regarding Green Belts (in particular Policy CS4 Green Belt and Policy SP2 Development in the Green Belt) and provides no further locally specific guidance such that this should be a Community Action instead of policy.
Pages 44 – 46, Local Green Spaces	The Council objects to the proposed Local Green Spaces and recommends that these are removed and the policy deleted. In view of this it is recommended that the accompanying supporting text is also deleted. Notwithstanding this the comments below identify amendments to the existing text. This should not be taken as support for their retention.



Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
p.45 – 2 <sup>nd</sup> para.	<p>The chapter notes that it does not seek to duplicate any sites already protected. The Council supports this approach but is concerned that the sites proposed as Local Green Spaces are contradictory to this stated aim (see later specific comments on Policy NE2).</p>
Policy NE2 local green spaces	<p>The Council objects to the proposed Local Green Space sites and recommends deletion of this policy and the accompanying text. The comments below should be read in conjunction with comments on the response form relating to the Local Green Spaces evidence base document.</p> <p><u>General observations</u></p> <p>There appears to be an inconsistency between the supporting text and the sites put forward; it refers to not duplicating sites already protected in the Local Plan. However the Leys Lane and Lodge Lane sites are within the Green Belt as shown in the Policies Map accompanying the adopted Sites and Policies document. As such these sites already benefit from policy protection equivalent to that which designation as Local Green Space would offer. National Planning Practice Guidance indicates that in these circumstances consideration should be given to whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation as Local Green Space. The supporting evidence base document does not demonstrate any additional benefits and as such the Council does not support allocation of Local Green Space designations in such circumstances.</p> <p>The High Nook Road and Keats Drive site is allocated for residential use in the Policies Map accompanying the adopted Sites and Policies document; however the Council considers that this would be classed as incidental green space subject to protection under Policy SP38 Protecting Green Space. It is considered that the site would have sufficient existing protection, and the Council does not consider that such sites should be designated as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Finally, it is considered that the allocation of the school playing fields as Local Green Space would not be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan, nor would they be consistent with planning for sustainable development. The Council does not support such proposals and considers that its inclusion could risk the Neighbourhood Plan not meeting the basic conditions.</p> <p>It is unclear whether the qualifying body has had due regard to Planning Practice Guidance:</p> <p><i>Does land need to be in public ownership?</i>  <i>A Local Green Space does not need to be in public ownership. However, the local planning authority (in the case of local plan making) or the qualifying body (in the case of neighbourhood plan making) should contact landowners at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of their land as Local Green Space. Landowners will have opportunities to make</i></p>

Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
	<p><i>representations in respect of proposals in a draft plan.</i> <i>Paragraph: 019 Reference ID: 37-019-20140306</i></p> <p>No evidence is provided that owners of the proposed Local Green Spaces (including the Council as landowner with respect to the school playing fields) have been contacted or notified of the proposals. The Council therefore has concerns with the process undertaken to take forward the proposed Local Green Spaces.</p> <p><u>Page 46, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph</u> Whilst noting that this refers to the miner's welfare site which is not included in the proposed Local Green Space sites, nor is it a neighbourhood plan policy, the last sentence of this paragraph should be deleted. No evidence or justification is provided to support the suggestion that 'at least 40%' of the site should be retained as Green space. The Sites and Policies document already provides detailed site development guidelines relevant to this site, including the approach to be taken as regards open space.</p> <p><u>Policy wording</u> As set out above the Council does not support the identified sites proposed, and recommends that the policy is also deleted. Notwithstanding this, should the policy remain then there are no issues raised with the policy wording.</p>
P.46 Biodiversity	<p>There are concerns that there is no individual discussion of specific sites and aspirations. Dinnington Marsh for example is threatened by development and possibly by an invasive aquatic plant. Throapham Common could be affected by development of allocation site H75.</p> <p>There is no mention of ancient woodlands (such as Swinston Hill Plantation, Brand's Wood or Anston Stones Wood) and SSSIs (Anston Stones Wood SSSI is nearby).</p>
Policy NE3 Biodiversity	<p>The Council considers that the policy does not add anything locally specific to the Local Plan policies regarding biodiversity and wildlife and is far weaker. The policy would be better framed around identifying the specific locally significant and important features that should be protected and focus on these. In the absence of any locally specific element to the policy then it is recommended that this is deleted.</p>
<b>4.6 Built environment, design and infrastructure</b>	
p.50 – where are we now	<p>The Council is concerned at the un-evidenced opinions expressed in the first four bullet points. No baseline information or evidence is provided on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- how the current infrastructure provision is insufficient and inappropriate;</li> <li>- how development has or may impact on the character of Dinnington;</li> <li>- how development is not sympathetic to the needs and character of Dinnington; and</li> <li>- who in particular are not benefiting from growth and how.</li> </ul>

Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
	In the absence of any evidence to support these opinions they should be deleted.
Policy BED1 – Local Heritage Interest	<p>The Council broadly supports this policy and the heritage assets identified (subject to the comments below). For clarity it is suggested that a clearer description of the sites (including their address where relevant) should be given to enable the policy to be implemented. For example ‘Dave’s computer shop’, or ‘currently Panache Café’ are poor descriptors as the occupants could change in future years and do not allow an officer considering an application to easily identify the address or location. In addition it is suggested that the sites should be identified on accompanying inset maps.</p> <p>The Council expresses concern with the inclusion of the following buildings / structures to be included in the list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Front of the Old Brewery (viewing from the historic map, the building was not built for industrial purposes)</li> <li>- Handsworth Woodhouse Co-op Buildings</li> <li>- Old Dentists (the building itself has little heritage interest except the plaque)</li> <li>- Middleton Institute (the building itself has little heritage interest except the plaque)</li> <li>- Silverdales Social Club</li> </ul>
p.53– Design Principle – 3 <sup>rd</sup> para.	The Council is concerned at the inclusion of un-evidenced opinions. Unless clear evidence can be provided to support these opinions then the paragraph should be re-worded to remove these claims.
Policy BED2 – Design and Infrastructure	<p>Whilst part 1 of this policy does re-iterate many elements of existing policy, such as SP55 Design Principles, there are elements which are locally specific through references to the Parish. The Council consider that there is further scope for a more effective policy to be created by focusing on guidance specific to the Parish. The new point 1(i) is noted however the wording of ‘they’ should be removed for consistency purpose</p> <p>The Council continues to have concerns with part 2 of the policy relating to infrastructure given its wide ranging nature. It is considered that it would be difficult to assess proposals against this policy.</p>
p. 56-57 – CIL	The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 123 list has been withdrawn by the Council following introduction of recent Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations. As such paragraph 2 on page 57 and the associated bullet points should be deleted, and paragraph 3 re-worded. Should reference to infrastructure requirements be required then reference should be made to Local Plan Core Strategy Appendix A: Infrastructure Delivery Schedule, or the Rotherham Infrastructure Delivery Study 2012 (on which this is based).
Policy BED3 developer contributions	The council objects to this policy as it is concerned that it may affect the Local Planning Authority’s ability to negotiate Section 106 contributions with developers as part of determining planning applications. Furthermore as worded it would apply to all applications, including small developments (for example, 1 or 2 homes). It is suggested that this would be most

Page / paragraph	RMBC Comment
	<p>appropriately applied to larger scale developments which are more likely to result in the provision of infrastructure. The generally accepted definition of major development is: 10 or more dwellings, or the creation of 1,000 sq m or more of floorspace, or where a site is of 1 hectare or more.</p> <p>The Council considers that a more appropriate approach would be for the policy to establish how the parish Council will seek to prioritise spending of their proportion of CIL monies on local infrastructure.</p> <p>It is also suggested that the supporting text should clarify that the Parish Council will be responsible for prioritising and spending of that element of CIL receipts which go to Parish Councils; however for CIL receipts retained by RMBC, prioritisation and spending decisions will be determined by Council Members.</p>
<b>5.0 Monitoring and reviewing the plan</b>	
p.58 – 2 <sup>nd</sup> para.	Chapter 5 refers to the neighbourhood plan being monitored annually, with assessment against agreed ‘success measures’. Whilst a number of possible measures are identified there is no clarity regarding the indicators to be utilised, the monitoring methodology, or any baseline data against which indicators will be considered. These should be identified in the neighbourhood plan.