

CABINET MEMBER FOR ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

**Venue: Bailey House,
Rawmarsh Road,
Rotherham**

Date: Monday, 26 July 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. Minutes of a meeting of the Town Centre Initiative Steering Group held on 24th June, 2004. (copy attached) (Pages 1 - 4)
 - to receive the minutes.
4. Speeding Problems - Walker Lane. (report attached) (Pages 5 - 6)
Head of Streetpride Service to report.
 - to acknowledge receipt of a petition from residents on Walker Lane.
5. Design Guidance for Residential, Commercial and Industrial Developments, including Technical Appendix and Revised Highways Specification. (report attached) (Pages 7 - 9)
Transportation Unit Manager to report.
 - to note the design guidance.
6. Yorkshire and Humberside Cycle Benchmarking Project. (report attached) (Pages 10 - 16)
Transportation Unit Manager to report.
 - to inform Members about feedback from a recent two day visit to Rotherham by the Yorkshire and Humberside Cycling Benchmarking Group.
7. **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**
The following item is likely to be considered in the absence of the press and public as being exempt under Paragraph 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (report contains contractual information):-
8. Business Vision Centre. (report attached) (Pages 17 - 20)
Partnership Implementation Manager to report.
 - to seek exemption from Standing Orders.
(Exempt under Paragraph 9 of the Act – report contained contractual information)

ROTHERHAM TOWN CENTRE INITIATIVE STEERING GROUP

24th June, 2004
(at the Town Hall, Rotherham)

Present:-

Councillor G. Smith	Cabinet Member, Economic & Development Services – IN THE CHAIR
Councillor S. Walker	Advisor, Economic & Development Services
Julie Roberts	Town Centre, Tourism & Markets Manager
Colin Scott	Rotherham Chamber of Trade
Terence & Pauline Barker	Access Liaison Group
Jeff Wharfe	Rotherham Partnership
Phil Woodward	Yorkshire Water
Norma Rao	Rotherham Parish Church

Apologies:-

Colin Knight	Streetpride
Mike Smith	Rotherham Chamber of Commerce
Patrick Middleton	Development Surveyor, RiDO
Sarah Crossland	Rotherham Churches Tourism Initiative
Jane Sinclair	Rotherham Parish Church

1. INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairman welcomed those present to the meeting and introductions were made.

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 6th May, 2004 were approved as a correct record.

3. MATTERS ARISING

3 Cranes, High Street

There was nothing further to report at this stage.

4. TOWN CENTRE ACTION PLAN – UPDATE

Julie Roberts reported that she had taken into account everyone's comments on the draft, and that this would form part of the Town Centre Business Plan for 2004-2007.

She distributed a copy of the nine primary aims of the Business Plan (copy attached). It was pointed out that the 3 Year Town Centre Business Plan would underpin the Renaissance 20 year Master Plan for the physical redevelopment/regeneration of the town.

Julie expanded on each of the nine aims.

Those present discussed the following aspects:-

- driving up footfall in the area of Imperial Building
- the Housing Pathfinder
- cultural events
- car parking strategy, including charging policy
- retail mix
- the need to ensure that properties were occupied
- visitors' and residents' perception
- promotion and publicity
- public transport

Julie explained that the next step would be to distribute copies to the full membership of the Steering Group asking for comments, and to send the aims to the Economic Spoke of the Partnership.

Colin Scott expressed the view that the aims should also include reference to achieving and maintaining, as well as developing.

5. MARKETS REGENERATION STUDY

Julie Roberts reported that the consultants were half way through completing the study and an interim meeting had been held with them. So far several options had been identified regarding the market and its future. The consultants had now been asked to examine retaining the market on its present site and look at how it could be redeveloped to expand the market operation, and how the covered area could be reused and how to bring the shops and market around Howard Street out on to the street.

A further meeting was scheduled for the second week in July. A report would be presented to the Steering Group and to Town Team as part of the Renaissance process.

Those present discussed:-

- the indoor market
- storage issues
- impact of the Continental markets
- increase in footfall
- street infrastructure

6. ROTHERHAM RENAISSANCE UPDATE

Colin Scott referred to the presentation given to the last Town Team meeting which outlined the Master Plan and said that this was the information which was to be put on display on 15th and 16th July in the former hairdressers in the Old Town Hall complex.

Julie Roberts explained that at the last Town Team meeting on 8th July those present were asked to feed back comments on the proposals to the Executive Director, Economic and Development Services. She explained that her own comments included items she believed were missing from the scheme e.g. the proposal to cover High Street to form an arcade; car parking; a shelter/canopy over Effingham Square; insufficient development of new retail floor space. She also had concern about the location of the exhibition and the need to work on a wider consultation event out into the community.

Those present referred to:-

- car park layouts
- provision of an OAP Drop in Centre
- redevelopment of the former Speeds building

7. FUTURE ROLE OF THE STEERING GROUP

Julie Roberts reported that draft Terms of Reference had been drawn up to bring this group into the Town Team/Master Planning arena, and to form a more strategic body.

8. GIANT LED SCREEN

Julie Roberts reported that a planning application would now be considered on 8th July 2004. Several issues had been raised and the former All Saints Square Working Party and other interested parties had met to discuss and resolve these. The outcome of the meeting was that a Project Manager would be appointed.

It was reported that four objections had been lodged and some had requested a "Right to Speak", including Julie herself.

Reference was made to the formation of a Contents Management Group which would look at drawing up a policy for the way in which the screen was used. A control panel would be located in the Rotherham Tourism and Information Centre.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- (a) Provision of car parking spaces for people with a disability

It was reported that this information could be obtained from Planning Services.

- (b) Domine Lane Car Park

Colin Scott asked if there had been any progress to prevent car drivers overstaying the limits.

The Chairman agreed to follow this up.

(c) Cars turning left at the top of Main Street

This issue was brought to the attention of the Group.

The Chairman agreed to follow this up.

(d) Partnership Pamphlet

Reference was made to the above which contained photographs of Partnership staff in the town centre, and it was thought that this should have been inclusive of the general public.

(e) Medieval Festival

It was reported that this was being organised for 9th to 11th July, 2004. Anyone interested should contact Sarah Crossland (sarah@rcti.org.uk or Tel: 07779875642)

10. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

Agreed: That the next meeting of this Steering Group be held on THURSDAY, 22ND JULY, 2004 at 6.00 p.m. at the Town Hall.

ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1. Meeting: Economic and Development Services - Delegated Powers

2. Date: 26 July 2004

3. Title: Speeding Problems – Walker Lane

4. Originating Officer:- Leigh Richmond, Streetpride Technician, Streetpride Service, leigh.richmond@rotherham.gov.uk, ext 2970

Designated Manager: - T.R Knight, Streetpride Manager, Streetpride Service, tom.knight@rotherham.gov.uk, ext 2906

5. Issue

To report the receipt of a 10 signature petition; a copy of which is attached, from some of the residents of Walker Lane.

The residents are complaining about cars speeding along Walker Lane, they feel that this is a direct result of changes made to the junction layout of Clifton Lane. The petitioners feel that a closure of one end of Walker Lane would be a suitable solution to the problem. The lead petitioner also states that a 200 signature petition had been submitted to the Council, but there are no records of the petition ever being received.

6.References

A copy of the petition is attached as Appendix A

7.Recommendations

- (a) The petition be received and an acknowledgement sent to the lead petitioner;**
- (b) The Head of Streetpride investigate the matter and report to a future meeting of the Cabinet Member and Advisors.**

Speeding problems – blank page

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL - REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1. **Economic and Development Services Matters**
2. **26 July 2004**
3. **Design Guidance for Residential, Commercial & Industrial Developments, including a Technical Appendix & revised Highways Specification.**
4. **Originating Officer:** - Ian Ferguson, Development Control Officer, Planning and Transportation Service, Ext. 2965. ian.ferguson@rotherham.gov.uk
Divisional Manager: Ken Wheat, Transportation Unit Manager, Planning and Transportation Service, Ext. 2953. ken.wheat@rotherham.gov.uk
5. **Issue**
To note the design guidance for residential, commercial & industrial developments, (incorporating a technical appendix and the revised Highways Specification) prepared under the auspices of the South Yorkshire Planning and Transportation Steering Group (SYP&TSG).
6. **Summary**
Current Government guidance and policy with regard to residential, commercial and industrial development sets out a new approach which requires that new development be of the highest quality, makes the best use of land and is built in a sustainable way. With this in mind, the South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Group (ITG) established a sub group of officers from the four local authorities in South Yorkshire and the Passenger Transport Executive to update existing guidance. The residential design guide "Better Places to Live in South Yorkshire" takes its cue from P.P.G 3 Housing and various companion guides such as "Better Places to Live" (DTLR 2001) and "Places Streets and Movement" (DETR 1998). The industrial design guide, "Better Places to Work in South Yorkshire" develops the issues contained in By Design, Urban Design Compendium 2000. Both guides set out the principles of good design and show how good design makes economic sense and delivers social and environmental benefits. The guides are a radical development from the previously published guidance on layout design in South Yorkshire County Council "Design Guide for Residential Roads". A more comprehensive approach to creating a "sense of place" is now involved. The guides provide a framework which can be used to create and assess layout proposals as part of the planning, development control and highway adoption processes.
7. **Clearance/Consultation**
All four local highway and planning authorities in South Yorkshire and the Passenger Transport Executive have been fully engaged in the process and the various consultants involved in the preparation have consulted widely with other key stakeholders.

8. Timing

The guides have been prepared in response to Government guidance and policy. The Planning & Land Compensation Act 2004 introduces significant changes in planning and it is considered prudent to consolidate this guidance in the form of a Supplementary Planning Document after the delivery of the first round of the Local Development Framework, anticipated in 2007. In the meantime, it is proposed to "soft launch" the guidance, to make it available on a less formal basis, to guide the design and assessment of proposals submitted for planning permission for example. The "soft launch" would take the form of a letter plus printed copies of the documents to the main developers/agents active in South Yorkshire inviting them to make use of the documents and submit feedback. A review of progress and the responses by ITG and SYP&TSG is planned early next year

9. Background

ITG established a sub group of highway development control officers to update, on a countywide basis, existing guidance used in the design and layout of highways, access and transportation arrangements for residential developments. The detailed work of the group has been assisted by Llewellyn Davies and JSM. At around the same time, the Objective 1 Programme initiated a review of commercial and industrial estate layouts aimed at raising the quality of employment sites in line with the Programme's agenda. In addition, the group and JSM in particular have organised extensive technical consultations about the Technical Appendix and Specifications for both documents. In May 2004, the design group finalised the guidance and now has available copies of the guidance in limited edition printed copies, CD format and on the Sheffield City Council website. The guidance comprises:

"Better Places to Live in South Yorkshire"

"Better Places to Work in South Yorkshire"

Technical Appendix

Specification of Construction Materials and Standard Construction Details

All the final documents will be available at the meeting and it is intended to put them on the Council's website in due course.

10. Argument

The guidance aims to bring more certainty, creativity and quality to the planning process by guiding the developer in designing sustainable, high quality places that meet the aspirations and the transformational change agendas of the local authorities in South Yorkshire.

The guidance was endorsed by ITG on 7 June 2004. SYP&TSG on 12 July 2004 recommended that it be referred to individual Councils to include as advice and guidance in determining planning applications and aiding the preparation of things like master plans and planning briefs.

11. Risks and Uncertainties

None directly, though because of the nature of some of the advice, some aspects may be controversial.

12. Finance

Funding has been from existing budgets with support from the Objective 1 programme in specific instances.

13. Sustainability

In recent years, the suitability of a development in terms of sustainable travel has become a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 Transport requires local planning authorities to examine critically the standards they apply to new development. The guidance seeks to promote a balance between the social, environmental and economic aspects of development as well as easy movement for all modes of transport whilst positively discriminating in favour of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport.

14. Wards Affected

All Wards.

15. References

Better Places to Live in South Yorkshire
Better Places to Work in South Yorkshire
Technical Appendix to Better Places to Live & Work in South Yorkshire
South Yorkshire Highways Construction Specifications
Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 (Transport)
Better Places to Live (DTLR 2001)
Places Streets and Movement (DETR 1998)
By Design, Urban Design Compendium 2000
SYCC Design Guide for Residential Roads (1982)

16. Presentation

N/A

17. Recommendations

Cabinet Member is asked to note the report, endorse the countywide design guidance and refer the documents to the Planning Regulatory Board for information, assistance and guidance in determining planning applications .

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

- 1. Economic and Development Services Matters**
- 2. Yorkshire and Humberside Cycling Benchmarking Project.**

DATE: 26TH JULY 2004

3. Originating Officer: -

Paul Gibson (Transportation Unit; Planning, Transportation and Tourism Service), extension 2951, paul.gibson@rotherham.gov.uk

Divisional Manager: -

Ken Wheat, Transportation Unit Manager (Transportation Unit; Planning, Transportation and Tourism Service), extension 2953, ken.wheat@rotherham.gov.uk

4. Issue

To inform members about feedback from a recent 2 day visit to Rotherham by the Yorkshire and Humberside Cycling Benchmarking Group.

5. Summary

In November 2003 members agreed to participate in a project to identify and benchmark best practice in Cycling Planning and infrastructure provision with other local authorities across the Yorkshire and Humberside Region.

Rotherham hosted a 2 day benchmarking visit on the 7th and 8th of July 2004. This report outlines the outcome of that visit.

6. Clearance/Consultation

Cycling benchmarking is undertaken on a regional basis (Yorkshire and Humberside) with the following participating local authorities:

- Leeds CC
- Harrogate BC
- Hull CC
- East Riding DC
- Sheffield CC
- Doncaster MBC
- Barnsley MBC(observer only)
- Kirklees MBC
- Wakefield CC
- Bradford CC

Streetpride Service has also been fully engaged in the process.

7. Timing

There are no timing implications associated with this report.

8. Background

In February 2000 the Cyclists Touring Club launched their Regional Cycling Benchmarking initiative endorsed by the English Regions Cycling Development Team (ERCDT) and the National Cycling Strategy Board. It uses the technique of benchmarking to support local authorities in the development and implementation of cycling policy as well as measuring their success and disseminating results.

The process assesses local policy and practice to determine what actually works in encouraging people to cycle and examines examples of good practice to understand the key factors that contribute to their success. The key elements of benchmarking are:

- An initial workshop, introducing participants to the process of co-operative benchmarking.
- A series of 2 day study visits to each authority by participants, to investigate how each is implementing cycling policy.
- A consolidation of the results of the benchmarking process, including a final workshop for each participant to develop an action plan
- The creation of a best practice web-site including comparisons with European neighbours.

9. Argument

Rotherham hosted a visit from participating benchmarking partners in the Yorkshire and Humberside region on the 7th and 8th July 2004. The Head of Planning and Transportation Service welcomed the delegates on behalf of the Council.

Partners were generally impressed with what Rotherham had to offer cyclists and feedback was generally excellent. Best practice was identified within:

- Cycling policy and strategy
- Cycling promotion
- The planning process
- The travel planning process
- Provision and maintenance of routes through subways for cyclists
- A number of mainly on-road cycling infrastructure projects

Many of these projects will be put forward as best practice and included in emerging databases for future use nationally.

The benchmarking group also made recommendations where the Council could improve by either reviewing or in some instances stopping current practices. For example:

- Providing more Advanced Stop Lines and feeder lanes at traffic signals
- Providing more contraflow cycling facilities
- Use flush dropped kerbs
- Improve maintenance along the canal towpath
- Improving signing for cyclists
- Reviewing older traffic calming schemes
- Publishing local cycle maps e.g. a town centre map
- Improving awareness and co-operation within the cycle planning process.

The recommendations will be included in a Cycling Action Plan currently being developed as part of the Council's self assessment of performance on cycling improvements (led by the ERCDT) which will subsequently inform LTP2 and the Annual Progress Report for 2004/5.

A further report detailing the outcome of the self assessment and Cycling Action Plan will be presented to Cabinet Member at the earliest opportunity.

The benchmarking visit summary report is shown in Appendix A.

13. Wards Affected

Potentially all wards are affected by the findings of the benchmarking visit.

14. References

English Regions Cycling Development Team and Regional CTC
Benchmarking report (Minute 216 of 10th December 2003)

15. Presentation

The LTP advocates the re-allocation of road space to encourage a modal shift towards sustainable travel modes including cycling and the Government expects the Council to make progress towards meeting related targets set both at a local and national level.

Adopting the benchmarking recommendations within the emerging ERCDT Cycling Action Plan and improving the Council's knowledge base and performance via benchmarking will help hasten progress towards these targets.

16. Recommendation

That Cabinet Member notes this report and the benchmarking summary report attached as Appendix A and requests a further report following preparation of the Cycling Action Plan as part of the Council's self assessment of performance and cycling improvements.

**YORKSHIRE AND HUMBERSIDE REGIONAL BENCHMARKING PROJECT
DELEGATE FEEDBACK FROM THE ROTHERHAM VISIT ON 7TH AND 8TH JULY
2004.**

BEST PRACTICE FEEDBACK - DO MORE	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Cycling Facilities	Scoring out of 10							
Cycling facilities and lanes on direct radial routes.	7	8	7	9	8	7	9	7
Cycle lanes and narrow traffic lanes on Ferham Road.	8	7	9	9	9	8	9	8
Converting subways to cyclist / pedestrian shared use.	8	10	10	8	10	9	9	8
Traffic calming / humps on major routes (Sheffield Rd)*	9	10	9	9	8	9	9	10
Cycle parking lockers	6	10	8	10	9	7	5	7
Funding flexibility to enable provision of lockers	9	7	8	8	9	10	6	8
Cycle Planning								
Rotherham Cycling Strategy (general)	9	10	9	9	9	9	9	9
Providing road routes for different types of users	9	9	8	8	9	8	9	7
Providing a choice of routes (Rotherham - Sheffield)	10	9	10	9	10	9	10	10
Input into new developments	7	7	7	7	8	9	6	7
Links to employment/education/travel (Manvers)	10	10	9	9	10	9	10	9
Objective 1 - use of funding to promote cycle travel	9	9	9	10	9	9	10	9
Design guidance (Places to Live and Places to Work)	9	7	8	9	9	10	10	10
Travel Plan modal split related issues - parking charges	9	10	9	10	10	10	10	10
Travel Plan - scrapping of essential user allowance	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Travel Plan - pool bikes, electric bike etc	8	10	10	8	9	10	9	10
Maintenance								
Maintenance of subway cycling routes	10	10	9	9	9	10	10	7
Maintenance of cycle parking lockers	6	10	8	10	9	7	5	7
Cycling Promotion								
Use of virtual bike as a promotional tool	10	10	10	10	10	9	10	10
Year round promotional events	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9
Cycle map / map information	10	8	8	8	10	8	10	10
NCN Route compact leaflet	10	9	9	9	9	9	9	10
Innovation								
Cantilever route on towpath	10	10	10	10	10	9	9	9
Team working - Paul Gibson / Andy Sealey	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Co-operation with the cycle planning process**	7	5	4	6	3	4	5	4

Notes:

Individual local authority names have been omitted to maintain confidentiality.

* Although identified as an example of best practice, Streetpride are likely to remove the vertical traffic calming measures.

** The benchmarking group identified a number of projects where co-operation between design teams could have improved delivery of the cycle planning and infrastructure process. Examples include:

- The abrupt termination of cycle lanes on Moorgate Road at the narrowest point
- The removal of cycle lanes without apparent reason on Sheffield Road
- Build outs in cycle lanes on Broom Lane
- The lack of a contraflow cycle lane on Ship Hill
- The exclusion of cyclists from the Corporation Street Contra flow bus lane

Additional Feedback - The Council is recommended to do the following "Differently"	
DO DIFFERENTLY	WHY
Barriers on the towpath and cycle barriers generally	Barriers affect continuity and comfort of cycling route and create obstacles for wheelchairs, trailers and bikes. Best practice indicates that Barriers should only be used where unauthorised access problems cannot be prevented in any other way.
Towpath maintenance	Overgrown vegetation and standing water make the route unattractive in places.
Downhill section of towpath near Steel Street.	The design in this area needs reviewing to improve cyclist safety.
Signing general	Missing / turned signs on TPT. Not enough side road and 'short cut' / connecting cycling routes identified.
Cycle lanes on Sheffield Road	Some vehicles park in the cycle lanes. Mandatory lanes would prevent parking.
Dropped kerbs	Many dropped kerbs had unnecessary upstands. Best practice indicates that dropped kerbs should be 'flush' with the road surface to assist cyclists, pedestrians and disabled people.

Additional Feedback - The Council is recommended to "Start Doing" the Following	
START DOING	WHY
Advanced Stop Lines at traffic signals	Best practice indicates that there needs to be a consistent and more widespread use of ASL's at signals.
Reviewing older traffic calming schemes that adversely affect cyclists.	Some schemes present a danger to cyclists such as the build outs on Canklow Road.
Investigate links from Magna to the TPT and canal towpath	To improve connectivity between Magna and the with existing canal route.
Improving TPT link from Boston Castle	A useful route but some attention needs to improving the conspicuity of the steps at the Canklow end of the path.
Contra-flow Cycling on Ship Hill	The alternative route via Wilfred Street is steep, narrow and shared with traffic.
Publish a smaller version of the Cycling Map	Smaller versions of the map showing neighbourhood routes would be useful.

Widen awareness of cycling issues in RMBC.	Although the inclusion of cycling in the Planning process was identified as best practice. Some evidence was found suggesting that cycling issues and the need to encourage cycling was not embedded throughout the Council.
--	--

Additional Feedback - The Council is recommended to STOP doing the following:	
STOP DOING	WHY
Build outs in cycle lanes (Broom Lane)	Build outs in cycle are not best practice and present dangers to cyclists. This is already being addressed by Streetpride.
Mandatory Cycle Lanes with waiting restrictions.	Parking is prohibited in mandatory cycle lanes. The use of waiting restrictions in some (but not all) mandatory cycle lanes is likely to present a confusing message to motorists.

Document is Restricted