

# Public Document Pack

## CABINET MEMBER FOR ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

**Venue:** Conference Room 3, 3rd Floor Bailey House,  
Rawmarsh Road,  
Rotherham

**Date:** Monday, 17 May 2004

**Time:** 9.00 a.m.

### A G E N D A

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested, in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered later in the agenda as a matter of urgency.
3. Notes of a meeting re: Promoting Rotherham held on 23rd February, 2004 (Pages 1 - 3)
  - **to receive the minutes.**
4. Minutes of a meeting of the Unitary Development Plan Review Members' Steering Group held on 23rd April, 2004 (Pages 4 - 8)
  - **to receive the minutes.**
5. Minutes of a meeting of the Tourism Panel held on 26th April, 2004 (Pages 9 - 12)
  - **to consider and receive the minutes.**
6. Pricing Structure for Rotherham Markets - Tuesday Street Market (Pages 13 - 15)  
Town Centre and Markets Manager to report.
  - **to consider the implementation of a new pricing structure for Rotherham Street Market.**
7. Review of all Outdoor Market Stall Rents from 1st April, 2004 (Pages 16 - 17)  
Town Centre and Markets Manager to report.
  - **to review the rent levels of all outdoor market stalls and associated payments from 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2004.**
8. Dog Kennels Lane (B6059), Kiveton Park - Development Control Line (Pages 18 - 21)  
Transportation Unit Manager to report.
  - **to consider a replacement Development Control Line.**
9. Streetpride Performance Response Times (Pages 22 - 25)

Head of Streetpride Service to report.

- **to report on 'response times' across a range of Streetpride services during the last quarter.**

10. Rotherham Road, Laughton en le Morthen - Proposed Footway (Pages 26 - 28)  
Acting Schemes and Partnerships Manager to report.
  - **to report a proposal to build 50m of footway.**
11. Dale Hill Road/Addison Road, Maltby - Objections to Road Hump Notice (Pages 29 - 39)  
Acting Schemes and Partnerships Manager to report.
  - **to report receipt of and consider objections to the proposal to introduce traffic calming measures.**
12. BVP109 - Speed of Planning Decisions: Annual Report (Pages 40 - 42)  
Head of Planning and Transportation Service to report.
  - **to report performance against national and local targets.**
13. 2003/2004 Activity Report for Business Development Team (Pages 43 - 57)  
Business Development Manager, RiDO, to report.
  - **to inform Members of results, achievements and key activities from the Business Development areas of RiDO.**
14. Voluntary Surrender of Unwanted Vehicles (Pages 58 - 60)  
Head of Streetpride Services to report.
  - **to inform Members of the measures to be taken to promote the fact that the Council accept motor vehicles surrendered for disposal.**
15. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The following items are likely to be considered in the absence of the press and public as being exempt under the paragraphs, indicated below, of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972:-

16. South Yorkshire Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder - Town Centre Feasibility Studies (Pages 61 - 71)  
Development Co-ordinator to report.
  - **to report for information purposes on proposed feasibility works being taken forward in Rotherham Town Centre through the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder initiative.**  
(Exempt under Paragraph 9 of the Act – report contains information relating to the disposal of land)
17. Request for CERB Funding - Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder (Pages 72 - 76)  
Economic Strategy Officer to report.
  - **to consider a contribution from CERB towards the cost of implementing the Town Centre Housing Renewal Pathfinder programme.**  
(Exempt under Paragraph 8 of the Act – report contains financial

information)

18. Strategic Partner for Civil Engineering Construction (Pages 77 - 79)  
Head of Streetpride Service to report.
  - **to report on the evaluation of the tenders received and obtain approval to accept the most suitable tender.**(Exempt under Paragraph 9 of the Act – report contains contractual information)
19. Second Stage Tender Report - Moorgate Crofts Business Centre  
Head of RiDO to report.

### **EXTRA REPORTS (OPEN)**

20. Minutes of a Meeting of the Health, Welfare and Safety Panel held on 22nd April, 2004 (Pages 80 - 83)
  - to receive the minutes.
21. Minutes of a meeting of the Town Centre Initiative Steering Group held on 6th May, 2004 (Pages 84 - 89)
  - to receive the minutes.
22. Opening of Tenders (Page 90)
  - to report the opening of tenders for various schemes.
23. Supertram Extensions (Pages 91 - 97)  
Transportation Unit Manager to report.
  - to update Members on further study work on Supertram Extensions.
24. A57 - M1 to Todwick Crossroads Improvement Scheme (Pages 98 - 100)  
Section Engineer to report.
  - to advise Members of suggested alternatives for the above road scheme.
25. Preparation of Regional Spatial Strategy - Input of a South Yorkshire Spatial Vision (Pages 101 - 118)  
Forward Planning Officer to report.
  - to inform Members of the need for a South Yorkshire sub-regional perspective to be fed into the preparation of the draft Regional Spatial Strategy.
26. EIRA General Assembly and Board Meeting in Vasteras, Sweden (Pages 119 - 120)
  - to consider attendance.

### **EXTRA REPORTS (EXEMPT)**

27. SRB4 - New York Riverside - Midland Road, Princes Street, Rotherham (Pages 121 - 125)  
Project Officer to report.
  - to consider an application for grant aid.  
(Exempt under Paragraph 5 of the Act – application for grant aid)
  
28. SRB4 - New York Riverside - Walker Mausoleum, Chapel Walk, Rotherham (Pages 126 - 128)  
Project Officer to report.
  - to consider an application for grant aid.  
(Exempt under Paragraph 5 of the Act – application for grant aid)
  
29. SRB4 - New York Riverside - AFP Van Hire Ltd, Clough Road, Rotherham (Pages 129 - 132)  
Project Officer to report.
  - to consider an amended application for grant aid.  
(Exempt under Paragraph 5 of the Act – application for grant aid)

**ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL**

Notes of meeting of Promoting Rotherham held on 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2004.

Present

Fabienne Cotte (chair)	Marketing Manager
Eileen Brooks	Head of Communications
Andy Foster	Head of Design
Marie Hayes	Commercial & Promotional Services Manager
Sarah Myers	Tourism Manager
Julie Roberts	Town Centre & Markets Manager
Laura Stanley (minutes)	Marketing Assistant

Apologies

Clark Herron	Public Relations Manager
Clare Warsop	Visitor Centre Co-ordinator

1. Minutes of last Meeting (23.02.04)

The minutes were agreed as a correct recording of the proceedings.

2. Matters Arising

SM updated the group on her progress with the D-Day events, she has contacted Archives and Local Studies who will be doing a display and is yet to speak to Pete Coulton.

JR has met with the Normandy Veterans regarding D-Day; they will be having a market stall to display memorabilia. The British Legion would like a large event in the town centre on the Sunday. It was also agreed to look at possibility of holding a large 'street-party' style event for VE Day next year.

JR informed the group that in regard to Rotherham Renaissance, they are still awaiting a response from David Seaman.

AF updated the group on the photographic library, this is half complete and presenting the work to the group at the next meeting was discussed.

EB confirmed that the corporate marketing post has been agreed as a one day per week position. The objectives of the post have not yet been determined.

AF informed the group that he is working on the first edition of the new corporate newsletter, Unite. This publication will be bi-monthly and information to be included should be sent to the Communications Officer for the relevant programme area.

FC updated the group on the progress of the Rotherham Show Programme. In order to increase the print run, local businesses will be approached to support the printing.

### 3. Rotherham Arts Festival

JR informed the group that Sean Rourke, Festival Director for Rotherham Arts was unable to attend this meeting. Notes and Sponsorship Proposals from Sean were distributed to the group and discussed.

SM mentioned that Sean wanted ideas for the events from the Promoting Rotherham Group. It was agreed that Sean would be invited for a meeting with the Promoting Rotherham Group to discuss ideas.

**Action:** Sean to be invited to the next meeting

### 4. Photographic Consent Form

EB informed the group that the consent form draft is complete and will be emailed out to the group for comments.

**Action:** All to feedback on consent form.

### 5. Town Centre LCD screen

JR informed the group that the screen should be up and running by June. JR mentioned that she would like to set up a working group to draw up a policy of the screen's content. A short discussion was held regarding who should be invited to the group to draw up a policy. JR mentioned that in the future there may be somebody in post to monitor the screen's content.

### 6. Dissemination of minutes

MH mentioned that Councillor Georgina Boyes has expressed a wish that Promoting Rotherham's minutes be fed through to Tourism Panel and Education, Culture and Leisure Cabinet Member and Advisors' meetings for information. It was also decided that the minutes should be fed through to Economic and Development Services Cabinet Member and Advisors.

**Action:** Julie Roberts to provide name of EDS Committee Clerk.

EB suggested that a quarterly update on the progress of the Promoting Rotherham Group should be sent to the Corporate Management Team.

7. Any other business and exchange of information

SM informed the group that it is the Visitor Centre's 1<sup>st</sup> Birthday on 27<sup>th</sup> May. Any ideas regarding events on the day should be sent to Clare Warsop.

**Action:** All to send any ideas to Clare Warsop.

Ideas for forthcoming launches were discussed, e.g. re-opening of Clifton Park Museum.

**Action:** All to send ideas to Fabienne Cotte.

SM offered to do a window display in the visitor centre for the museum.

JR informed the group that her funding bid from SRB for events equipment has been successful. Equipment for special events can be borrowed from Town Centre Management.

8. Date and time of next meeting

Monday 17<sup>th</sup> May, 2.30pm, location to be confirmed.

## UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW MEMBERS' STEERING GROUP

23<sup>RD</sup> April, 2004

Present:-

Councillor G. Robinson	Cabinet Member, Community Planning and Social Inclusion – IN THE CHAIR
Councillor R. Pearson	Chair, Planning Board
The Mayor	Councillor R. S. Russell, Senior Advisor, Economic and Development Services
Councillor S. Walker	Advisor, Economic and Development Services

together with:-

Alan Mitchell	Forward Planning Manager
Phil Turnidge	Senior Planner

Apologies:- Councillor G. Smith, Cabinet Member, Economic and Development Services

**1. MINUTES**

Agreed:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> March, 2004 be approved as a correct record.

**2. MATTERS ARISING**

(i) Work in progress re: PPS1 "Creating Sustainable Communities"

Comments had been invited from other Services within the Council. It was pointed out that the Council's comments had to be forwarded to the Government by 21st May, 2004. A special meeting of the Cabinet Member for Economic and Development Services had been arranged for 11th May to consider a formal response to PPS1.

It was pointed out that this was a fundamental piece of guidance relating to the purpose of planning and arising from which there were a lot of positives to strengthen planning.

(ii) Draft Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.

It was reported that this was being considered by the Cabinet Member for Economic and Development Services on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2004, and then by the Cabinet on 5<sup>th</sup> May. This would be in time for submission to the ODPM by 21st May.



### **3. BAPTIE SETTLEMENT APPRAISAL STUDY – PHASE 1 (DEARNE) – CONCLUSIONS**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Forward Planning Manager, relating to the conclusions of Phase 1 of the above study. It was explained that Phase 1 dealt with the Dearne Settlements, including Rawmarsh and Parkgate.

It was stressed that these conclusions needed to be seen in a wider context and needed to be treated with caution until the second phase of the study was completed, covering the whole of Sheffield and the rest of Rotherham and Doncaster.

The information, together with the Urban Capacity Study, the Housing Pathfinder etc, would be useful in the preparation of the Local Development Framework. The information would also be helpful in determining future housing policy.

It was pointed out that the South Yorkshire Spatial Strategy would also be available later this year.

Reference was made to the recent consultation from Doncaster MBC regarding road improvement options for Finningley Airport and the impact on the sub-region. Reference was also made to this Council's representation on the Steering Group and Members expressed the view that there should be a named Elected Member substitute should the Cabinet Member be unable to attend.

Members stressed the need to ensure that Rotherham and the individual townships retained their identity, and reference was made to Postcodes, which often suggested a misleading location.

Agreed:- (i) That the report be received.

(ii) That a special meeting of this group be held to consider the overall conclusions of the Babtie Study in more depth.

### **4. URBAN POTENTIAL STUDY – FINAL AUDITORS' COMMENTS**

It was reported that this was also an important component that would help to put together the Local Development Framework. Consultants had been engaged to audit the study methodology and their final comments were favourable. The Study Report would now be published in due course.

Agreed:- That the report be noted.

### **5. LIAISON WITH LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP**

Consideration was given to a report, that was submitted to a meeting of the respective Local Strategic Partnership Managers.

The aim of the report was to enable the LSP to consider Rotherham's future Local Development Framework, its scope and the areas of common interest with the work

of the Partnership, especially the Community Strategy and Area Action Plans. It was hoped that mutually beneficial areas of joint working and co-operation would develop.

The paper encouraged closer working between the LSP and the local planning authority. The Partnership were also informed about the present planning context and the likely future role of planning bearing in mind the Government's planned reforms and the Planning Bill which was still in Parliament. Reference was made to the earlier paper PPS1 and the three main themes of planning:-

- Sustainable development
- Spatial development and land use
- Community involvement

It was recognised that there was much common ground and the report listed issues for consideration by the Spoke Managers Group.

Appendix A of the report summarised relevant links between the Community Strategy themes and priorities for action and the potential areas/issues to be addressed in the Local Development Framework.

Members commented on transport issues, particularly QBC's; car use; extent, effectiveness and value of consultation; impact of Finningley Airport.

Agreed:- That the report be noted.

### **6. ROTHERHAM VISION**

It was pointed out that the content of the previous reports considered at today's meeting would shape the Rotherham Vision.

This was needed to feed into the Regional Spatial Strategy by the end of June.

It was reported that the South Yorkshire Spatial Study, which set out options for growth in South Yorkshire, was considered to be primarily economically driven by the Yorkshire and Humberside Regional Assembly.

All four local planning authorities were now working to produce their respective Spatial Visions and a meeting with representatives of South Yorkshire Partnership was planned to achieve co-ordination at the sub-regional level. It was acknowledged that it was imperative that all the positive aspects of Rotherham were highlighted with emphasis on how Rotherham could contribute to the sub-region and how to complement neighbouring authorities.

Members raised the following issues:-

- housing
- use of brown/greenfield sites
- green spaces issues
- sustainability of individual townships and villages
- future of the town centre and town centre housing provision

- creating new life and uses for existing town centre buildings
- housing and building design
- development of the riverside

Agreed: (1) That the report be received and issues noted.

(2) That a further report on this topic be submitted to the next meeting of this group.

## **7. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME – SCOPE OF FIRST LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

Members were informed of the changing guidance being issued by the Government regarding the preparation of the above.

Currently Government had advised that, before producing a Local Development Framework, the Council had to produce a Local Development Scheme to advise the public what would be contained within the Local Development Framework.

Previous discussions of the Steering Group had envisaged a simplified portfolio of Local Development Documents but with a fairly comprehensive scope. It was acknowledged that the current Unitary Development Plan would continue in place until the new Framework document was published.

Currently Government Office Yorkshire and Humberside was warning against over ambitious and unrealistic LDFs and was advising neighbouring authorities to only produce:-

- a core strategy
- a statement of community involvement
- housing policy and allocations

Additional LDDs could then be prepared in subsequent years under separate consultations and examinations.

Officers expressed concern that the three year target was inadequate in which to produce a comprehensive replacement plan. It was envisaged that the LDF would be in perpetual motion with poor links between topics and policies and would be difficult to keep together and difficult for people to understand and interpret. These difficulties would not assist the integration of the LDF and the Community Strategy. The issue was to be discussed by District Heads of Service with a view to representations being made to GOYH.

Members raised the following issues:-

- would the document be fit for purpose?
- concern about the process and timescales
- the amount, and value, of the work being required
- concern about fragmentation

Agreed:- That the update be noted.

**8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

There were no other items of business.

**9. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR NEXT MEETING**

Agreed:- That the next meeting of this Steering Group be scheduled for Friday, 21st, May, 2004 at 10.00 a.m. at the Town Hall.

**TOURISM PANEL  
MONDAY, 26TH APRIL, 2004**

Present:- Councillor G. Smith (in the Chair); Councillors Boyes, Littleboy and Walker:-  
together with:-

Guy Kilminster, Manager, Libraries, Museums & Arts  
Marie Hayes, Commercial and Promotional Manager  
Sarah Myers, Tourism Manager  
Richard Poundford, Head of RiDO

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

Apologies for absence were received from:-

Councillor J. Austen	Advisor, Education, Culture & Leisure Services
Mr. C. Scott	Rotherham Chamber of Trade
Julie Roberts	Town Centre and Markets Manager

**2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 26TH JANUARY, 2004. (COPY ATTACHED)**

The Panel received and noted the minutes of the previous meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> January, 2004.

**3. MATTERS ARISING.**

There were no matters arising from the previous minutes.

**4. TOURISM ACTION PLAN.**

The Tourism Manager gave an update on the development of the Tourism Action Plan 2004-2005.

It was reported that this was now in draft form and Members were asked for their comments.

The plan aimed to identify areas that the Tourism Service should be developing.

The draft would be sent out to various consultees.

Resolved:- That a draft copy of the Tourism Action Plan 2004-2005 be sent to members of the Tourism Panel for their comments.

**5. TOURISM UPDATE.**

The Tourism Manager gave an update on the following tourism issues:-

(i) Mr. Tony Munford, Archivist

The Tourism Manager referred to the recent death of Mr. Tony Munford, and asked that condolences of this Panel be conveyed to his family.

Resolved:- That the Panel's condolences be conveyed to Mr. Munford's family.

(ii) South Yorkshire Tourism Co-ordinator

It was reported that the above post was due to commence within the next three weeks. The aim of the post was to co-ordinate the tourism offices within South Yorkshire.

Resolved:- That the information be noted.

(iii) Rotherham Visitor Information Centre – Staffing and Opening Times

The Tourism Manager reported that on the basis of the footfall recorded it had become apparent that the opening hours of the Centre were not sustainable. Also it was not possible with the existing complement of staff to undertake all the required tasks e.g. familiarisation visits, stock taking etc. The facility had to operate as a commercial entity and it was therefore necessary to manage it within the budget available.

It was, therefore, proposed that the opening times should be reduced at the quietest times as follows:-

Monday to Friday	-	9.30 a.m. to 5.00 p.m.
Saturday	-	9.40 a.m. to 3.00 p.m (or 4.00 p.m.)

It was pointed out that the operation of the Centre was due for review after a year of opening.

It was also reported that there was a need to address staff morale, staff training, expectations and work to obtain the Charter Mark.

Members referred to the following:-

- the need for changes to staff contracts
- the welcome customers received
- the customer focus of staff
- the need for financial information

Resolved:- (a) That the Tourism Panel supports the proposals outlined.

(b) That a comprehensive report be submitted to the Cabinet Member for

Economic and Development Services relating to this issue.

(iii) Programme Area/Service Area Representation on the Tourism Panel

Reference was made to the representation on the Tourism Panel. It was suggested that there was a need to widen this to include representation from other teams across the Council e.g. from Transportation and Planning etc.

(iv) European Tourism Funding Conference

It was reported that there was some funding that the Council may be able to draw down if the Tourism Service worked with Town Twinning.

It was pointed out that the Rotherham Visitor Information Centre was still the only full-time operational centre in South Yorkshire, and this would be a good opportunity to push Rotherham to the front of the tourism agenda.

## **6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.**

The following items were raised:-

(i) Clifton Park Museum – Gulbenkian Prize

It was reported that the Museum did not reach the final but was chosen in the top thirteen.

(ii) Feasibility of Theatrical Productions at Roche Abbey

The question was asked whether there were any further theatrical productions scheduled at Roche Abbey.

In response it was reported that the Abbey was in the care of English Heritage and not the Council. However, it was not an ideal venue in terms of access etc.

(iii) Minutes of a meeting re: Promoting Rotherham held on 23<sup>rd</sup> February, 2004.

Consideration was given to the minutes of the above meeting referred to the Panel by the Cabinet Member, Education, Culture and Leisure Services.

Those present discussed where best this group could report into the Council.

Resolved:- That the Promoting Rotherham group submit minutes to the Tourism Panel and to the Regeneration Board in view of the cross cutting nature of the issues discussed.

(iv) Hospitality/Tourism training for Taxi Drivers

Those present discussed the value of the above.

Resolved:- That a report be submitted to a future meeting of the Tourism Panel detailing the present training offered, uptake, how the training could be improved and how the training could be extended to more taxi drivers, and possibly bus operators.

(v) Regeneration Issues

It was pointed out that, with the range of products that Rotherham could offer, e.g. the new Museum, the proposed development at Rother Valley Country park, proximity to Sheffield City Centre, Derbyshire and the development of Finningley Airport, this was a very good time to market tourism in Rotherham.

(vi) Landmarks Booklet

Copies of the above booklet were made available to members of the Panel. It was pointed out that these would be launched in June 2004. It was reported that funding had been obtained to produce interpretive panels at local cultural landmarks e.g. Catcliffe Glass Cone, together with this guide.

**7. TO AGREE THE DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING.**

Resolved:- (a) That the next meeting of the Tourism Panel be held on MONDAY, 7<sup>th</sup> JUNE, 2004 at 2.00 p.m. at the Town Hall, Moorgate Street, Rotherham.

(b) That Councillor Smith's apologies for that meeting be recorded and that Councillor Boyes be asked to Chair the meeting.



ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

**1. Meeting:** Economic and Development Services matters

**2. Date:** 17<sup>th</sup> May 2004

**3. Title: Pricing Structure for Rotherham Markets Tuesday Street Market**

**4. Originating Officer:-** Robin Lambert, Assistant Markets Manager, ext. 6957, e-mail robin.lambert@rotherham.gov.uk

**Designated Manager:** - Sharon Webster, Operations Manager, ext. 6956, e-mail sharon.webster@rotherham.gov.uk

**5. Issue**

To implement a new pricing structure for Rotherham Street Market

**6. Summary**

When the annual outside rent reviews are implemented on 24 May 2004 the Markets are also seeking to introduce a new pricing structure for its street market.

**7. Clearance/Consultation**

Member representatives from the Markets Consultative committee were consulted at a meeting held on Monday 23 February 2004.

**8. Timing**

A decision would be required for implementation from 17 May 2004.

**9. Background**

Currently any trader who wishes to hold a permanent licence on the outdoor street market must also hold a permanent licence on or in one of R.M.B.C.s other markets.

**10. Argument**

Due to the nation wide downturn in markets popularity there has been a dramatic decrease in footfall through markets. Some traders are not wishing to trade on the markets where this decline has had an adverse effect on their business, preferring instead to trade permanently on street markets where footfall is more concentrated.

Current rules for trading on the Effingham street market stipulate that a trader must also licence and run a stall on one of the other R.M.B.C. Market venues. Due to this ruling, the current pricing structure is generating unrealistic levels of rent arrears for those traders not trading on general market days but having to remain registered on these markets in order to retain their permanent stall on the street market.

**11.Risks and Uncertainties**

The proposed new structure may deter some traders from taking up permanent stalls on the street market but this risk should be outweighed by the numbers of new traders that may be attracted.

**12.Finance**

No effect on revenue is anticipated from the introduction of the new pricing structure.

**13.Sustainability**

The proposed pricing policy is necessary in order to generate interest from new traders for the street market, providing a greater, more varied product base improving its sustainability and also increasing opportunities for new business start up in Rotherham.

**14.Wards Affected**

All

**15.References**

None

**16.Presentation**

All parties involved with the negotiations were in agreement that the present arrangements were having a detrimental effect on the occupancy levels of the street market and the arrears levels of the outdoor markets.  
A new pricing structure should negate these effects.

**17.Recommendations**

**That a rent structure be introduced as below.**

- (a) £ 17.75 for traders who stand on other R.M.B.C. markets.**
- (b) £17.75 for casual traders – maximum of 3 weeks.**
- (c) £30.00 for traders who do not stand on other R.M.B.C. markets.**

### Effingham Street Market - Pricing Structure

Trader Category	Existing Charges	Proposed Charges
(1) Permanent. Also standing on another RMBC market.	£17.00	£17.75
(2) Casual	£17.00	£17.75 maximum of 3 weeks then must join category 1 or 3.
(3) Permanent. Street market trader only	<b>Category not currently allowed</b>	£30.00

ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

**1. Meeting:** Economic and Development Services matters

**2. Date:** 17 May 2004

**3. Title:** Review of all outdoor market stall rents from 01 April 2004.

**4. Originating Officer:-** Robin Lambert, Assistant Markets Manager, ext. 6957  
e-mail robin.lambert@rotherham.gov.uk

**Designated Manager:** - Sharon Webster, Operations Manager, ext. 6956  
e-mail sharon.webster@rotherham.gov.uk

**5. Issue**

To review the rent levels of all outdoor market stalls & associated payments (e.g. storage), with immediate effect.

**6. Summary**

The annual rent review for outdoor market stalls and associated charges is now due. The review covers all stalls on the outdoor markets held at the Centenary Market Complex, Town Centre Street Market and the district markets at Wath & Rawmarsh.

**7. Clearance/Consultation**

This matter was discussed at a meeting with the Markets Consultative Committee outdoor trader representatives on Monday 23 February 2004.

**8. Timing**

The new rent levels will take effect from 24 May 2004 until 31 March 2005. The next review will be from 01 April 2005.

**9. Background**

The trading climate experienced by markets in recent years has led to rent increases being levied at or below current inflation levels in order to cover rising costs without actually increasing revenue surplus. The current trading conditions in markets show little or no improvement.

**10. Argument**

At the meeting with the Markets Consultative Committee outdoor representatives on Monday 23 February 2004 the trader representatives asked that, due to the current trading climate, there be a zero increase in rents in order to try to halt the decline in stall occupancy.

R.M.B.C. management members present explained that although they were in agreement that markets were still suffering from a decline in trade an increase in rent was necessary in order to meet the increased operating costs and to maintain or improve the current service standards.

A lower level of increase could be considered for Mondays general market however as this day already suffered from considerably lower occupancy rates than the others.

#### **11.Risks and Uncertainties**

With any increase in rent level, however small the amount, there is always the risk that some traders will either be unable or unwilling to pay that increase and leave the market further decreasing occupancy levels.

The risk is however outweighed by the need to maintain and improve service standards.

#### **12.Finance**

The revised rents are expected to increase revenue income by approximately £8,900 per annum.

#### **13.Sustainability**

The rent increase is required in order to maintain the quality of service delivery, overall efficiency and operating sustainability of the markets.

#### **14.Wards Affected**

All.

#### **15.References**

None

#### **16.Presentation**

All parties involved with the negotiations agreed that despite the continuing nation wide decline in market popularity service levels must be maintained and where possible improved.

In order to achieve this an increase in rent is imperative.

#### **17.Recommendations**

- 1. That an increase of 2% in stall rent for Mondays General Market be effective from 24 May 2004.**
- 2. That an increase of 4% for all other Outdoor Market rents and charges be effective from 24 May 2004.**

<b>ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL - REPORT TO MEMBERS</b>
--

**1. Economic and Development Services Matters**

2. 17 May 2004

**3. Dog Kennels Lane (B6059), Kiveton Park.  
Development Control Line (DCL)**

4. **Originating Officer:** - I. L. Ferguson, Development Control Officer, Transportation Unit, Planning and Transportation Service, Ext. 2965  
[ian.ferguson@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:ian.ferguson@rotherham.gov.uk)

**Divisional Manager:** - Ken Wheat, Transportation Unit Manager, Planning and Transportation Service, Ext. 2953  
[ken.wheat@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:ken.wheat@rotherham.gov.uk)

**5. Issue**

To consider a replacement Development Control Line (DCL) at B6059 Dog Kennels Lane.

**6. Summary**

An outline planning application to construct 4 No. dwellings and a new access and drive on land at Dog Kennels Lane is compromised by a DCL inherited from the former highway authority (SYCC). It is unlikely that an improvement of the magnitude of the inherited scheme is required and it is suggested that a revised DCL be imposed which allows the applicant greater flexibility, without compromising unduly the Council's duties and responsibilities

**7. Clearance/Consultation**

No other Service Area has been involved.

**8. Timing**

The issue has arisen following receipt of a planning application. A speedy decision is requested to enable the planning application to be processed.

**9. Background**

A DCL illustrates the likely effect of any future highway improvement scheme on adjoining land and is of particular relevance in a planning context where an area is likely to be redeveloped or new buildings erected. The line is intended to be of guidance to property developers to ensure that any new development, particularly new buildings, do not prejudice or are not prejudiced by any future transport proposals. A DCL is, where applicable, declared in response to a Local Authority Search and is taken into account when assessing planning applications for affected land/property.

A DCL at B6059 Dog Kennels Lane/Crowgate, in Kiveton Park from Red Hill in the south to Axle Lane to the north, has been in place for a number of years having been inherited by this Council from the previous highway authority, South Yorkshire County Council. Indeed, a substantial number of DCL's have been inherited in this way by the Council. Members may recall agreeing to amend such lines at A633 Rawmarsh Hill and St. Johns, Laughton-en-le-Morthen.

Ideally, we should be carrying out a comprehensive review of such matters throughout the Borough, but resources and other priorities are constraining our ability to do this. In the short term we will have to continue to deal with them as they occur on an ad hoc basis.

The line affects land and numerous properties at Dog Kennels Lane/Crowgate although that part of the line the subject of this report is restricted to that part of Dog Kennels Lane fronting and immediately adjacent the planning application site boundary. In view of the Council's transportation policies which reflect the regional and national emphasis on better management of existing road space and travel demand rather than the provision of additional capacity, it is considered most unlikely that future road improvement proposals, which would require all of the land protected by the DCL in this location, could be justified. However, the future need for some form of highway improvement on road safety grounds cannot be ruled out.

An outline planning application to erect 4 No. dwellings on land off Dog Kennels Lane has been submitted. The application, if approved as submitted, would prejudice, and be prejudiced by, the existing DCL in that any future road improvement proposal in this location could involve demolition of some of the proposed properties or adversely impact on the amenity of future residents with obvious compensation implications. In the event of the new dwellings being erected behind the revised DCL, no direct affect would be involved.

## **9. Argument**

In view of the changed circumstances the DCL has been re-examined. It is considered that there is justification for protecting a line in the vicinity based upon the requirements for a standard 7.3m carriageway and 2 No. 1.8m footways. The existing and suggested DCLs are shown on drawing No. 5082/16, attached as Appendix A. The revision is based on a possible future road improvement, the details of which are not known at present. However, it is considered most unlikely that the improvement envisaged by the former Highway Authority could be justified and an improvement with less effect on the property is considered more reasonable.

## **10. Risks and Uncertainties**

The applicant may claim that the Council's existing or revised DCL is blighting the property and seek redress.

## **11. Finance**

N/A

**12. Sustainability**

Continuing to protect schemes and possibilities which only increase capacity is not sustainable and not in accordance with the latest national and local policies. The revised DCL is an attempt to balance the often conflicting aims of road improvement schemes in the economic, social and environmental context.

**13. Wards Affected**

Ward 1, Anston and Woodsetts  
Ward 18, Wales

**14. References**

N/A

**15. Presentation**

N/A

**16. Recommendations**

**In view of the foregoing, I ask Cabinet Member to resolve that;**

- (a) the development control line affecting Dog Kennels Lane, Kiveton Park be revised as indicated on the attached plan reference No. 5082/16 at Appendix A, and**
- (b) the Planning and Transportation Service review the desirability or otherwise of retaining other lines inherited from the former South Yorkshire County Council and report to a future meeting thereon as necessary.**



Blank page

**ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT****1. Economic and Development Services Matters****2. 17 May 2004****3. Streetpride Performance Response Times****4. Originating Officer:-**

Jon Surridge, Support Manager, Streetpride, Ext 2908  
[jonathan.surridge@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:jonathan.surridge@rotherham.gov.uk)

**Divisional Manager:-**

Tom Knight, Head of Streetpride Service, Ext 2906  
[tom.knight@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:tom.knight@rotherham.gov.uk)

**5. Issue**

To report on 'response times' across a range of Streetpride services during the last quarter

**6. Summary**

The results for the first quarter of 2004 are presented in tabular form in Appendix 1, and show a continuing improvement compared to the previous quarter.

**7. Clearance/Consultation**

The target response times have been agreed with the relevant managers and staff. The Head of Environmental Services has been consulted.

**8. Timing**

It is proposed to continue to monitor and record the response times monthly, and to continue to report the results to the Cabinet Member, quarterly.

**9. Background**

The Streetpride Service has a set of targets covering 'response times' for 26 key services. Our actual performance achieved in respect of each of these targets is recorded and monitored monthly.

**10. Argument**

The results for the last quarter (see Appendix 1) show that 70% of these key services are now consistently being delivered within the target response times 100% of the time. Performance has improved significantly since Streetpride was officially launched in September 2003. This has been achieved against a background of continuously rising demand for most of these services.

In March, those services which did not meet the targets 100% of the time were as follows:

Estimate for vehicular dropped crossing	(97%)
Streetlight out	(78%)
Dangerous defect on footpath	(83%)
Removal of fly tipping	(80%)
Empty overflowing litter / dog bin	(75%)
Remove racist or offensive graffiti	(94%)
Report of a stray dog	(86%)

Action is continuing to further improve performance in these areas, particularly for street lighting faults.

**11. Risks and Uncertainties**

Streetpride is now a high profile Council Service. There is a risk that if demand continues to rise further, there may be some reduction in performance response times compared to current levels.

**12. Finance**

All costs incurred in meeting these response times are contained within existing budgets.

**13. Sustainability**

Improving response times contributes to the delivery of the Council's sustainability agenda, particularly in respect of issues such as the removal of abandoned cars, fly tipping and graffiti.

**14. Wards Affected**

All.

**15. References**

Appendix 1 - Streetpride response times.

**16. Presentation**

There has been a further general improvement in response times this quarter.

**17. Recommendations**

**It be resolved that the report be noted and Streetpride continue to monitor performance response times and report to the Cabinet Member quarterly.**

Blank page

Blank page 2

**ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL - REPORT**

1. **Economic and Development Services Matters**
2. 17 May 2004
3. *Rotherham Road, Laughton en le Morthen – Proposed footway*
4. **Originating Officer:-** *M. Lowe, Assistant Engineer, Road Safety, Streetpride - matthew.lowe@rotherham.gov.uk - Ext. 2380*  
**Divisional Manager:-** *D Popple, Acting Schemes and Partnership Manager Design and Engineering Service – dave.popple@rotherham.gov.uk - Ext. 2950*
5. **Issue**  
To report a proposal to build a short length of footway to improve access for pedestrians to the new burial ground on Rotherham Road at Laughton en le Morthen.
6. **Summary**  
The proposal involves changing approximately 50m of verge into footway.
7. **Clearance/Consultation**  
It is proposed to consult with South Yorkshire Police and Local Ward Members. The Parish Council do not need to be consulted as they have requested that we provide the footway link.
8. **Timing**  
It is proposed that the scheme will be constructed during the current financial year. Problems may be identified during detail design which could cause a delay in the completion of the scheme, however, as most of the work is being done within existing highway this is expected to be minimal.
9. **Background**  
A new burial ground has been established on the outskirts of Laughton en le Morthen, off Rotherham Road. Within this burial ground there is space for a hearse and two mourners cars to park. When there is a funeral service it is anticipated that some mourners will walk to the burial ground from the church. Currently the footway from All Saints Church towards the burial ground stops some 50m from the entrance. This means that mourners will have to either walk along a grass verge or in the carriageway where a 60mph speed limit is in force.

The planning application for the burial ground did not include for provision of a length of footway to join into the footway in the village. The Church Warden of the Parochial Church Council of All Saints Church stated that this would not be necessary as mourners would travel to the graveside by car. Given the lack of parking within the burial ground this clearly will not be the case and it is expected that most mourners will walk to the burial ground.

10. **Argument**

The lack of a footway link from the All Saints Church may mean that mourners drive to the new burial ground and park on Rotherham Road. This is undesirable, as Rotherham Road is a rural road with a 60mph speed limit.

Without the footway link any mourners who do choose to walk to the burial ground would have to walk in the verge or carriageway.

Providing the footway link may encourage mourners to walk to the burial ground.

11. **Risks and Uncertainties**

The estimated cost is subject to the need to divert Statutory Undertakers apparatus; this is expected to be minimal.

12. **Finance**

The scheme is estimated to cost approximately £6,000. Funding is available from the Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Capital Programme for 2004/2005 together with a contribution of £1 000 from Laughton en le Morthen Parish Council.

13. **Sustainability**

The proposal is in line with the Council's policy of improving pedestrian safety.

14. **Wards Affected**

Ward 18 – St Johns

15. **References**

South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan.  
Appendix A – drawing 126/15/LBG/01

16. **Presentation**

The proposal should improve pedestrian safety.

17. **Recommendations**

**It be resolved that:**

- i) necessary consultations be undertaken regarding the proposals**
- ii) authority be given for the detailed design to be carried out and subject to no objections being received the scheme be implemented.**
- iii) the scheme be funded from the LTP Integrated Transport Programme for 2004/05 with a contribution from Laughton en le Morthen Parish Council.**

Blank page



**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL - REPORT TO MEMBERS**

1. **Economic and Development Services Matters**
2. 17 May 2004
3. ***Dale Hill Road / Addison Road Maltby – Objections to Road Hump Notice***
4. **Originating Officer:-** *N. Davey, Engineer, Road Safety, Highway and Traffic Engineering, Streetpride Service -nigel.davey@rotherham.gov.uk Ext. 2380*  
**Divisional manager:-** *D Popple, Acting Manager Schemes and Partnerships, Streetpride Service - david.popple@rotherham.gov.uk Ext.*
5. **Issue**  
To report receipt of and consider objections to the proposal to introduce traffic calming measures on Addison Road and Dale Hill Road Maltby, from Braithwell Road and Rotherham Road.
6. **Summary**  
Three letters have been received from residents who live on streets that are adjacent to the scheme. All object to the provision of road humps.
7. **Clearance/Consultation**  
Consultation has taken place with the Police, South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive, South Yorkshire Metropolitan Ambulance and Paramedic Service, South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service, Rotherham Chamber of Trade, Local Ward Members, Maltby Parish Councillors and the Freight Transport Association. No objections have been received from the above.  
The Ward Members have been informed of the contents of the objections received. There has been no response from any Ward Member.
8. **Timing**  
It is proposed that the scheme will be carried out during the 2004/2005 financial year.
9. **Background**  
At the Cabinet Member meeting on 29 September 2003, approval was given to amend the Maltby Concept Plan to include Dale Hill Road and Addison Road and to undertake the detailed design and consultation on the scheme.  
Council Minute 143 refers  
A plan (Drawing N<sup>o</sup> 122/U315) showing the extent of the scheme is attached as Appendix A  
The letters of objection are attached as Appendix B
10. **Argument**  
The first objector feels that:

**Objection**

The roads have not been plagued with the sort of accident frequency that might merit action being taken, neither have they schools directly sited on them.

**Observation**

There have been 10 injury accidents that have occurred on these roads in the three year period under investigation. Following extensive consultation regarding the Maltby Concept Plan and further consultation with local residents, the area Assembly and Town Council regarding the approved concept plan, the aforementioned consultees indicated their desire to include Addison Road and Dale Hill Road in the concept plan as a scheme to be implemented with immediate effect.

**Objection**

As a pedestrian I cross one or both every day and have never waited more than 20 seconds to do so safely.

**Observation**

The proposal will improve road safety for all vulnerable road users.

**Objection**

As a cyclist the idea of having to negotiate greasy speed bumps on a steep hill in bad weather fills me with dread. You can't always steer to either side of the cushions because people park next to them.

**Observation**

The layout of the cushions allows cyclists to pass them either at the kerb side or toward the centre of the carriageway if the cushions are to be avoided. The actual location of each set of cushions has been determined after undertaking a parking survey to ascertain the extent of on street parking. The cushions are located so as to avoid any regular on street parking.

**Objection**

As someone with a heart condition and cancer it doesn't reassure me that any emergency service I may need will lose vital seconds reaching me or taking me to hospital.

**Observation**

Consultation with each of the emergency services have been undertaken and no objections received.

**Objection**

Other councils are facing huge protests by residents who want these low tec devices removed yet our forward thinking council is putting them in. Probably the few people who wanted them (there are not that many houses that directly front onto these roads) will be the first to request their removal, being sickened by the low gear revving needed to surmount them.

**Observation**

The proposal has resulted from extensive consultation involving local residents, The Area Assembly, the Parish Council, emergency services, bus companies, etc. These features have been found to be successful in reducing speeds to below 30mph, wherever they have been installed within the Borough and are the most successful tool currently available to reduce vehicle speeds over a length of road such as this.

**Objection**

In recent bad weather the Amorys Holt estate had little or no grit and cars were sliding about on sheets of ice – is not effective gritting a greater contribution to road safety?

**Observation**

Winter gritting on other residential roads has little or no bearing on this proposal

**Objection**

This is a major bus route, for the 1,2,286,X7 and 262. On the First Mainline buses the combination of the penny pinching design of the seats and powerful brakes has already thrown one passenger off her seat and onto the floor. I would imagine that a bus driver occasionally misjudging one of these bumps (e.g. in fog) would exacerbate the problem, causing potentially serious injury.

**Observation**

The cushion size is such that buses can straddle the cushions without undue discomfort. As previously stated the cushions are located where on street parking is not prevalent and therefore the bus driver should be able to align themselves correctly and indeed we have received no objections from the bus companies who run services on this route. In addition bus drivers will use these roads regularly so will become familiar with the location of the cushions reducing the chance of misjudging their position relative to the cushion.

**Objection**

Many larger vehicles such as 4x4 with right wheel width drive through the cushions without slowing.

**Observation**

Wide based vehicles will be able to negotiate the cushions with minimal discomfort in order to accommodate emergency vehicles. However, unless the traffic is free flowing, the first vehicle in a line of moving traffic will always dictate the speed of vehicles behind them

The Second Objector feels that:

**Objection**

The Council is pouring money into schemes which punish those road users who do not speed and pay particular care when in and around residential areas. It is an outcry.

**Observation**

The proposal will improve road safety for all vulnerable road users. The speed cushions should not cause any problems for those motorists who drive at an appropriate speed.

**Objection**

Does not want their vehicle to be put through the damage inducing process of going over these humps time and again.

**Observation**

There is no evidence that suggests that driving over speed cushions at or below the posted speed limit damages vehicles.

**Objection**

Even when speed humps are installed in areas, they do nothing to combat some of the worst offenders for speeding, such as Motorbikes, buses and works vans.

**Observation**

Wide based vehicles are able to straddle the cushions better than smaller vehicles. However, in order to satisfy the demands of the emergency services and bus companies speed cushions offer the best solution for reducing vehicle speeds.

**Objection**

Why couldn't someone with an ounce of common sense realise that instead of installing speed humps which punish those who do no wrong, speed cameras would be more appropriate.

**Observation**

The criteria for installing speed cameras anywhere along Dale Hill Road or Addison Road is not met.

The Third Objector feels that:

**Objection**

Understands from the community plan, which was written following consultation with residents of Maltby, that road humps were never asked for nor included in the plan. Residents of the area asked for safer crossing points to enable them to cross the roads to get to shops, buses etc.

**Observation**

Whilst safe crossing points are mentioned within the Maltby Community Plan, the plan also shows that Addison Road requires traffic calming to cut down accidents and enable children, the elderly and people with learning disabilities to cross this road safely. This proposal aims to achieve what is stated in the Community Plan.

**Objection**

There are a number of bungalows for the elderly, two schools, and a residential home for people with leaning disabilities, as well as a day centre used by people with learning disabilities in that area – all of whom would welcome safer crossing points rather than humps in the road, which would not give that safety to pedestrians.

**Observation**

The Council's criteria for installing formal crossing points is not met anywhere along Dale Hill or Addison Road. Pedestrian refuges as stated previously in this report can not be constructed due to limited carriageway width. The installation of vertical traffic calming features should reduce vehicle speeds which should assist vulnerable road users to cross the road.

**Objection**

Addison Road and Dale Hill Road are on the main bus route into and out of Maltby, and previous experiences in other areas have shown that drivers and passengers have been made very uncomfortable by the buses passing over the humps.

**Observation**

Consultation with the bus companies has taken place with no objections being received from the bus companies.

**Objection**

I am sure that road humps have been successful on minor roads, and although Addison Road and Dale Hill Road are not classed as A roads, the very nature of them being used as bus routes and a main thoroughfare to many houses and public facilities in the area make them major roads and as such should not, in my opinion be subjected to the proposed construction.

**Observation**

The proposal is aimed at improving safety for all vulnerable road users. As previously mentioned there are road safety problems on these roads and this scheme offers the best solution to overcome them.

**Objection**

To conclude, if consultation with Maltby residents has been carried out and their views are not taken into consideration, what is the point of consulting with the people who live in the area? Surely this is a tokenistic gesture and Rotherham Borough Council are not carrying out the wishes of the community involved.

**Observation**

Consultation with Maltby residents in terms of the Community Plan and the Concept plan has been extensive. Dale Hill Road and Addison Road have been identified by residents as a road where there are concerns with regard to speed of vehicles. There are recorded injury accidents and speeds of vehicles have been recorded in excess of the posted speed limit. Following letters that have been sent to every frontage on Addison Road and Dale Hill Road and the public notice that has appeared on street and in the Rotherham Advertiser there has not been one single objection from any resident on Dale Hill Road and Addison Road.

11. **Risks and Uncertainties**

Implementation of the scheme is subject to not acceding to the objections. If the objections are acceded to and the scheme does not proceed then speeds will remain as at present around 37mph along Dale Hill Road / Addison Road and the potential for injury accidents will remain high.

12. **Finance**

The scheme is estimated to cost approximately £50,000. Funding will be available from the Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Capital Programme for 2004/2005.

13. **Sustainability**

The proposal is in line with the Council's policy of improving road safety.

14. **Wards Affected**

Ward 14, Maltby ward.

15. **References**

Minute N<sup>o</sup> 143 of the meeting of the Cabinet Member held on 29 September 2003 and associated report.

South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan.

Letters of objection

Plan of scheme (Drawing No 122/U315)

16. **Presentation**

The proposed works will provide a safer road environment by reducing vehicle speeds and assisting pedestrians to cross the road.

17. **Recommendations**

**It be resolved that:**

**i) The objections be not acceded to and the objectors be informed of the reasons.**

**ii) Support for the scheme be reiterated and the scheme be implemented.**

**Streetpride Service**

Blank page

Blank page 2



Blank page 3

Blank page 4

Blank page 5

**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS****1. Meeting**

Delegated powers meeting

**2. Date of Meeting**

26<sup>th</sup> April 2004

**3. Title**

BVP109- speed of planning decisions: annual report

**4. Originating Officer**

Karl Battersby, Head of Planning and Transportation Service X3815

**5. Issue**

Report of performance against national and local targets

**6. Summary**

Performance against the national and local targets has improved compared with the figures for 2002/03.

**7. Clearance/Consultation**

N/A

**8. Timing**

It is timely to report the performance at the beginning of this financial year.

**9. Background**

BVP 109 – speed of decision on planning applications, is the national measure for Development Control performance. Members receive monthly updates of performance against the three national targets as part of the Mission Possible performance statistics.

**10. Argument**

The table below shows the performance for the whole year as compared to last year, and the last quarter's performance. The figures show that in all three categories performance has improved over last year, despite a 12% increase in the number of applications received. It is also worth noting that the figures for the last quarter and March are significantly higher than our local targets, and exceed national targets.

BVP109: speed of planning decision

<b>Period</b>	<b>major applications</b>	<b>minor applications</b>	<b>Other applications</b>
	national target 60% local target 57%	national target 60% local target 55%	national target 80% local target 75%
2002/2003	50%	47%	74%
2003/2004	55%	55%	80%
Last quarter	71%	63%	87%
March 2004	88%	65%	95%

The table below shows that the number of applications received has continued to increase since 2001. The number of applications received has increased by 28% since 2001. The trend looks set to continue. The number of applications received for end of the first quarter this year is 24% higher than the same quarter in 2003. If this trend continues throughout the year it will have serious implications for Development Control Performance.

It is the intention to seek 2 additional members of staff for Development Control, funded from the Planning Delivery Grant allocation, to ensure that performance does not slip.

Number of applications received

Year	Jan-March	Apr-Jun	Jul-Sept	Oct-Dec	Total for year
2001	405	512	447	392	1756
2002	524	502	514	468	2008
2003	575	592	579	500	2246
2004	714				

#### 11. Risks and Uncertainties

If the trend in workload continues throughout the year it will have serious implications for Development Control Performance.

#### 12. Finance

The sections performance against national targets is critical, not just in terms of the council's CPA rating, but also because of the impact of the level of Planning Delivery Grant that the service receives.

#### 13. Sustainability

N/A

#### 14. Wards Affected

All

**15. References**

Best Value Performance Plan

**16. Presentation**

Performance continues to improve, despite a continued increase since 2001 of applications being received.

**17. Recommendations**

**That the performance is noted, and that this report is presented to the Planning Board for information. A further report will be brought to the Cabinet Member in six months.**

**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS**

1. **Economic and Development Services – Delegated Powers**
2. **Date of Meeting – 17<sup>th</sup> May 2004**
3. **Title Of Report - 2003/04 Activity Report for Business Development Team**
4. **Originating Officer:-** Paul Woodcock, Business Development Manager  
RiDO
5. **Issue**  
To inform Members of results, achievements and key activities from the Business Development Team for 2003/04
6. **Summary**  
It is important to report and inform Members on key activities and especially results, achievements and performance. The attached paper provides a detailed account of 2003-04 for the Business Development areas of RiDO.
7. **Clearance/Consultation**  
The report has been subject to consultation and discussion with the team.
8. **Timing**
9. **Background**  

All areas produce a team plan, which set targets and priorities for the forthcoming year. It is therefore imperative that a report be produced to measure and account for what has (or has not) been achieved. The practice of producing performance data and reports helps:

  - measure year-on-year activity
  - set with future targets
  - inform future strategy and policy
  - provide Officers and Members the opportunity to ascertain performance and where relevant either promote good news/achievements or put corrective action in place for under-achievement.

The 2003-04 report follows the template used in the 2002-03 and 2003-04 6 month reports.
10. **Argument**  
The report meets the aims of reporting on key performance indicators, which continually need to be improved in the context of national, regional and local indicators to monitor progress against objectives and targets.
11. **Risks and Uncertainties**  
It is important that any published results can be substantiated and that the service has significantly contributed to the results. However, work in

economic development is influenced by global and national economic conditions, which are outside the influence of the Council and its partners. These external conditions need to be considered when looking at performance by the Business Development Team.

12. **Finance**

There are no financial implications arising directly from this report.

13. **Sustainability**

The service aims to make best use of available resources. In particular, the activities and work programme of the team is a key part of the Regeneration Plan, which has been subject to appraisal following the sustainability framework. Examples of sustainability for the Business Development Team include – utilising brownfield land, looking at local jobs for local people and helping companies in the supply chain (Buy-Local).

14. **Wards Affected**

All

15. **References**

Business Development Team Plans for 2002-03 and 2004-05. End-of-year report 2002-3 and 2003-04 6-month progress report.

16. **Presentation**

Some key achievements include:

- over 1,400 new jobs created
- an occupancy rate of 95% for the two business centres
- Formation of a new Business Development Team under the new RiDO
- implementation of SRB6 and Objective 1 M30 programmes
- the addition of the JOBMatch service
- considerable work on the ODPM National “Working With Business Project”
- Conversion rate for business conference enquiries has gone up from 16% to 28%.

17. **Recommendations**

That Members note the attached 2003-04 report for Business Development.





a service of



**BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT TEAM  
2003/04 ACTIVITY REPORT**

**April 2004**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this report is to provide details of activity, achievements and outputs for 2003/04 from the Business Development Team of the Rotherham Investment and Development Office (RiDO).

## **OVERVIEW**

2003/04 saw the emergence of a restructured EDS with a new service area called RiDO, which brought together teams from various areas. The Business Development Team is one of 4 teams within RiDO, which in its own right brought together teams from inward investment/'old' RiDO; the business centres team, business support, marketing/PR and business conferencing. In addition, the team now also features a 'JOBMatch' service. The Business Development team has a significant role to play in the 4 areas of economic development:-

- Inward Investment / getting new companies into Rotherham;
- Supporting existing businesses;
- Helping businesses / people start-up in business ; and
- Interventions in the labour market

The year has seen a number of new faces in the team, many of which are funded through external programmes (such as SRB and Objective 1). These include Paul Woodcock (Business Development Manager); Clare Warne (JOBMatch); Simon Spode (Investment/Marketing Officer – based within RSY); Andrew Klinkenberg (Research / Database Co-ordinator) and Angela Tubb (Business Support Assistant).

## **KEY RESULTS FOR 2003/04**

A summary of key performance indicators is provided in Table 1 (Appendix A). The indicators match those in the Team Plan for 2003/04 and last years indicators, which enable comparisons to be made 'year-on-year'.

### **Inward Investment & Business Activity**

Enquiry levels for foreign direct investment continue at a low level, but despite this, overall enquiry figures have risen dramatically over the year. 2003/4 saw an increase of 32% over the previous year and the highest number of enquiries since records began in 1995. Trends show higher numbers of new companies are wanting to start-up and higher numbers of more local enquiries. We have started to measure the impact of advertising, quite often local, which contributed 11% toward the total source of enquiries within the period.

Rotherham has seen a number of new developments completed throughout the year, with RiDO playing a large part in the planning and marketing/promotion of these. The developments amount to a significant investment from both the public and private sector - Genesis (Templeborough)

with investment of £2.3 m private and £987,000 Objective 1 Priority 5 grant, Aspen Phase 1 (Templeborough) with a £ 2.6 m private and £ 979,000 Objective 1 Priority 5 grant, The Point (Templeborough) with £2.2 m private sector, Innov@te (Manvers) and also Waterside Enterprise Park (Dinnington) with CAPEX to be confirmed.

Existing developments continue to be attractive to potential investors, although there is a high preponderance of high spec office currently available, especially in the North of the Borough. In comparison, there is currently a lack of quality office space towards the south of the Borough.

Future developments are progressing well, with the Dinnington Colliery reclamation nearing completion and interest in the site at a high level. The Beighton site will be completed later this year, with plans for Brookfield Park and Fairway at Manvers West progressing.

The Advanced Manufacturing Park is moving forward well, with the first building on site (Boeing AMRC – Sheffield University joint venture) nearing completion. TWI have signed up for the site and interest has been shown by other companies in the AMM cluster.

RiDO has recently attended MIPIM, along with Regional Partners and developers to promote the borough/region to investors. A number of new leads have been gained via this, and the event proved a good trial for the new corporate brochure, which has received positive feedback. Earlier in the year, the Paris Airshow proved a good event for RiDO as part of the Advanced Manufacturing Park (AMP) Project.

RiDO also exhibited at the CBI Conference and Exhibition in Birmingham in November, and will be part of the Farnborough Airshow delegation in July. Both events attract senior decision-makers from industry.

There have been a number of instances over the year when RiDO have had in depth involvement with relocating and expanding businesses. These include Springer Rapid and Newburgh Engineering. Ventura has also announced it's expansion, creating a further 1000 jobs, with a recent press release announcing another 120 part and full time employees to be recruited. Toyoda Gosei also continue to expand at a pace, with 650+ jobs having being created since starting in Rotherham. Ellison Metal Finishing expanded into Rotherham from their West Yorkshire base, creating 26 jobs. Also, Rosehill Press, a local printing company, has expanded at Bradmarsh Business Park, Templeborough, highlighting their continuing success since RiDO's initial involvement, supporting the company with starting-up operations in the borough.

### **Start-up Support/Incubation/Business Centres**

The two RiDO Business Centres at Brampton and Century have continued to be a success with high occupancy levels at both sites, with a yearly average

of 95%. The centres are a key part of the borough's work to encourage and help business start-up. Successes / areas of work include:-

- Introduction of a new facility for start up businesses - a 'virtual office'.
- Provision of a managed leased line broadband system to residents at the Brampton Centre (adding to what is already popular at Century);
- Work on the Moorgate Crofts centre (due to open Spring 2005).
- A new Incubation Strategy for Rotherham – with lots of proposals for moving the service forward, such as introducing new Incubator facilities at Century and Moorgate Crofts.
- Work on the Objective 1 bid for incubation.
- Following the success of Beacon status, Amanda Pettitt's team have hosted 9 visits this year to other local authorities and business support organisations, including groups from the Ukraine and Portugal.
- Worked with Virtual College to develop the Entrepreneurs Toolkit. Hopefully this will be piloted during 04 within the Business Centres.
- Improved the working relationship with other support agencies, for example Business Link South Yorkshire.
- A number of businesses now have a need and desire to 'grow-out' of the centres as part of their expansion plans.

The forthcoming year will be a challenging one, especially with the introduction of new services, a new centre and the implementation of the incubation strategy and objective 1 project (which will provide additional resources and 3 new members of staff).

**The Buy-Local Scheme** – see [www.buy-local.co.uk](http://www.buy-local.co.uk)

282 Rotherham companies and organisations are involved in Buy Local at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004, an increase of 98 during the period 1<sup>st</sup> April 2003 – 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004. Total Yorkshire/Humber membership at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2004 totals 3715, up 537 during the year, of which 869 are based in South Yorkshire.

The South Yorkshire portal, covering Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham, Sheffield, North Nottinghamshire and North Derbyshire, has seen more new registrations (276) than the North and West Yorkshire and Humberside portals (261) combined.

During the year a series of 5 leaflets has been produced, designed to guide members through the process of posting items to the Buy Local website, maintaining the Directory, and setting up Keyword Advisory service. This information, together with suggestions for keywords and tender / news topics, is sent to all new members upon registration, and to earlier registrations as the opportunity arises. 70% of Rotherham members have received this information by 31.3.04, and it is anticipated that the process will be completed by June 2004.

All Rotherham members now have Usernames which conform to the uniform format adopted across the Buy Local network.

Promotion of Buy Local continues with targeted mailshots on industrial estates, and the circulation of tender information to member and non-member businesses. 184 tenders and news items have been posted to the Bulletin Board via the Rotherham portal.

Buy Local has participated in four events during 2003/04. These include the Construction Event at Don Valley Arena (Oct '03), Meet the Buyers at Doncaster Council (Oct '03), the Footsey at Magna (Oct '03) and the RiDO Business Breakfast at Magna (Oct '03). An event scheduled to take place in Dinnington in December, has now been re-scheduled for May 2004.

The Buy Local Partnership is working with a number of agencies and other Council services to organise events designed to promote Buy Local and other support initiatives within the business community. The 2004/05 programme will include:

- Rotherham Construction Partnering Scheme - an event organised in partnership with Rotherham Chamber and RMBC to introduce the Council's Construction Partnering scheme and to encourage local suppliers to become supply chain partners.
- Rother Valley Networking Event - an event organised in partnership with a number of organisations and other Council services to raise awareness to the range of support available to businesses in the southern part of the borough.
- New Buy Local display banners have been purchased in 2003/04, and these will be complemented during 2004/05 by leaflets of improved quality.

### **Business Conferencing**

Promotional and marketing initiatives in the year from April 2002 included:

- Familiarisation visits in May and September.
- Produced updated version of Conference Guide
- Exhibition stand at International Confex & Yorkshire Corporate Hospitality Show
- Adverts and editorial in annual BACD and YTB Business Tourism Partnership directories, and extensive coverage in focused national publications including Government Business and Health Business.
- Production of new exhibition 'pop-up' stands

Two week-end visits were arranged in co-operation with local venues, and included show rounds at Magna Science Adventure Centre and the Manorial Barn, while Hellaby Hall and Courtyard Hotels both provided hospitality and overnight accommodation. The September visit ended with an afternoon at the annual Rotherham Show that was enjoyed by our guests. It is unknown at this time whether any business has been secured as a result of these visits.

Our attendance at International Confex was a stand share in partnership with both Magna and Hellaby Hall, and The Yorkshire CHS highlighted Rotherham and Magna as in previous years. Both generated new enquiries which will hopefully show a return in new business during 2004/5.

These projects have helped to increase the enquiry levels to 279, the highest since records were started in 1998. Of these 29% were for specific events, and 71% brochure only requests. The conversion rate of the specific enquiries increased from 16% to 28%. Seven events have taken place in 2003/04 financial year and generated income in the region of £3300. Expected income from all known confirmed bookings is expected to be in excess of £10,500.

Some interesting information:

- Most enquiries from Yorkshire and Humber (39%) followed closely by London and the home counties (35%)
- Most events had 100 or fewer delegates (60%), only 17% were 500+
- 60% of events lasted one day or less

### **Public Relations, Marketing and Promotion**

2003-04 exceeded even the previous year's record level of activity. The PR/marketing role has increased enormously. From covering primarily the small "old RiDO", it has expanded first to take in the four teams comprising new RiDO and now, increasingly, activities right across EDS.

As well as contributing to the monthly Town Team meetings on Rotherham Renaissance, Clark Herron set up and plays a leading role in the Town Team Media Group to prepare, deliver and continue into the future the marketing of Renaissance. Added to this is the involvement in the YES! Project, Rotherham Ambassadors Steering Groups, Promoting Rotherham Group and the Advanced Manufacturing Park, plus articles for EDlineS, Council Matters and Rotherham Chamber Matters. Clark is also giving increasing support on town centre and other initiatives, such as the Streetpride entry for the Municipal Journal annual awards. Beyond the borough, he is still deeply involved in the marketing of South Yorkshire, under the aegis of Renaissance South Yorkshire.

Press releases, images and suggestions for articles or broadcast have increased the already massive positive coverage. The trend of joint PR initiatives with private sector companies has increased. E.g.:

- Helping organise the opening of Redwall Developments' new Waterside Business Park by Rother Valley MP Kevin Barron, and arranging press coverage.
- Springer Rapid Industries Ltd, on its move to Rotherham, which resulted in print, TV and radio coverage.
- St Paul's Developments plc, on Brookfields Park – a Press-call event produced substantial print, TV and radio coverage.

The websites are increasingly bringing enquiries and have attracted praise. But the entire internet-based promotion of Rotherham Regeneration needs a major overhaul to win even better results. The [www.rido.org.uk](http://www.rido.org.uk) website has more than doubled the number of hits it is receiving in the past year, from 24,476 to just over 52,078.

The quarterly RiDO Business Breakfast, in conjunction with magazine Yorkshire Business Insider, continues to be a success. Themes for April 2003 to date have been the Budget and Business, with MP John Healey, the Advanced Manufacturing Park, the YES! Project and, currently, encouraging start-up business and an entrepreneurial culture. These always involve speech-writing for RMBC speakers such as the Leader. The latest two have successively broken the magazine's record, with 90+ and then about 110 attendees. The PR manager always encourages partner organisations to share the display space at the events.

There is continuing liaison with local companies in publicising their success – such as the expansion of AESSEAL and TJ Lowe.

Clark also continues to work with Yorkshire Forward's Advanced Manufacturing Park development director and with the heads of the Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre, and has continued to gain positive publicity for these projects.

The measurable results cannot convey the massive liaison with the media, especially by phone and email, that both wins good publicity and kills off or defuses bad publicity.

#### **Statistics:**

**Press releases**, statements, responses issued, etc, by subject (not including different versions for, e.g., specialist magazines and broadcasters): **132**.

**Articles published: 33**, from locals to nationals and internationals

#### **Broadcast items (unable to monitor more than a few):**

- **Radio Sheffield** – 6 news reviews (7-8am), plus several interviews (Yes! Project, Rotherham Renaissance, Springer Rapid, Brookfields...)
- **Radio Hallam** – several items on Yes!, several on Brookfields
- **BBC Look North** – several items, in particular The Politics Show, with filming based on Manvers-Cortonwood with Richard Poundford; excellent coverage of Brookfields
- **YTV (Calendar)** – several items, particularly Yes! and Brookfields

#### **Promotional items (with colleagues and internal/external designers):**

- new roadside hoardings
- an investor pack
- small pocket-sized leaflet on RiDO's services
- several sets of business cards for the "new RiDO" teams
- Marketing brochures

- ✦ ... all bearing the “Rotherham: passionate about progress, committed to Business” branding
- ✦ pop-up stands – for JOBMatch, Conference and Buy Local services... all bearing their relevant branding

#### **SRB 4 New York Riverside**

The SRB4 programme is now in it's final year with only a few projects to 'wrap-up', but with no further initiatives to start. Successes / work includes-

- ✦ Phase 1 of Delma Developments Aspen Court scheme was completed and opened by Cllr Roger Stone on 3 March 2004. The scheme provides a high specification modern environment which is attracting interest from the type quality businesses that will help make a significant long term contribution to the local and regional economy. Occupiers to date include Springer Rapid, Bereco, Signs Express, Carol Aston Carpets and M Gosney. Interest in the remainder of the development is encouraging the developer to bring forward phase 2 proposals.
- ✦ Priority Sites' Genesis scheme has proved a major success delivering a hybrid product that was previously unavailable in the local area. All eight units are now either occupied or under offer. Occupiers include Energy Management Systems, Rotherham Chamber of Commerce and Action Housing Association.
- ✦ “The Point” office development on Bradmarsh Business Park has succeeded in finding occupiers for all bar one of the available units in the scheme. There is also strong interest on a pre-let basis for most of the space in phase 2. Occupiers at the Point include Mowlem, One to One Mortgages, Bilson Logistics Management Ltd, The Display Link, SIS Systems, the Mortgage Bureau and Cutler Communications.
- ✦ The training and wage subsidy programme run in partnership with Rotherham Chamber of Commerce has been extremely successful exceeding all of it's output targets and helping support the creation of over 200 jobs and supporting over 225 people through training.
- ✦ A final evaluation of the scheme has been commissioned with consultancy Meridien Pure due to report in early summer 2004.



**Table 2 - SRB4 Scheme Output Measures for 2003/04**

Measure	Annual target 02/03	Achieved	Annual target 03/04	Achieved
Jobs Created	330	336.5	300	508
Residents Accessing Employment through assistance	151	205	129	30
People trained obtaining jobs	29	6	7	157
Unemployed People entering Self Employment	8	1	3	2
New business Start Ups	2	0	N/A	N/A
New Business Floor Space Completed	18141 sq m	11825 sq m	8760 sq m	10,177 sq m
Land improved for open space		3 hectares	N/A	N/A
Land Improved for Development	8.9 hectares	1.1 hectares	5.36 hectares	5.13 hectares
SRB Funding	£1,885,960	£1,949,240	£1,537,365	£1,232,507
Public Sector Leverage	£1,387,600	£1,226,331	£4,244,401	£2,552,339
Private Sector Leverage	£4,320,170	£9,839,731	£3,679,056	£8,141,027

Achievement against output targets has been good. The table above shows areas of over-achievement and some shortfalls. The shortfalls are primarily due to delays in achieving development on two key sites – New York/Guest and Chrimes and Centenary Riverside. Slippage in the expected development timescale for both these key sites has had an impact across the whole range of scheme outputs. Action has been successfully taken to deliver outputs on other sites which is reflected in the achievements outlined above.

### **JOBMatch**

JOBMatch is now part of the package offered to inward investors and expanding local companies that come to RiDO for assistance. Since December 2003, 34 companies have been provided with basic information on people and skills in the area. 8 companies have had more detailed assistance.

The JOBMatch service has helped RiDO to provide the link between companies that are creating employment opportunities (e.g. inward investors, local companies, expanding or new start-ups) with organisations and initiatives, particularly those that assist long term unemployed and jobseekers.

We have linked in 5 companies to community initiatives. These initiatives include Action in the Community for Employment (The ACE Project), Formula for Success (FfS), Phoenix Enterprises, Remploy, Connexions and Lifetime Careers.

JOBMatch is building good relationships with Jobcentre Plus (JCP) and has worked with them on a number of inward investment enquiries, providing labour market information and wage surveys.

In conjunction with Phoenix Enterprises, Formula for Success and The Ace Project, JOBMatch has worked on a job guarantee scheme with Hazlewood Prepared Foods at Kiveton. The scheme aims to bring people into employment, as well as address employee retention. The job guarantee scheme will now be used as a model for assisting other companies with recruitment.

The HR Support Grant (Objective 1 funded) is now being marketed to eligible companies in the SEZs and urban centre. It will provide assistance with HR related projects such as recruitment, implementation of best practice and HR policy and procedures.

JOBMatch/RiDO is represented on the Employability Focus Group, a bi-monthly meeting which focuses on the LPSA Employability Target in the Borough.

## **OTHER**

During the year the team has put a substantial amount of work, time and effort into an ODPM funded project called “**Working With Business**”. It is a national project which looks at improving the way local authorities do work with, interact and provide services to businesses. The project is currently being piloted in Rotherham with RiDO being a major player. In Rotherham we are working with BT and RBT to pilot new systems, processes and utilising the Siebel CRM software that is used in the RBT Connect centre. If successful this should enable Rotherham to be at the leading edge of working with business and we are already receiving visits and enquiries from other local authorities.

The team has also contributed to many other areas of work and initiatives over the year, with a number listed below:-

- Customer consultation – already happening for investment enquiries and business centres; Buy-Local and business conferencing to follow shortly
- Regeneration Plan and Best Value Review
- Press-cuts service
- Magna project team
- Worked with Forward Planning team to identify and prioritise future land for employment use
- Team ‘Away Day’

- Introduction of a monthly newsletter – the “Business Bulletin”
- Various events – such as Rotherham Show, BURA South Yorkshire event
- Members and contributors to a number of boards, projects, partnerships etc – e.g. LEDP, Investment South Yorkshire, town team, YES!, Change groups, corporate equalities group.

### **TARGETS FOR 2004/05**

2004/05 is the second year of the new EDS team-planning framework, therefore, a team action plan for the Business Development Unit has been produced. The Business Development Team Plan contains a number of targets for the year, with the indicators being similar to those in Table 1 – this will enable comparison between years.

Some specific work areas and priorities for 2004/05 include:-

- Assisting growth companies from the business centres ‘grow-on’
- Working With Business National Pilot
- Implementation of incubation strategy
- Opening of Moorgate Crofts
- Implementation of Objective 1 Incubation project
- Partnership work with rest of RiDO, EDS, RMBC and other partners
- Further work on the ‘local people for local jobs’ service
- Major regeneration schemes – e.g. Brookfields Park, Dinnington, Beighton, town centre, AMP
- Promotion of Rotherham
- Connecting employability and ‘supply chain’/Buy-Local with opportunities from physical developments (such as Dinnington, Brookfields, town centre).

Table 1 Key Performance Indicators	2002-03	2003-04
<u>Inward Investment</u> New jobs created Number of enquiries No. of RiDO actions / work carried out on enquiries Business space taken up - sq ft occupied or taken off market Business space becoming available in Borough – sq ft No. new companies starting-up in Rotherham	1562 642 1390 1,054,569 1,198,937 29	1407 845 1976 890,903 1,048,246.50 36
<u>Business Conferencing</u> No. of conference & meeting enquiries No. familiarisation visits No. exhibitions attended	205 1 1	279 2 2
<u>Managed Workspace</u> Jobs created No. companies moving into centres Ratio companies surviving 52 weeks Companies moving to commercial property Business Centres occupancy rate No. start ups from young entrepreneurs new young entrepreneur companies surviving 52 weeks	264 29 92% 16 93% 6* 10*	86 26 <sup>1</sup> 90% 13 <sup>1</sup> 95% 3* 7*

<p><u>Buy Local</u></p> <p>Increase in no. companies registered on directory                  No. tenders posted on bulletin board                  No. networking events attended</p>	<p>30 219 5</p>	<p>98 184 4</p>
<p><u>Marketing &amp; Promotion</u></p> <p>No. of partners in network                  No. joint marketing initiatives                  No. positive PR stories                  No. papers/journals publishing +ve PR                  No. of positive broadcasts                  No. new media contacts</p>	<p>8 25 66 58 10 58</p>	<p>See Marketing &amp; PR section</p>
<p><u>JOBMatch (Nov – March)</u></p> <p>No. of companies marketed to                  No. of companies assisted**                  Companies linked to community initiatives                  Job Guarantee Scheme                  Companies accessing Training Subsidies &amp; Workforce Diagnostic</p>	<p>N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A</p>	<p>34 8 5 1 1</p>

\*Century Business Centre Only.

\*\*8 hours work minimum.

Most indicators have either exceeded or equalled those of last year, however a number do have lower outputs, an explanation is given here. <sup>1</sup> The number of new companies starting-up in the business centres (and also through RYE) and therefore number of new jobs created is lower because we have had few companies move on from the centres (due to a lack of grow-on space) which thereby stops new companies coming in and creating new jobs.

**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS****ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES MATTERS****17 May 2004**

VOLUNTARY SURRENDER OF UNWANTED VEHICLES.

**Originating Officer :** *Robert Stock, Network Management Principal Engineer*  
*Tel. Ext. 2928. E:mail [bob.stock@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:bob.stock@rotherham.gov.uk)*

**Designated Manager:** *Dave Cooper, Network Manager*  
*Tel. Ext 2828, E:mail [david.cooper@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:david.cooper@rotherham.gov.uk)*

**Issue**

To make Cabinet Member aware of the measures to be taken to promote the fact that the Council accept motor vehicles surrendered for disposal at no cost to the owner.

**Summary**

A range of measures are to be adopted to make residents aware of the service for the removal of unwanted motor vehicles.

**Clearance/Consultation**

The intention to more broadly advertise the acceptance of unwanted vehicles has been discussed with the Council's contractor for the disposal of abandoned vehicles and they are prepared to dispose of all such vehicles under our current contract arrangements.

**Timing**

The additional technician resource made available to deal with abandoned vehicles, and the establishment of a new 2-3 year contract with a contractor who is willing to support the Council in developing the ways in which the problem of abandoned vehicles are dealt with, makes it an appropriate time to market the service more widely.

**Background**

The Council has accepted the voluntary surrender of unwanted motor vehicles at no cost to the owner for many years. However, to date it has not been our practice to advertise this fact.

Over recent years the number of vehicles abandoned across the Rotherham area has increased alarmingly. Each year the Council receives over 2400 reports about cars and vans that local residents believe to have been abandoned by their owners. Many of these vehicles can end up being vandalised or burnt out creating an environmental nuisance and a possible threat to public safety.

### **Argument**

The recent implementation of the End of Life Vehicles Directive has increased the costs of disposal and is expected to result in an increase in the number of vehicles abandoned by their owners.

To try to reduce the number of vehicles that end up being dumped in this way it is proposed that the service for removal and environmentally friendly disposal of unwanted vehicles on behalf of Rotherham residents, by the Council, be made more widely known.

The number of vehicles surrendered to the Council has increased in proportion to the number of abandoned vehicles reported to the Council but is currently only in the order of 45 vehicles a year. It is believed that this level of vehicle surrender can be increased to help contain the numbers of vehicles abandoned in Rotherham.

The development of the way that Streetpride markets its services forms part of both the Streetpride Service Plan and the appropriate Team Action Plan. It is therefore proposed that the service for removal of unwanted motor vehicles be advertised in a number of ways:

- Issuing of press releases
- Production of an information leaflet
- On the Streetpride pages of the Council's website
- Appropriate advertising.

In order to further address problem vehicles reported to the Council a partnership agreement with the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Agency is currently being investigated and will be the subject of a separate report to Cabinet Member.

### **Risks and Uncertainties**

The advertisement of this service will mean that a number of vehicles will be accepted by the Council which would otherwise have been disposed of in a legal way by their owners.

### **Finance**

The costs associated with the voluntary surrender of motor vehicles and any associated advertising costs will be contained within the allocation made for abandoned vehicles within the Streetpride Revenue Account.

### **Sustainability**

Actions to reduce the numbers of vehicles abandoned and the speedy removal of those vehicles that are abandoned or burnt out helps improve the environment and street scene across the Borough.

### **Wards Affected**

All

### **References**

None

**Presentation**

Positive action being taken by the Council to protect the environment and street scene from the nuisance caused by abandoned and unwanted vehicles.

**Recommendations**

**That it be resolved to note the report.**



By virtue of paragraph(s) 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 8 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

**HEALTH, WELFARE AND SAFETY PANEL  
THURSDAY, 22ND APRIL, 2004**

Present:- The Mayor (Councillor R. S. Russell) (in the Chair); Councillors Burke, Jack, Jackson, Senior, G. Smith and Whelbourn. and Mr. J. W. Clay (ATL), Mr. G. Curd (UCATT), Mrs. L. Heywood (UNISON), Mr. M. Martin (UCATT), Mr. K. Moore (AMICUS) and Mr. C. Oldfield (TGWU)

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from (none).

**24. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY, 16TH JANUARY, 2004**

Agreed: That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health, Welfare and Safety Committee held on 16<sup>th</sup> January, 2004 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

Matters arising:-

(i) Habershon House:

Concerns were expressed regarding work not yet carried out at Haberson House regarding window catches and manhole covers.

The Principal Health and Safety Officer reported that the Health and Safety Executive had officially written to the Chief Executive regarding windows throughout the Authority including Habershon House and that the matters were being pursued by Asset Management.

(ii) Mr. John Stapleton, Principal Health and Safety Officer

It was noted that John Stapleton was now part of the Asset Management Service within Economic and Development Service and that he had direct input into the Asset Team on health and safety matters.

**25. STATISTICS OF ACCIDENTS, INJURIES AND INCIDENTS OF VIOLENCE TO EMPLOYEES**

The Principal Health and Safety Officer submitted a chart summarising reported accidents to all employees by quarters from the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter in 2001 to the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter in 2004. Reference was made to the linear trendline which appeared to show a dramatic increase in accidents at certain times and an explanation of this was sought. Increases in accidents were sometimes attributable to seasonable trends.

Agreed: That the information be noted and that the reasons for any unusual increases in accidents in a given period be submitted this Panel.

**26. HEALTH AND SAFETY BULLETIN**

The Principal Health and Safety Officer submitted a copy of the most recent Health and Safety Bulletin. Fourteen recent health and safety articles and cases were highlighted.

Particular reference was made to :-

(a) Teacher jailed for manslaughter of pupil.

The Principal Health and Safety Officer confirmed that all schools and relevant organisations/groups had been made aware of the new LEA146 (Guidelines for Off-Site Visits). The information had been put on CD and all schools would be receiving a copy and it would also be available on the Intranet. Arrangements were in hand for training for School Governors.

It was confirmed that there were issues within the risk assessment that must be dealt with to account for variances on visits.

(b) Occupational Stress

A comment was made that there were a number of stress cases within the workplace that were not coming forward.

It was reported that a report on the Health and Safety Executive's recommendations on stress at work would be submitted to this Panel in due course.

(c) Elderly woman asphyxiated by bed rails.

It was noted that a letter had been sent to all Nursing Homes to ensure that appropriate cot sides are fitted.

(d) Poor Workstation Design.

Concerns were expressed regarding the number of Year 7 pupils and clerical workers at some schools who were working in areas not suitably designed and it was suggested that such areas be inspected by this Panel on their Visits of Inspection.

Agreed: That the information be noted.

**27. REPORTS ON VISITS OF INSPECTION HELD ON FRIDAY, 12TH MARCH, 2004**

Consideration was given to matters arising from the visits of inspection made by the Panel on 12<sup>th</sup> March, 2003.

It was noted that the Executive Director, Economic and Development

Services would investigate the relevant matters and the Heads of Service concerned be notified accordingly.

Particular reference was made to:

(a) Brampton Ellis C of E Junior School

Concerns regarding water escape from the fallpipe design and refurbishment of large windows.

(b) Brampton Leisure Centre

Concerns regarding the communal changing facilities. It was noted that visits were being made to all Leisure Centres in the coming months.

(c) Civic Hall, Swinton

Concerns raised that the Panel were unable go gain entry as the building was locked up.

It was noted that a visit to Swinton Civic Hall would automatically be put on the next visits.

(d) Churchfields, Wickersley

Agreed: That the Principal Health and Safety Officer write to the Executive Director, Social Services, asking about progress regarding:-

- (1) the levelling and rebedding of flagstones around the premises;
- (2) the repair of concrete around manhole covers to allow grass cutting machinery to pass over them easily and without moving the covers, and
- (3) the door security and signing in and out procedure at Reception.

(e) Bramley Grange School

Concerns regarding no response from the school regarding action necessary following the visit by the Health, Welfare and Safety Panel.

Feedback required on the requirements on safety footwear in kitchens. It had been observed that visitors to the kitchen were not wearing protective clothing.

Agreed: That the Executive Director, Education, Culture and Leisure Services be asked to submit a response to the Health, Welfare and Safety Panel on proposed actions following the visit of inspection, in accordance with agreed procedures.

## **28. SECURITY ON SCHOOL SITE**

The Panel noted the contents of a Joint report between Dinnington



Comprehensive School and Leisure Services regarding the security of the staff and general public on the Dinnington campus between the hours of 6 pm and 10 pm.

The Panel also noted the action that had been taken by the school following a recent incident on the campus and expressed concern that it took the Police one hour to respond.

Because of the wider issues and security cost implications contained in the report, the Panel felt it was appropriate to forward the report with a covering letter to appropriate Members and officers with a covering letter explaining the reasons.

Agreed: (i) That the action being taken by the school be noted.

(ii) That the Principal Health and Safety Officer write to the appropriate Members and Officers attaching the report and ensure that risk assessment is being carried out and that a report thereon be submitted to the next meeting of this Panel.

## **29. REINSTATEMENT OF BUILDING WORKS SAFETY COMMITTEE**

Reference was made to consultations with the Cabinet Member, Housing and Environmental Services regarding the reinstatement of the Building Works Safety Committee.

Agreed: That the Building Works Safety Committee be reinstated.

## **30. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **(1) VISIT TO SAFETY EXHIBITION, NEC, BIRMINGHAM**

Resolved:- That the Cabinet Member, Economic and Development Services, be asked to approve the attendance of Health, Welfare and Safety Panel representatives at the Safety Exhibition to be held on Wednesday, 12<sup>th</sup> May, 2004 at the NEC, Birmingham.

### **(2) DATE OF NEXT MEETING/VISITS**

The following dates were agreed:-

Visit of Inspection - Friday, 2<sup>nd</sup> July, 2004  
Meeting - Friday, 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2004

**ROTHERHAM TOWN CENTRE INITIATIVE STEERING GROUP**

**6<sup>TH</sup> MAY, 2004**  
**(at the Town Hall, Rotherham)**

Present:-

Councillor Gerald Smith	Cabinet Member, Economic & Development Services – IN THE CHAIR
Julie Roberts	Town Centre & Markets Manager
Colin Scott	Rotherham Chamber of Trade
Sarah Crossland	Rotherham Churches Tourism Initiative
Sgt Paul Gray	South Yorkshire Police
Terence & Pauline Barker	Access Liaison
Jeff Wharfe	LED Partnership Manager
Colin Knight	Streetpride
Philip Woodward	Yorkshire Water
Zulfiquar Manzoor	Caprice

Apologies:-

Rev. Jane Sinclair	Rotherham Parish Church
Chris Stanbra	RCAT

## **1. INTRODUCTIONS**

The Chairman welcomed those present to the meeting and in view of the number of new faces, asked everyone to introduce themselves.

## **2. MINUTES**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 11<sup>th</sup> March, 2004 were approved as a correct record.

## **3. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

### **3 Cranes, High Street**

The Chairman reported that the Planning Officer had discussed the issue of the frontage with the new owners and they had agreed to put in a planning application.

Julie added that the planning application was for a wooden frontage with lettering more in keeping with the building, and would be considered by the Planning Board in June. Permission had also been sought to prosecute if the work was not carried out speedily.

#### **4. FUTURE ROLE OF THE TOWN CENTRE INITIATIVE STEERING GROUP**

Julie distributed copies of a chart which illustrated the proposed structure for Town Centre Groups in which she had incorporated views from the discussion at the previous meeting.

She explained that Town Team was working on the Master Plan for the 20 year Vision/Renaissance for the town centre. Once that plan was complete it had to be delivered and technical issues would need to be addressed. There was a need to avoid duplication of representation on the various groups.

Julie explained the proposed roles of the groups:-

- Town Centre Action Plan Group:-

This would help to deliver the 3 year plan and address issues e.g. crime, events, marketing, car parking problems etc. This would be a group of people to help the Town Centre and Markets Manager including Streetpride, Trading Standards, Legal Services, Police etc.

- Town Centre Delivery Group:-

This group would comprise representatives from English Partnerships, Yorkshire Forward, together with the physical delivery team, and would deal with issues such as site reclamation, CPO's, legislation.

- Renaissance PR Group

The purpose of this group was to promote and publicise achievements and milestones to raise the profile of Rotherham locally, regionally and nationally. This comprised REP, NHS Trust, Rotherham Advertiser and Chamber of Commerce.

- Town Centre Forum

This group comprised representatives from the Town Centre businesses. Their views were then fed into the Town Centre Plan and up to the Strategic Group.

- Town Centre Strategic Advisory Group

This would be a consultative and advisory group and any issues needing a decision would have to be fed into the Cabinet Member, Regeneration Board or Planning Board depending on the issue.

It was suggested that the TCI become part of this group to oversee the Master Plan.

Colin commented positively on the opportunity this gave to move forward.

Julie added that the next step was to write up Terms of Reference for each of the groups outlining aims and objectives, frequency of meetings and memberships.

Members were asked to feed any other comments to Julie.

## **5. MARKETS REGENERATION STUDY**

Julie reported that a study had been commissioned to look at the Rotherham markets. This had commenced and was funded jointly through the Economic and Development services budget and Yorkshire Forward's Regional Development Agency. The study would take nine weeks, and its remit was to look at:-

- options for the future
- location
- building
- identify customer base

The consultants would interview the market traders and would contact 42 stakeholders in the town on a one to one basis. Contact would also be made with the Chambers, the Partnership, the Police, zone representatives and retailers, together with the Programme Area Executive Directors and Cabinet Members.

The final report should be ready mid June and the recommendations incorporated into the Town Team master plan.

## **6. TOWN CENTRE TRADING POLICY**

Julie distributed copies of a proposed policy for the use of town centre pitches, together with copies of a plan showing their location.

The draft policy set out pitch number, location, uses and restrictions.

It was reported that the proposals had been put together in conjunction with colleagues in Streetpride. Its aim was to reduce/control the abuse of the town centre spaces and to improve the quality and presentation of the operators, and ensure that there was no conflict with retailers etc. Efforts would also be made to reduce the number of canvassers and reference was made to newspaper stands, itinerants, pedlars etc.

Julie reported that a letter had been sent to all town centre businesses advising them that the Town Centre and Markets Management intended to take over the administration of the town centre spaces in July. To date she had only received one reply.

Those present discussed the current arrangements – licensing and charges; proposed locations and permitted uses; possible resistance to the proposed policy and distribution of food outlets. Colin asked for retention of the three existing food outlets and maintaining the position of them.

Sarah asked if a clause could be added for pitches 13,14 and 7 in the vicinity of the Church relating to sound levels particularly when the church was being used.

Further views should be submitted to Julie for incorporation into the final draft report which would then be brought back to this Group prior to going to the Cabinet Member for consideration.

## **7. TOWN CENTRE ACTION PLAN UPDATE**

Julie reported that at the last Town Centre Forum businesses had been asked to prioritise issues and seven main objectives had been identified, and these would be included in the Three Year Action Plan.

The Action Plan would be brought to the next meeting for this group to comment on.

## **8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **(a) Town Centre Spring Clean**

This was being scheduled for the end of May, and would include pavement washing, gum busting, power washing litter bins, identifying "grot spots". This would be accompanied by an enforcement "sting" working with the Environmental Wardens issuing fines for littering.

It was reported that twelve gum bins had been purchased to locate on walls outside pubs, clubs, food outlets etc. These would be emptied by the town centre cleansing operatives.

Benches would be renewed, rails and bollards re-painted.

The town centre walkabout was also to be reintroduced and anyone interested was asked to contact Colin Knight (Streetpride – Tel: 01709 822924).

A copy of the detailed schedule and planned work was distributed (copy attached to these minutes).

### **(b) Shop window washing**

Julie reported that local businesses had been contacted about window washing.

The Chairman added that it was important that the town centre looked clean in September when a visit from the Mayor of Riesa was planned.

### **(c) Town Centre Manager of the Year Award**

The Chairman reported that Julie had reached the final of the above and was in the final three. The award would be decided on 22<sup>nd</sup> June. This was excellent national publicity for Rotherham.

### **(d) Medieval Festival**

Sarah reported that this was scheduled for 9<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2004.

**(e) Churchills**

It was reported that Churchills had approached the Architectural Assistant for All Saints Square enquiring about extending their premises. Julie added that a planning application had been submitted.

Sarah commented that this would affect the Millennium bricks.

**(f) Drop in Centre for ROPES**

Mr. Barker asked if there was a suitable location in town to accommodate the above.

Julie suggested that this request be fed into the Master Plan via the Town Team.

**(g) Short Stay Car Park – Domine Lane**

Colin reported that this was being abused by workers who were parking all day.

Sarah added that Pizza Hut scooters were taking up much of the space allocated for motorcycles.

It was also pointed out that there were no signs stating that this was a short stay car park.

The Chairman agreed to raise these issues with Car Parking Management.

**(h) Giant LED Screen**

Julie reported that the supplier had been contacted and it was proposed to have the screen operational by the end of June, subject to planning permission being granted. A working group was to be established to draw up a content management policy about what to show on the screen and there would be discussions with the Police about policing levels when there were major events taking place. The screen would be computer controlled from the Town Centre Office and by broadcast satellite. The screen could be used for community information, allowing local groups to use it, promotion of events and activities, news updates, live messages, entertainment, music and promotions.

Colin expressed concern about possible town centre drinking and potential for disruption in relation to sporting events. Julie assured that there would be no intention of allowing any activity that may cause disruption, as the screen was intended to enhance the town centre.

**(i) Update on Shops in the Town Centre**

Julie reported that attempts to use the former M&S building for a Renaissance exhibition on 10<sup>th</sup> July had been turned down by the owners.

It was reported that a unit was being opened at Retail World to house Dorothy Perkins/Burtons, Evans and Wallis.

Primark had confirmed their trading position on High Street.

The former Qdos Shop in the Old Town Hall complex was under offer.

**(j) Nostalgia items**

Julie asked the Group for their opinions on putting three red telephone boxes into the town centre.

Reference was made to cost and to the need to have them cleaned.

It was agreed: That the suggestion be supported.

**(k) Anti-Social Behaviour Orders**

Julie reported that she had instigated two ASBO's following abuse to staff and public. Witness statements had been obtained.

**9. DATE, TIME AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT MEETING**

Agreed: That the next meeting of this Steering Group be held on THURSDAY, 24<sup>TH</sup> JUNE, 2004 at 6.00 p.m. at the Town Hall, Moorgate Street, Rotherham.

<b>ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO CABINET MEMBER</b>
---

**1. MEETING:- ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES ISSUES  
(DELEGATED POWERS)**

**2. DATE: 17TH MAY, 2004**

**3. OPENING OF TENDERS**

I wish to report the opening of tenders by the Cabinet Member, Economic and Development Services, as follows:-

on 10th May, 2004, for the following :-

- Supply of Street Lighting Lanterns
- Hired Plant and Machinery

and together with Councillor Nightingale, Mrs. Harper and Mr. West from Thurcroft Parish Council:-

- Offers for the sale of land at Zamor Crescent, Thurcroft

**4. RECOMMENDATION**

That the action of the Cabinet Member be recorded.



**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL - REPORT TO MEMBERS****1. Economic and Development Services Matters**

2. 17 May 2004

3. Supertram Extensions

4. **Originating Officer/Divisional Manager:** - Ken Wheat, Transportation Unit Manager, Planning and Transportation Service, Ext. 2953  
[ken.wheat@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:ken.wheat@rotherham.gov.uk)

**5. Issue**

To update Members on discussions with the Department for Transport (DfT) and further study work on Supertram Extensions.

**6. Summary**

South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive [SYLTE] and their consultants have had discussions with DfT and arranged further study work. In the current climate there would seem to be insurmountable difficulties in moving forward with the network as originally envisaged. The strongest performing tram extension is that between Royal Hallamshire Hospital/Sheffield University and Rotherham Parkgate via Rotherham Town Centre and there is potential to fund the Government's required 25% local contribution. Further work is needed regarding how Waverley can be best connected into Sheffield and Rotherham.

**7. Clearance/Consultation**

A full public consultation exercise was undertaken in autumn 2003 and the results of the exercise were reported to Cabinet Member on 15 March 2004 (Council Minute 319). The Director General of the SYLTE held an informal meeting with the Executive Director Economic and Development Services and Cabinet Members in mid March and the matter was reported to the 1 April 2004 SYPTA meeting.

**8. Timing**

This report is for information only and does not require a decision. However, it is important that South Yorkshire is able to indicate the direction it wishes to go in its Local Transport Plan (LTP) Annual Progress Report (APR) in June which is submitted to Government Office at the end of July. The PTE intend to hold meetings with all District Councils in the interim.

## 9. Background

Attached as Appendix A is a copy of the SYPTE's report to 1 April 2004 SYPTA. The full document including all the Appendices and Figures will be available at the meeting.

Discussion with DfT centred on 2 key issues:

- the robustness of the analyses carried out
- the affordability of the schemes

Members are reminded that the PTA in May 2003 agreed to a reduced network combining 4 extensions into 2 lines:

- Ranmoor to Rotherham Parkgate via Rotherham Town Centre
- Dore to Hellaby via Waverley/Orgreave

whilst bearing in mind the need for possible future extensions to the Dearne Valley (Manvers) and Northern General Hospital, Sheffield.

## 10. Argument

Since the report to May 2003 PTA and my report to Cabinet of 25 June 2003, the DfT has revised aspects of its guidance on light rail schemes. As a consequence of this and further comments on the detailed modelling work, the base case for the network was reworked and this showed a decrease in the overall benefit/cost ratio (BCR) for the full network from 1.27 to 1.06. Government uses such figures to assess and determine which schemes give value for money and therefore which schemes to support with grant funding. In this instance a BCR of 1.06 does not compare favourably with other schemes and priorities for investment and therefore it was considered there was a need to re-examine options.

The main focus of discussion with the DfT was affordability of light rail schemes. It is this aspect that has changed most in the last few months and since discussions were first held with DfT in 2003.

Factors influencing Government include:

- The likely outcome of the Government's Spending Review for the next period;
- Requirements for investment in the rail network as a result of the Rail Regulator's decision on Track Access Charges and the general review of the rail industry;
- Pressures on spending in other Government policy areas;
- Competition from other transport investment schemes;
- The Government's increasing concern over the value for money of light rail schemes, given the discussions they had been having in Autumn 2003/Spring 2004 with the promoters of schemes elsewhere in the country which are having to be re-evaluated in the light of increased cost estimates.

The DfT's position can best be described as that the Government still believes that light rail schemes perform an important role in an integrated transport network but those Authorities wishing to come forward with schemes should ensure that: -

- They are economically robust and the most appropriate and cost-effective solution for the problems they are trying to address;
- They are capable of being funded and delivered. In particular, the DfT have strengthened their view that there **must** be a 25% local contribution to such schemes. A key dependency of the original decision of the PTA and Districts last summer was the ability for South Yorkshire to argue that there are special circumstances which might allow a lower level of intervention than 25% if the full network was to be developed. Discussions with the DfT, and others in the intervening period have indicated that this will be difficult. Nonetheless, the regeneration and economic benefits that flow from transport investment in order to support such arguments have been identified.

These realisations led the PTE to commission further consultancy study work on extension options which, although based on the original proposals, were truncated and somewhat less expensive. This might lead therefore to a greater chance of successfully achieving support from the DfT. Lower overall capital costs also reduce the extent of the potentially problematic 25% local contribution. In order to address the 'most appropriate and cost effective criteria, low cost and 'next best' options were also examined.

For each of the options originally under consideration, and those which have been subsequently explored as a consequence of discussions with the DfT, the study work has looked at three key indicators:

- The capital costs;
- The difference between operating cost and the farebox revenue (this must be positive i.e. require no ongoing subsidy);
- The economic 'net present value' (the difference between costs and benefits. It should be positive and be significant).

More details are given in Appendix A and the Consultant's report referred to in Section 15.

The conclusions that can be drawn from the analysis, based on the DfT guidance and discussions with them since the 25 June 2003 Cabinet report, are shown below.

Network	Mode	Estimated Costs (£m)	Present Value Benefits (PVB £m)	Net Present Value (NPV)	Benefit - Cost Ratio (BCR)
Full Network - Ranmoor-Rotherham Parkgate plus Dore-Hellaby	LRT	383	286	15	1.06
Royal Hallamshire Hospital-Rotherham Parkgate only	LRT	94	160	90	2.29
Meadowhall Interchange-Rotherham Parkgate	Bus-Based (Next Best)	25	32	13	1.70
Meadowhall Interchange-Rotherham Parkgate	Bus-Based (Low Cost)	12	1	-6	0.19
Royal Hallamshire Hospital-Rotherham Parkgate plus extension from Sheffield to Canklow Meadows via Waverley	LRT	183	218	86	1.65
Meadowhall Interchange-Rotherham Parkgate plus Canklow Meadows-Royall Hallamshire Hospital	Bus Based (Next Best)	89	60	3	1.06
Meadowhall Interchange-Rotherham Parkgate plus Canklow Meadows-Royal Hallamshire Hospital	Bus Based (Low Cost)	55	5	-30	0.15
<b>Schemes Previously Assessed *</b>					
Northern General Hospital Extension	LRT	41	-15	-22	
Rotherham Parkgate-Manvers	LRT	42	-4	-7	
Sheffield City Centre-Lowedges	LRT	54	-9	-17	

\*not re-assessed under new guidance, but unlikely to be substantively different

Further details of the schemes and the appraisals can be found in Appendix A.

Essentially, the Royal Hallamshire-Rotherham Parkgate via Rotherham Town Centre route operating under a Light Rail franchise is the strongest performing route with a BCR of 2.29 and NPV of 90, both well in excess of DfT requirements, and therefore likely to be supported. Including a truncated

option for the Dore-Hellaby line (a route from Sheffield City Centre to a Park and Ride site at Canklow Meadows via Waverley/Orgreave), though performing reasonably well in terms of NPV, has a significantly lower cost/benefit ratio (1.65) demonstrating that the additional costs outweigh the additional benefits. Therefore the scheme does not particularly add value as an addition to this route.

In Rotherham, we have expressed a desire for a tram extension that links Rotherham Parkgate with the Town Centre and the Waverley/Orgreave site. Work done in previous studies has indicated that such a route is likely to cost in the region of an additional £200m and will have a less strong case than the extension to Rotherham Parkgate plus the best tram spur or bus based investment package. The latter is likely to cost less and deliver a greater overall cost/benefit case.

In conclusion, from the discussions with DfT and the public consultation, there are significant concerns in moving forward with the originally envisaged network. It is important to recognise that major strategic transport schemes do take many years to deliver and over time public reaction, funding climates and government assessment criteria do change. There is a need for a pragmatic approach which produces the strongest package for resolution of the issues in Sheffield and Rotherham: one which is based around a mix of tram, bus and rail investment.

The PTE propose to hold discussions with all 4 District Councils to develop an agreed integrated package of proposals which reflect the following:

- The strongest performing tram scheme is that between Sheffield University/Hospitals and Rotherham Parkgate. There is the potential to fund this from within South Yorkshire to meet the 25% local contribution requirements (principally through Objective 1 contributions and other funding sources).
- An addition to that network would be to look at the ways in which Waverley could be best connected into Sheffield and Rotherham. Before coming to that decision, there needs to be further discussion with Rotherham and Sheffield about the suitability of such extensions as opposed to developing a high-quality bus network based on bus rapid transit.
- In the short to medium-term, the solution to Dore and Trolley will have to be based around investment in the existing bus and rail networks with a view to possibly looking at a light rail extension in the longer term.
- On this basis, the extensions from Sheffield University/Hospitals to Ranmoor, from Sheffield City Centre to Dore and Sheffield to Hellaby should not be pursued in the short to medium term.
- There will need to be discussions with all 4 Districts about how these priorities sit alongside other transportation priorities.
- There will also need to be further discussion with all of the South Yorkshire Districts on the funding impact and the way in which any scheme is taken forward is developed.
- None of the previously considered extensions to the Dearne, Northern General Hospital and Low Edges perform as well individually as the strongest schemes.

**11. Risks and Uncertainties**

There are no particular risks associated with this report as the matters considered are for information rather than decision. There are many uncertainties, some of which will be resolved when the PTA and District Councils reach a decision regarding which scheme will be promoted.

**12. Finance**

The operating costs of any extensions will be the subject of a suitable arrangement with the franchise operator and would not in themselves impact on the Council's revenue budget or PTA levy.

As far as the capital costs are concerned, as mentioned above, the Government are adamant that 25% will have to be found 'locally' in the form, for example, of grants from Objective 1 and others, local LTP allocations, the franchisee, developer contributions and resources put in to develop the scheme.

Previous and current stages of the study work and consultations have been funded by the PTE from their existing budgets with help from the Objective 1 programme.

Staff time in the Transportation Unit is funded from the existing revenue budget.

**13. Sustainability**

The economic, social and environmental benefits of public transport are well known. Light rail particularly is a very sustainable form of transport. Supertram has shown that it does attract existing car users, especially at peak commuting times. The likely reductions in traffic flows on key roads will result in benefits particularly in air quality and afford the opportunity to introduce other measures to support sustainable modes like walking and cycling which will bring further environmental and other benefits to local communities and the wider public. There are diverse local communities adjacent the potential route extensions. By addressing accessibility and severance caused by existing poor quality transport links and by opening up land for development, this project will improve access to jobs and contribute to sustainable development.

**14. Wards Affected**

All Wards are directly or indirectly affected.

**15. References**

Appendix A: SYPTE Report to 01/04/04 SYPTA  
South Yorkshire Supertram Extension Study - Appraisal of Truncated and Alternative Options - Faber Maunsell - March 2004  
South Yorkshire Supertram Extensions Study - Final Report - Faber Maunsell - May 2003  
Rapid Transit in South Yorkshire - Final Report - Oscar Faber - October 2001  
Supertram Extensions Scoping Study - SYPTE - January 2001

**16. Presentation**

South Yorkshire is working hard to transform its image and economy. We need high quality accessible transport networks to underpin these ambitions. Supertram has been very successful in recent years; many people and businesses benefit from the frequent, reliable, comfortable service it provides. To build on this we are engaging in discussions with the DfT and consultations with the local communities, to see how we can develop proposals which give clear, economic and regeneration benefits for Rotherham.

**17. Recommendations**

**Cabinet Member is asked to: -**

- (a) note the outcomes of the further study work and discussions with the DfT as summarized in this report, and**
- (b) refer a copy of this report to Cabinet and Regeneration Scrutiny Panel for information.**

ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

**1. Meeting:** Economic and Development Services matters

**2. Date:** 17 May 2004

**3. Title:** A57 M1 to Todwick Crossroads Improvement scheme.

**4. Originating Officer:-** *Mark Fisher, Section Engineer, Streetpride Service, extension 2948, mark.fisher@rotherham.gov.uk*

**Divisional Manager:** - *David Popple, Acting Schemes and Partnership Manager, Streetpride Service, extension 2950, david.popple@rotherham.gov.uk*

**5. Issue**

To further consider the scheme to be promoted following consultation on the planning application with the residents of Todwick.

**6. Summary**

The residents suggested an alternative junction layout at the A57 / Goosecarr Lane junction and a 50mph speed limit along the length of the new road. A detailed assessment of these suggestions shows there will be a reduction in the scheme benefits by approximately 40 % In addition, to progress these alternatives will delay the programme and may result in a loss of Government funding for the scheme.

**7. Clearance/Consultation**

The scheme was approved by Cabinet Member on 17 February 2003 (Minute No. 342 refers) and a planning application was submitted in April 2003.

**8. Timing**

The programme for the scheme shows that Planning Permission is required as soon as possible.

**9. Background**

The scheme was submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) for funding which was approved subject to satisfactory completion of the statutory procedures in the settlement letter received in December 2001.

The scheme comprises a dual carriageway road on a new alignment to replace a series of bends between Poplar Cottages and Todwick Grange and a new roundabout to replace the existing signal controlled Todwick Crossroads. The new road will be subject to the national speed limit.

**10. Argument**

Feedback from the Planning process resulted in a public meeting being held with the residents of Todwick in August 2003. The resident requested that the



scheme be amended to include a roundabout at Goose Carr Lane and a 50mph speed limit.

These amendments to the scheme were then assessed and it was found that they would reduce the scheme benefits by 40%. Following consultation with Government Office we were advised that this would be considered a significant change to the scheme and if we wished to pursue these changes we would have to re-work the scheme appraisal documents and resubmit them to Government Office. Ministers would then have to consider the new information and the possibility of the provisionally approved status being removed could not be ruled out. A further public meeting was undertaken in April 2004 to report the findings back to the Residents of Todwick recommending that we proceed with the original design. The residents did not agree with this and re-iterated their view that the amended scheme be pursued.

### **11.Risks and Uncertainties**

The risks are that Planning Permission will not be obtained and that the necessary land cannot be obtained by agreement. It is likely that Compulsory Purchase Orders will be required if problems occur in acquiring any of the land by agreement. If either of these issues cannot be satisfactorily resolved the scheme cannot be completed.

If the scheme is amended DfT may remove the provisionally approved status and the funding which this secures. If that occurs the scheme cannot be implemented.

### **12.Finance**

In approving the scheme the DfT have agreed to fund the total cost of the scheme up to an agreed level. A copy of the CP1 submission was submitted to Cabinet Member in March 2002, minute No 19 refers.

### **13.Sustainability**

The proposed works are in line with the objectives and strategies in the Local Transport Plan.

### **14.Wards Affected**

Ward 2, Aston, Orgreave and Ulley and Ward 13 Kiveton Park.

### **15.References**

South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2001-2006

Annex E Submission to DfT, July 2001

Minute No. 342 of the Cabinet Member and Advisors Meeting, 17 February 2003

### **16.Presentation**

The proposed scheme demonstrates good cost benefits and has been provisionally approved by the DfT.

## **17.Recommendations**

**It be resolved that:**

- a) the amendments to the scheme suggested by the residents of Todwick as part of the planning application consultation process be not acceded to, and**
- b) the previously approved scheme be progressed.**

*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

## **Draft Sub-Regional Spatial Strategy Vision for South Yorkshire**

### ***Introduction***

The following is a draft vision for South Yorkshire's Spatial Strategy. It is derived from published and draft strategy documents from the four local authorities, close consultation with officers from the four local authorities, officials from the Objective One office, Business Link South Yorkshire, Government Office, South Yorkshire Forum, the Regional Assembly and local investment partnerships.

This draft vision is directly derived from the set of spatial strategy vision principles agreed by the Leaders of the four South Yorkshire local authorities in 2003. The vision is for the period 2006-2020.

The historic settlement pattern of South Yorkshire has been one of a number of major urban areas<sup>i</sup>, namely Sheffield, Barnsley, Rotherham and Doncaster, supplemented by a large number of smaller settlements related to the historic development of the South Yorkshire Coalfield. This has resulted in dispersed settlement pattern with only a limited focus on the key urban areas for employment and services. With the decline of the coal industry this situation has changed with an increasing concentration of major development in the main urban areas.

This however leaves a significant dilemma as the smaller settlements are increasingly either attractive to housing development with limited prospects of local economic growth, or subject to a period of slow social or economic decline as the economic base has been removed and the attractiveness declines. To quote from the Brookings Institution's Report on Demographic Change in Medium-sized Cities<sup>ii</sup>

*Medium-sized cities in all areas ... cannot operate in isolation from their metropolitan areas... the ability to form coalitions with older suburban areas to stimulate reinvestment and economic development is critical. And all cities—big and small—must work cooperatively with one another to address traffic congestion, loss of open space, and other issues associated with metropolitan growth and suburban sprawl.*

South Yorkshire therefore faces a difficult balance to strike between the need for sustainable development by concentrating both homes and jobs in major settlements, and the need to transform communities to provide attractive and sustainable places to live with good access to jobs. It lays a heavy emphasis on the correct identification of sustainable settlements and on the role of environmentally sustainable transportation links.

The spatial strategy is driven by the principles of sustainable development as enshrined in the Regional Sustainable Development Framework and the Government's recent consultation paper on PPS1: Creating Sustainable Communities and interpreted to reflect the South Yorkshire context.

The four components of sustainable development<sup>iii</sup> as presented in these documents are:

*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

- Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment
- Social progress that meets the needs of everyone
- Effective protection of the environment
- Prudent use of natural resources

Translated into spatial terms, these principles mean that spatial investment in South Yorkshire will concentrate on:

- Those locations capable of attracting viable economic development investments and/or able to access the main regional employment centres without contributing unnecessarily to congestion and environmentally damaging journeys by car between dispersed journey origins and destinations;
- Enhanced public transport connectivity where it improves the competitiveness of the overall South Yorkshire spatial mix and enables the unlocking of key outlying settlements that will otherwise decline into uncompetitiveness and unsustainability;

The spatial vision builds directly on the strategic vision that has informed the South Yorkshire Objective One area:

*To build a balanced, diverse and sustainable high growth economy for South Yorkshire recognised as a growing centre for high technology manufacturing and knowledge based services, offering opportunities for the whole community.*

## **Themes**

Within the sub-regional spatial vision, south Yorkshire has identified five core themes.

- Economic development – The generation of output, and associated jobs and income.
- Transport – The environmentally and economically sustainable movement of people and goods within South Yorkshire and between South Yorkshire and elsewhere.
- Settlement – A focus on a sustainable settlement pattern that meets changing community and lifestyle requirements of South Yorkshire's current and future residents.
- Urban areas – The potential of South Yorkshire's four main urban areas to power a sustainable high growth economy in South Yorkshire.
- Rural areas – The role of rural areas in balancing the growth of metropolitan South Yorkshire.

*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

## **The Economic Development Theme**

South Yorkshire offers a diverse range of economic development opportunities across the sub-region based on a mixture of locational and knowledge base advantages. The competitiveness of the offering will be enhanced through greater understanding across the whole of the sub-region of how these characteristics interact.

The key elements here include critical mass, connectivity (including transport, information and access to skilled and knowledgeable workers). South Yorkshire will ensure that all economic development prioritisation is based on a clear appreciation of where and how these factors combine to offer the greatest likelihood of sustainable contribution to the economic well-being of South Yorkshire.

South Yorkshire is growing progressively more integrated into the regional, national and global economy. Led by its major city, Sheffield, and its expanding logistics centre, Doncaster, South Yorkshire has an increasingly important role to play both as a commercial and industrial location of choice and as a home for families whose wage-earners travel increasingly longer distances to work within the sub-region, across Yorkshire and even further.

South Yorkshire hosts two universities and all the districts seek to develop their attractiveness to high value-adding businesses by focusing on knowledge-based cluster or hub developments and by emphasising educational regeneration in strategic planning.

Sheffield has enjoyed the greatest success in this focus as the sub-region's city and through its aggressive development of physical infrastructure to support economic development, but the other districts have also made considerable progress, where they have focused on their particular strengths, most notably Doncaster has exploited and improved its logistical expertise and locational advantages.

It is not always appreciated how much potential there is for linking targeted knowledge enhancement and economic development across a region. There are, however, notable examples of economic development success where spatial initiatives and knowledge-based initiatives have gone hand-in-hand. A particular example is the Barnsley BICC, which has proven a model of high technology business nursery excellence.

Locational priorities will reflect the economic opportunities inherent in South Yorkshire's transport and urban area spatial initiatives. The four main central areas will aim for a balance of retail, office and domestic developments that support their individual urban development visions, while supporting the continuing development of its manufacturing sector by supporting location on brownfield land and other previously identified and prepared industrial development sites. It is proposed that manufacturing operations that wish to relocate from town and city centres should be supported in doing so.

Warehousing and distribution developments will be encouraged in locations easily accessible to the motorway and the rail network to reduce the need for heavy goods vehicles to go through congested or sensitive areas.

Clusters of leisure uses will be developed in urban centres and out-of-town locations accessible to public transport, subject to national sequential test guidance to ensure the

*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

wide mix necessary to cater for South Yorkshire's cosmopolitan community and to attract growing numbers of visitors from outside the sub-region.

South Yorkshire needs to be careful that its spatial strategy is always well supported by knowledge and skill development. This is mainly important in areas such as the Dearne where international competition combines with a shortage of skilled call centre operatives to threaten the longer term effectiveness of existing spatial investments.

Emphasis will be placed on development of sustainable jobs where strong evidence supports locational bias. South Yorkshire will welcome employers to locations where they can fully enjoy the mixture of logistical connection, access to the right level of employee, and the expertise of its universities and other academic and research institutions.

## *Vision*

**To view the spatial development of South Yorkshire's economy holistically where the different districts and settlements contribute to the well-being of the whole sub-region as sources of jobs and of employees.**

**To ensure that sub-regional economic development decisions are always integrated with and supported by South Yorkshire-wide transportation, settlement and retail/commercial development spatial initiatives;**

**To concentrate spatial investments on those locations capable of attracting viable economic development and/or able to access the main regional employment centres without contributing significantly to congestion and environmentally damaging journeys by car between dispersed journey origins and destinations.**

## ***Transport***

This spatial vision builds on the revised regional planning guidance and its associated regional transport priorities. It is recognised in South Yorkshire that sustainable and socially inclusive spatial development is highly dependant on transport infrastructure and services. Socially inclusive transport is defined as affordable, accessible and available to its target market. The most successful urban regions have the physical and electronic infrastructure to move goods, information and people quickly and efficiently - both internally and to markets outside.

Transport is therefore a key theme in the spatial strategy. The main strategic transport issues are external connectivity, movement patterns, accessibility and congestion within the sub-region. In operational terms the main issues are the maintenance of the transport network to improve safety and environmental impact.

South Yorkshire is served by a motorway network parts of which are operating at close to capacity levels. Targeted, junction-focused improvements and new road links to key development sites proposed in this vision will improve the quality of journey and the positive economic contribution to South Yorkshire of the road transport network, but will do little to raise capacity.

*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

Rather, South Yorkshire will concentrate primarily on public transport investments for the routes between the main settlements in South Yorkshire and between South Yorkshire and elsewhere. South Yorkshire's vision is of a balance of excellent light and heavy railway and quality bus connections providing an integrated network with easy interchange at key points.

South Yorkshire will enhance the quality of external connectivity through improved rail, road and air facility investments at key interchange locations and through investments to improve internal connectivity between settlements within South Yorkshire that reflect and bolster a pattern of rapid economic development within the sub-region.

## **External road connectivity**

South Yorkshire has good North-South access by road via the M1 and A1 and East via the M18. However, it can significantly improve the accessibility of its urban centres and local economy by intersection improvements.

South Yorkshire is concerned to limit the impact of its transformational development on localised levels of congestion and related environmental impact of its motorway network. To this end it is concerned primarily with improving ease of access to and from key motorway junctions where poor access is leading to knock-on congestion black spots and limiting economic development potential.

Access towards the Northwest via road is less good than North-South. The Snake and Woodhead pass routes are saturated or nearly so. The main bottleneck lying at the Manchester end of these routes where they come together east of the M60, but the routes are environmentally constrained along their whole length. The M1/M62 is both a longer route and is becoming saturated as well.

Current surface access to Finningley airport is only adequate up to operating levels of 2.3 million passengers per year. A new road link to the M18 will be required in the medium term to enable the airport to fulfil its potential as a regional airport. This road link will be needed in addition to major public transport improvements linking the airport to Doncaster Town Centre and beyond.

## **External rail connectivity:**

In general, rail capacity is constrained because local and long distance rail travellers are sharing the same lines. This limits the capacity of train operators to improve long distance services. There needs to be increased investment in rail capacity. Also, while Sheffield and Doncaster enjoy direct access to the national rail network, other parts of South Yorkshire, particularly Barnsley and Rotherham, are poorly connected due to capacity and other operational constraints.

South Yorkshire as a whole has potentially good connectivity to the capital via the East coast Main Line through Doncaster and less good access via the Midland Main Line through Sheffield.

Access to the North is potentially very good along the East Coast Main Line. However, connections from Sheffield to Leeds are either via slow-running local services or long

*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

distance, cross country services which are often subject to considerable delay caused by problems elsewhere on the network.

The poor quality of rail connection between Sheffield and Leeds is inadequate for the two main cities in a competitive region and a major obstacle to development of South Yorkshire and Yorkshire as a whole. The creation of a genuine express service between the two via Barnsley and Wakefield will enhance the economic attractiveness of the region and of Barnsley as a residential and market town.

Southwest access is good between Sheffield and Doncaster and the West Midlands, but less so along the line between the Northwest and the East Coast, which is operating at close to full capacity.

## **Movement patterns and congestion within the sub-region**

South Yorkshire is growing progressively more integrated, both within the sub-region and between South Yorkshire and adjacent sub-regions, as residents travel progressively greater distances between home and work, and between home and leisure/shopping/personal business activities.

The willingness of residents to undertake longer journeys potentially enables much greater flexibility in settlement planning, but also could limit the effectiveness of South Yorkshire's commitment to "location and land use policies, which discourage the dispersal of land uses in favour of more concentrated, mixed use of land to reduce the demand for travel." [Local Transport Plan (Para 4.4.10)].

South Yorkshire seeks therefore, to develop transport infrastructure and services that minimise congestion by more closely connecting economically and socially its inherited collection of dispersed settlements on the basis of a robust assessment of settlement sustainability.

Sheffield is the main source of jobs in South Yorkshire and will attract increasing proportions and numbers of its job-holders from the rest of South Yorkshire and from outside the sub-region. Doncaster is also a growing net importer of employees. Barnsley and Rotherham are increasingly becoming net exporters of workers.

Within South Yorkshire there are a number of significant former steel and coal mining settlements which suffer from poor connectivity with the main population and employment centres of South Yorkshire and with the main transport routes.

There are strong heavy rail and road commuting routes between Sheffield-Rotherham-Doncaster and between Sheffield-Barnsley in particular. There is scope for considerable improvement to local rail services, where a strong case can be made for investment, taking account of the strategic role of the rail network, through:

- Improving the reliability and performance of the existing network
- Improving service performance through investment in rolling stock, signalling and passenger facilities



*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

- Targeted development of the network through new and improved services, opening up access to communities
- Targeted development of the network to ensure major new economic development areas are connected to the rail network,

## **Air connectivity**

South Yorkshire lacks convenient national, European and long haul air connections, but Finningley offers the prospect of all of these. Finningley is potentially well located for access from outside the sub-region and from within South Yorkshire. However, there needs to be new and improved road and rail links to the airport.

South Yorkshire is committed to fully exploiting the potential of Finningley to serve as the air gateway to the sub-region by ensuring that excellent connections to and from the airport fully support the overall facility by making it easy to get to.

At present, the South Yorkshire looks primarily to Manchester for air travel. Journey time to and from Manchester and other airports in adjacent regions adds hours to flight times. Nevertheless, good access to the international long haul connections provided by Manchester Airport will, together with Finningley, ensure that South Yorkshire's accessibility via air compares to the best in Europe.

### *Transport Vision:*

**To ensure that the strategic road network efficiently supports traffic movement between South Yorkshire and external regions.**

**To improve access to and from motorway junctions through improved access to junctions.**

**To reduce the need to travel by private car through improved quality of public transport choice**

**To ensure fast, frequent and comprehensive rail connectivity between the main urban areas of South Yorkshire.**

**To improve the connection between Sheffield and Leeds by the establishment of frequent express services stopping only at Sheffield, Meadowhall, Barnsley, Wakefield and Leeds.**

**To radically improve trans-Pennine rail links for both freight and passenger movement (including improved access to Manchester Airport) between South Yorkshire and the Northwest.**

**To develop Finningley airport as a major international airport for a full range of passenger and freight services serving South Yorkshire, the wider region and neighbouring regions.**

**To ensure that the national, regional and local infrastructure conveniently links Finningley to all the main urban areas of South Yorkshire.**

*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

**To enhance public transport connectivity where it improves the competitiveness of the overall South Yorkshire spatial mix and enables the unlocking of key settlements that will otherwise decline into uncompetitiveness and unsustainability.**

**To provide high quality public transport system along three main axes of travel linking South Yorkshire's main centres – (1) Sheffield/Rotherham/Deane Towns/Doncaster Finningley, (2) NE Midlands/Sheffield/Barnsley/Leeds, (3) Woodhead/Barnsley/Deane Towns/Rotherham/Doncaster/Finningley;**

**To provide first class public transport across the sub-region, feeding in particular into the main centres;**

**A well maintained and effectively managed road network;**

**To maintain environmental and land use policies that radically improve town and city centre quality and encourage walking and cycling.**

## ***Settlement***

Historically, South Yorkshire settlements were essentially self-contained home and work locations. Today, there is a rapidly growing trend towards longer work journeys. There is a direct connection between the value-added (and income) associated with the work and the willingness of workers to accept longer journeys, but it is a fact that work journeys are growing longer for all but the lowest paid jobs.

As population demographics shift, South Yorkshire is faced with a changing pattern of locational and housing-type demand that will require a balance of demolitions and new-builds. The key challenges are location, standard and accessibility of housing to centres. Statistics reveal that South Yorkshire's rapidly expanding economy is causing a growing number of its residents to travel across district boundaries to their place of work.

While this trend seriously undermines traditional models of settlement viability, it also offers scope for many to establish a new basis for viability as homes for workers who wish to combine the advantages of urban employment and more rural homes. It dramatically widens the settlement and housing options of South Yorkshire, offering possibilities to satisfy housing demand that minimise stress on the green field edges of settlements and is consistent with environmental sustainability.

Thus, many of South Yorkshire's isolated coal field settlements have significant potential to satisfy housing demand, but some require significantly improved housing quality and connectivity with the four main centres to do so.

The Spatial Strategy vision is informed by the need to ensure that it is supportive of a sustainable pattern of settlement change. South Yorkshire will continually revisit its spatial vision to ensure that the vision remains consistent with the most advanced thinking on settlement sustainability.

Sustainability does not automatically mean allocating development to settlements solely on the basis of population size, as larger settlements are not necessarily more sustainable. Sustainability is based on a set of criteria which includes a range of

*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

facilities and access provision which intends to serve the needs of both the current and future community.

A settlement assessment has been carried out across SY based on the criteria listed below:

- Current sustainability in terms of services and accessibility;
- The costs and benefits to the settlement and South Yorkshire as a whole of improving the settlement's sustainability;
- Physical & environmental issues that might influence the potential for and patterns of settlement growth;

The criteria include the assessment of:

- The role of the settlement;
- Functional links with main urban areas;
- Transport accessibility;
- The local economy and employment market;
- Equity (in terms of levels of deprivation and population);
- Education facilities;
- Open space facilities;
- The perceived need for housing renewal;
- Health facilities;
- Landscape;
- Biodiversity;
- Flood risk.

**Sheffield** is a core English city that is building on its strength as a producer and the home of two major universities. It is combining renewal of the commercial centre of the city with massive regeneration of its historical eastern manufacturing quarter. Sheffield has made particular use of the Supertram light rail line to define the corridors along which it has focused much of its primary spatial strategy attention.

Sheffield faces increasing demand for new and varied housing development both to satisfy existing demand and meet projected demand. To this end, it is addressing the decline in demand for housing in some of its neighbourhoods whilst seeking to extend the areas where demand is buoyant. Priority is given to providing new housing in the main urban area but settlements close to the city, within and outside its boundaries, may

*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

contribute to meeting the needs of the Sheffield housing market. This includes the rest of South Yorkshire and the north East Midlands.

**Barnsley** is a sub-regional market town with a need to regenerate its historical position, which has declined with the collapse of the local coal industry. To this end it is concentrating on redefining and renewing its centre around the theme of a 21<sup>st</sup> © market town.

Barnsley may be seen to fall outside the immediate influence of the identified Sheffield-Rotherham-Doncaster corridor. However it does have an important role to play both in the vision for South Yorkshire and as a significant part of the Leeds City Region (which is the subject of a separate, but integrated spatial strategy process).

Barnsley seeks to build on its central location between South and West Yorkshire but suffers from comparatively poor local public transport connectivity. Increasingly, Barnsley serves as a home for people who travel to work outside its borders. This means that the market town's amenities are particularly important to the attractiveness of Barnsley.

It also lays pressure on Barnsley to ensure that its smaller settlements provide a genuinely attractive and distinctive living option for people who want to work in Barnsley and in West and South Yorkshire. To this end Barnsley must address its own offer and work closely with its South and West Yorkshire partners to ensure this vision is achieved. This involves developing well-connected, attractive settlements with a good range of local services, transport connections that provide good access to job opportunities in attractive countryside.

**Doncaster** is potentially the most important logistical interchange in the region. It lies at the intersection of the A1 and M18 close by the M62 and hosts the interchange of the East Coast Main Line and the main east-west train routes of northern and central England. And will soon be home to the international airport at Finningley.

All this has contributed to demand for expansion of the town as a logistics centre. To this end Doncaster is wholly renewing the public transport interchange in the town centre and has been improving access into the centre.

Doncaster's spatial development is framed by its ambition to become a regional gateway city. It seeks to strengthen its rail transport links with Barnsley in particular so that its role as a regional gateway brings benefits to all of South Yorkshire and its growth is enhanced by the participation of Barnsley residents and businesses.

**Rotherham** lies between Sheffield and Doncaster and is increasingly becoming linked to Sheffield in particular. Nearby Sheffield centre and Meadowhall have put enormous pressure on the centre, which now needs profound renewal. Rotherham is currently seeking to renew its town centre in a way that re-establishes the centre as a residential as well as a commercial centre.

Closer ties with Sheffield in particular are inevitable, so Rotherham is challenged to ensure that its centre is complementary to Sheffield's offer. Rotherham has considerable development potential in redundant brown field coal and steel sites, particularly in the Don Valley.

*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

**Outlying settlements** are important spatial resources to South Yorkshire, which was historically a place with numerous small isolated settlements based primarily on coal mines. At present, the most important concentration of such settlements is in the Dearne Valley, but there are other such settlements across South Yorkshire.

The outlying settlements were self-contained social and economic units, but the collapse of coal has forced them to find new ways to justify their existence based mainly on their capacity to serve as suburban settlements housing people who travel into the main urban areas (or beyond) for work, and their families. This has meant that they must be convenient for travel and endowed with the mixture of amenities necessary to make them attractive to families.

In order to achieve the spatial vision for South Yorkshire's settlements it will be necessary to develop a sustainable pattern of travel between the isolated smaller settlements in South Yorkshire and the major urban areas. It is proposed that new employment will increasingly become concentrated in the major settlements and in locations with good access to the motorway network. In order to sustain the future prosperity of the smaller settlements in the areas of former coalfield development, particularly the Dearne Valley, it will be necessary to balance the needs for sustainable patterns of development with the needs to restore social and economic prosperity to these settlements.

### *Vision*

**To integrate its housing markets, allowing them to transcend district boundaries, so as to ensure the dual objectives of 1) making South Yorkshire a realistically attractive location for all the types of housing demand arising from an increasingly prosperous region; and 2) removing the patchwork of disconnected areas of over-heated demand and directly adjacent areas of housing market failure.**

**To adapt isolated and declining coal field settlements with the potential to be more viable, where this would meet the demand of people and families who need to live in convenient socially and economically-linked locations and providing residential opportunities for people employed locally, sub-regionally and regionally**

**To adopt a strategy with respect to housing location that provides for access to employment across wider areas than in the past, whilst locating housing in places where people want to live and from where their journeys to work can be made as sustainable as possible.**

**To ensure new housing development is linked to good access to rapid public transport where it is already in place or where the mass of the development is enough to make improvements in the public transport offer viable.**

**To create of a series of vibrant, mixed neighbourhoods in the urban areas, which become locations of choice for both existing and future residents of South Yorkshire.**

*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

**To ensure that the spatial distribution of new housing is informed by the settlement criteria described above.**

## ***Urban Areas***

The Local Authorities have all adopted strategies which seek to regenerate and enhance the role of their main urban areas in the retail and service hierarchy. In this respect Sheffield as a Core City has a major role to play in providing higher order services, complemented by appropriate scale developments in Barnsley, Rotherham and Doncaster.

The Meadowhall Shopping Centre lies in the heart of the sub-region next to the M1 Motorway and provides a million square feet of retail and leisure which plays a major role in the retail activity of the sub-region. It is not anticipated that there will be any significant expansion of Meadowhall in the future and all Local Authorities are committed to developing complimentary retail centres matched to the scale and need of the local community. Any further major retail development will be concentrated in the urban areas and is unlikely to be permitted in out of town or edge of town locations

### *Vision*

**South Yorkshire's four urban areas will supply a wide range of opportunities to satisfy their commercial, retail and recreational demand within the sub-region and create a distinctive South Yorkshire urban offer.**

- **Sheffield's sophisticated mixture of metropolitan living, working, leisure and commerce will stretch out along the lower Don Valley towards Rotherham. The city will undertake major redevelopment of much of its commercial heart with different quarters designed to make the city centre into a visitor attraction in its own right.**
- **Rotherham will regenerate its town centre along the bank of the River Don through a mixture of commercial and housing initiatives that will establish it as an affordable and high quality option for urban living. It will offer a slower and more intimate alternative to Sheffield, plugged into the expanding core city but distinctively less intense. Rotherham recognises the need to ensure its offer augments the strong offerings of Meadowhall and Sheffield centre.**
- **Doncaster will offer the retail and commercial variety and convenience appropriate to a rapidly expanding transport centre and sub-regional city centre. This will include the complete renewal of its transport interchange.**
- **To the north, Barnsley will offer a market town alternative, combining all the recreational and leisure potential of such an oasis at the geographical centre of the South and West Yorkshire with its relative proximity to Sheffield, Leeds and Doncaster. It will reinvent its retail centre as a home for leading-edge new and niche businesses that can thrive in the context of its historic market culture.**

*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

**All the four main urban centres will augment and complement each other to offer attractive commercial/retail quarters reached by convenient and pleasant transport routes, both public and private.**

## ***Rural Areas***

The planned rapid growth of South Yorkshire presents challenges and opportunities for the sub-region's rural space. South Yorkshire seeks to emphasise the important role of green space as a distinct part of the South Yorkshire environmental mix.

South Yorkshire is committed to a development pattern that enhances rather than threatens its rural areas. As most of rural south Yorkshire is Green Belt, economic development will be limited as much as possible to activities that exploit existing resources without damaging or otherwise encroaching on exiting rural resources and quality of life.

### *Vision*

**To protect and enhance the countryside and natural environment for the benefit of those who live and work in South Yorkshire**

**To provide opportunities for rural diversification that are consistent with the protection and enhancement of the countryside and natural environment.**

**To maintain and enhance the character of rural villages while avoiding development that will lead to unsustainable patterns of development and additional car use.**

**To provide opportunities for sustainable rural recreation close to where people live reducing travel to environmentally sensitive locations, most notably, the Peak Park and negative impact on their environments**

**To achieve a locally diverse rural economy which emphasises the unique nature and assets of rural South Yorkshire.**

## ***The implemented vision***

South Yorkshire's spatial vision is an ambitious one. By 2020 it will have helped shape a thriving sub-region, transformed from its present position as one of the most needing of aid in Europe.

Across South Yorkshire, the four main urban centres and the most sustainable of its former coalfield settlements prosper and grow. The rapid public transport system enables coordinated economic development investments that minimises the congestion and other negative environmental effects of South Yorkshire's historically dispersed settlement pattern.

Sheffield will be a world-leading advanced manufacturing centre with a vibrant city centre offering a range of retail, leisure and commercial opportunity strongly competitive with other cities of its size. Its imaginative mixed development of the urban centre, the

*Draft – for discussion only. This document has been tabled to drive forward discussions but carries no ratified status.*

Don Valley and its diverse neighbourhoods will ensure it serves as the main engine for growth in the sub-region; a true 'core city' for South Yorkshire.

Rotherham will be closely linked to Sheffield. Its urban village atmosphere will contrast with and augment the Sheffield offer. Its exceptional accessibility and amenities will make it both an ideal central location with easy access to all of South Yorkshire and the regions beyond.

Doncaster will have developed into one of Britain's leading regional logistic centres and be a city in its own right. As the main logistical gateway to Yorkshire, it will attract businesses and residents. Its excellent public transport links with the rest of South Yorkshire ensure that all the sub-region has easy and efficient access to jobs, leisure opportunities and trade.

To the north of the Sheffield-Rotherham-Doncaster axis, Barnsley will have confirmed its place as one of Yorkshire's main regional market towns. Its residents can take advantage of excellent public transport connections with Sheffield-Rotherham-Doncaster to the south and Wakefield-Leeds to the north to access jobs and amenities, while residents of all these places regularly visit Barnsley to enjoy its market ambience.

Within the sub-region, emphasis on education facilities has contributed to the growth of knowledge clusters in the main urban centres. The Sheffield universities and other established knowledge hubs ensure that there is a stream of new viable businesses. They and other businesses are attracted to South Yorkshire by its combination of urban and rural amenities with easy access to a skilled workforce and to global markets.

Bryan Gladstone

Wednesday, 12 May 2004

---

<sup>i</sup> Urban area is used throughout this paper to describe the contiguous built up areas of Sheffield city, and Rotherham, Barnsley and Doncaster towns. This excludes outlying settlements and rural areas.

<sup>ii</sup> Vey, Jennifer S. and Benjamin Forman, "Demographic Change in Medium-Sized Cities: Evidence from the 2000 Census," Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, 2002.

<sup>iii</sup> Source: UK Sustainable Development Strategy and also adopted in PPG1, draft PPS1 (2004) and Yorkshire and Humber RPG



ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

**1. Meeting:** Economic and Development Services matters

**2. Date:** 17 May 2004.

**3. Title:** Preparation of Regional Spatial Strategy. Input of a S Yorks Spatial Vision.

**4. Originating Officer:** - *Alan Mitchell, Forward Planning Manager, extension 3834, e-mail alan.mitchell@rotherham.gov.uk*

**Designated Manager:** - *Karl Battersby, Head of Service, extension 3815, e-mail karl.battersby@rotherham.gov.uk*

**5. Issue**

The Regional Assembly requires a S Yorks sub-regional perspective to be fed into the preparation of the draft Regional Spatial Strategy. This report presents the work carried out to date for the consideration and views of Members.

**6. Summary**

The spatial vision for S Yorks will influence the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy [RSS], Local Development Frameworks and Local Transport Plan. The attached draft has been prepared by the South Yorkshire Partnership. It contributes to sustainable development and has five core themes, economic development, transport, settlement, urban centres and rural areas. It looks forward to 2021.

**7. Clearance/Consultation**

The S Yorks Planning Officers Group was asked to work with the S Yorks Partnership to assist in the preparation of the vision. Transportation officers have also been fully involved to ensure an integrated planning and transportation input to the work.

**8. Timing**

The timetable established by the Government for the preparation of the RSS is very demanding. The timetable requires first stage policy development and options in the period April - June 2004, first draft RSS June - August 2004, informal consultation September – October 2004, redrafting Nov 2004 and submission to Government December 2004. The input from S Yorks is required by the end of June 2004 if it is to influence the RSS at an formative stage. The attached report is to be considered by the S Yorks Spatial Study Member Working Group meeting in Rotherham on 19<sup>th</sup> May.

**9. Background**

The proposals for reform of the planning system to be enacted later this year by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act will give statutory status to the RSS.

The draft vision for S Yorks has been prepared following meetings between the representative of the S Yorks Partnership and the authorities and organisations with a stake in the area and with the benefit of initial papers relating to each of the authority's LDF visions. It has been made clear that these contributions have no formal status and could not have been given status in the very short timescale available for the work.

The draft sets out visions for each theme dealing holistically with the key issues for S Yorks.

The importance of economic progress as a pre-requisite of other forms of progress is built into the paper but the interdependencies and importance of the other themes must also be recognised.

The paper draws attention to the loss of role of many S Yorks settlements particularly former mining communities. The challenge for the vision is to establish a rationale for the area's settlement pattern that will be sustainable for the period to 2021.

The paper places emphasis on the role of Sheffield as the area's major city and the aspirations of Doncaster to develop as a major gateway and logistics centre. Rotherham is presented as area with considerable development potential needing to develop a complementary role to Sheffield, with a centre to be regenerated by commercial and housing initiatives offering high quality options for urban living.

Transport features strongly in the paper which attempts to reconcile the trend to greater mobility and the need to ensure access from outlying settlements to higher order services and facilities in the urban centres, with the need to reduce the need to travel particularly by car and the need to promote sustainable development.

## **10. Argument**

It is important that sub-regional and local interests are well represented as the RSS is being prepared.

Some further amendments to the paper should be proposed to reflect Rotherham's needs.

- Rotherham's economic achievements and the assets and opportunities that Rotherham offers the sub-region.
- Some of the references to Rotherham's centre need to mention its relationship to Retail World as well as Sheffield centre and Meadowhall.
- There should be more positive references to the potential for regeneration, diversification and attractive varied development in Rotherham town centre.
- The paper does not include options and may be seen as reducing Rotherham's scope to buck the trend by promoting a growth strategy for population and employment.

- The draft needs to more clearly reconcile the objective of reducing the need to travel whilst using mobility [primarily by enhanced public transport] to ensure the most sustainable future role for outlying settlements.
- The Transport Vision is extensive and there is scope to shorten this by combining and rationalising a number of elements.
- The paper would benefit from further editing.

Whilst efforts should continue to be made to contribute to the draft paper, it should be noted that there will be opportunities to comment on the emerging RSS as outlined in 8 above.

### **11.Risks and Uncertainties**

This work will inform the Regional Spatial Strategy which will have significant status as part of the statutory development plan. The contribution of Rotherham in the wider sub-regional and regional context and aspirations of Rotherham need to be reflected in the RSS.

### **12.Finance**

Officers from Economic and Development Services have contributed to this recent S Yorks work. The main resource has been officer time, which has been funded from existing budgets.

### **13.Sustainability**

Sustainable development is the “purpose of planning” at local and regional levels. The RSS will in due course be the subject of Strategic Environmental Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal.

### **14.Wards Affected**

All.

### **15.References**

“Draft Sub-Regional Spatial Strategy Vision for South Yorkshire”, attached as Appendix.

### **16.Presentation**

The draft document attached will contribute to the future regional planning context for Rotherham and as such will be important in shaping the long term future of this area.

### **17.Recommendation**

- i) Members views are requested on the attached draft document.**
- ii) It is recommended that the Leader be briefed on the views of the Cabinet Member and his advisors prior to the**

**meeting of the S Yorks Spatial Study Members working  
Group on 19<sup>th</sup> May.**

1. **Meeting:** Delegated Powers
2. **Date:** Monday 17<sup>th</sup> May 2004
3. **Title:** EIRA General Assembly & Board Meeting in Vasteras, Sweden
4. **Originating Officer** Richard Poundford, Head of Rotherham Investment and Development Office, [richard.poundford@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:richard.poundford@rotherham.gov.uk) ext 2971
5. **Issue**  
To seek authorisation for the attendance of the Leader as president of EIRA and Cabinet Member for EDS to attend the general assembly and board meeting for EIRA on 15<sup>th</sup> -17<sup>th</sup> June 2004.
6. **Summary**  
EIRA is an organisation of International states with industrial economies and operates to share best practise and lobby the EU for the benefits for their communities.
7. **Clearance/Consultation**  
Graham Joyce, Director of South Yorkshire Forum.
8. **Timing**  
15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> June 2004
9. **Background**  
The annual board meeting and annual general meeting of the EIRA group are to be held in Vasteras, Sweden on 15<sup>th</sup> -17<sup>th</sup> June 2004. Rotherham is the represented by the Leader who is also president of EIRA and also as interest of representing South Yorkshire. In addition to the annual general meeting and board meeting, there are a number of workshops seeking to share innovation and experience of restructuring.
10. **Argument**  
It is important for Rotherham to continue to raise its profile on the international stage wherever possible and continue to learn from and share experiences with other states. The EIRA organisation provides such a forum.
11. **Risks and Uncertainties**  
The risks associated with this are that a failure to keep in touch with other European organisations which may impede our chances of securing additional funding in future.
12. **Finance**  
The cost to cover the flight, travel and accommodation is approximately £500 for both the Leader and Cabinet Member.
13. **Sustainability**  
The continuation of European funds post 2006 is an issue crucial to the sustainability of key regeneration activities already underway.

14. **Wards Affected**

All

15. **References**

None

16. **Presentation**

Rotherham Council continues to operate on European stage lobbying for future funding, learning and sharing regeneration experiences.

17. **Recommendations**

**That the Cabinet Member for EDS and Leader attend the EIRA Board Meeting and General Assembly in Vasteras, Sweden on 15<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> June 2004.**

By virtue of paragraph(s) 5, 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 5, 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted



By virtue of paragraph(s) 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted