

## CABINET MEMBER FOR ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

<b>Venue:</b>	<b>Bailey House, Rawmarsh Road, Rotherham</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>Monday, 18 October, 2004</b>
		<b>Time:</b>	<b>9.00 a.m.</b>

### 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 Rotherham Local Development Framework Steering Group held on 24th September, 2004. (copy attached) (Pages 1 - 8)
4. Minutes of meeting Friday, 16th July, 2004 of Health, Welfare and Safety Panel. (copy attached) (Pages 9 - 11)
5. Promotion of Travel Plans to Businesses in Rotherham. (copy attached) (Pages 12 - 14)  
Transportation Unit Manager to report.
  - to report to Members on the promoting the uptake of Travel Plans amongst existing businesses.
6. Local Authority Business Growth Incentives - ODPM 2nd Consultation Paper. (report attached) (Pages 15 - 21)  
Economic Strategy Manager to report.
  - to inform Members of the 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation paper issued by the ODPM and to seek approval for the RMBC response.
7. Town Centre, Drunken Pedestrian Accidents - Beermat and Poster Campaign. (report attached) (Pages 22 - 23)  
Schemes and Partnerships Manager to report.
  - to report of the proposed campaign.

(Please note: copies of the proposed beermat and poster are not available electronically.)
8. Barnsley Road, Wath - Proposed Traffic Calming. (report attached) (Pages 24 - 27)  
Schemes and Partnerships Manager to report.
  - to consider a proposed traffic calming scheme and speed limit on

Barnsley Road, Wath.

(Please note that the plan referred to is not available electronically.)

9. Winter Service 2004/2005. (report attached) (Pages 28 - 33)  
Network Manager to report.
  - to consider a revised policy following legislative change.

**Extra Item:-**

10. Conference
  - to consider the nomination from the Regeneration Scrutiny Panel to attend the following:-  
  
Local Government Association - Annual Economic Regeneration Conference, 26th to 28th October, 2004 - Bristol
11. 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:-
12. Orgreave Community Gain Fund. (report attached) (Pages 34 - 37)  
Head of Planning and Transportation Service to report.
  - to report the procedure for the release of monies.  
(Exempt under Paragraph 8 of the Act – report relates to financial information)
13. Retail and Leisure Study. (report attached) (Pages 38 - 47)  
Head of Planning and Transportation Service to report.
  - to endorse the use of the Retail and Leisure Study in determining planning applications and making other planning decisions and to refer the report to Cabinet for endorsement.  
(Exempt under Paragraph 9 of the Act – land and property issues)
14. Streetpride: Budgetary Pressures for 2005/2006. (report attached) (Pages 48 - 54)  
Head of Streetpride to report.
  - to outline future pressures on the Streetpride budget and options for future Highway Service Improvements.  
(Exempt under Paragraph 8 of the Act – report contains to financial information)

**ROTHERHAM LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK STEERING GROUP**  
**Friday, 24th September, 2004**

Present:- Councillor G. Smith (in the Chair); Councillors Hall, Pickering, Robinson, Walker and Wardle.

together with:-

Steve Holmes	Community Involvement Manager
Phil Turnidge	Senior Planner
Tom Bell	Principal Strategy Officer, Housing Services
Adrian Gabriel	Waste Strategy Manager
Andy Duncan	Strategic Planner
Paul Gibson	Senior Transportation Officer

**1. INTRODUCTION**

The Chairman explained that this was the first meeting of the reconstituted Unitary Development Plan Review Members' Steering Group, now known as the Rotherham Local Development Framework Steering Group, with a wider membership.

**2. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from the following:-

Councillor Burke	Advisor, Economic & Development Services
Phil Gill	Greenspaces Manager
Ken MacDonald	Service Solicitor, EDS

**3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW MEMBERS' STEERING GROUP HELD ON 16TH JULY, 2004**

Agreed: That, subject to the inclusion of Councillor Pickering in the list of those submitting apologies, the minutes of the previous meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> July, 2004 be approved as a correct record.

**4. MATTERS ARISING**

The following issues were raised:-

- (i) Legislation – update

Reference was made to the new Planning Act which would be effective from 28<sup>th</sup> September, 2004.

Those present were advised that the Council now had 6 months to produce a Local Development Scheme and achieve key milestones within by March 2007. The Planning Inspectorate was beginning to realise the implications of numerous Independent Examinations under the new regime.

It was pointed out that a Sustainability Appraisal would have to be carried out from the start, and that the ODPM was currently consulting on the guidance. Comments had been requested by 10<sup>th</sup> December, 2004, but it was unlikely that the guidance would be re-issued much before Easter 2005.

(ii) The Northern Way Growth Strategy

Councillor Walker reported that this had been discussed at a recent meeting of the Yorkshire Tourist Board and it had been emphasised that Yorkshire Councils should be doing all they can to make the economy of the North the best.

The Chairman commented that from Rotherham's perspective the Strategy only referred to cities and not the towns in between.

Agreed: That updates on the Northern Way Growth Strategy be submitted to future meetings of this Steering Group.

**5. BRIEF PRESENTATION ABOUT THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK**

Phil Turnidge, Senior Planner, gave a brief presentation about the production of the Local Development Framework (LDF) and the tasks and timescales involved.

Reference was made to:-

Timescales:-

- commencement on 28<sup>th</sup> September, 2004, under the new Planning Act, of the LDF process
- the LDS had to be agreed with Government Office by March 2005
- the key milestones in the LDS had to be achieved by 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2007 – not necessarily full adoption as originally thought

LDF Content:-

- loose leaf format
- Local Development Scheme (the Project Plan)
- Statement of Community Involvement (the Participation Plan) – which would be subject to independent examination
- Development Plan Documents:- including Core Strategy and policies; Site Specific Allocations; Proposals Map; Area Action Plans; others?

- Non Development Plan Documents – Supplementary Planning docs
- Annual Monitoring report

### New features:-

- the Regional Spatial Strategy and the LDF would become the statutory Development Plan
- the LDF would be the spatial dimension of the Community Strategy
- subject to sustainability appraisal
- performance in the production of the LDF would be linked to the Planning Delivery Grant that the Council received

### Implications:-

- the scope of the first LDF vs. time – this would mean a compromise and would be subject to a strict project management approach
- enhanced participation requirements vs. timescales and complexities – this would mean tensions
- closer integration of the LDF with the Local Transport Plan and the Community Strategy – this would mean more corporate working and links with the Local Strategic Partnership
- maintenance and management of baseline data
- the need to avoid duplication of effort
- the need to streamline

### The following questions were raised:-

- at what point would the Unitary Development Plan no longer be applicable?

The UDP would operate as the statutory development plan until its replacement by the relevant parts of the LDF. There was provision to save parts of the UDP for 3 years, or longer, if it could be justified to the Government Office.

- In terms of sustainability - could the Council build in a % requirement in new developments for e.g. solar power?

The Regional Spatial Strategy was looking at targets for renewable energy that the Council would be duty bound to apply. There was a need to show a desire to promote eco-friendly developments. The Council could set out include Supplementary Planning Documents setting out guidance for developers to provide eco features and issues such as orientation of buildings etc.

- how could the Council ensure commitment from the Euro M.P.'s

and the local M.P.'s?

Once a Core Strategy had been compiled consultation would begin and this would include the M.P.'s. Lobbying was being undertaken by Heads of Service and via Government Office about the short comings in the process, and also via the LGA and the M.P.'s. It was pointed out that the new process was required by act of Parliament.

**6. DELEGATION SCHEME**

Phil Turnidge explained that the new Delegation Scheme was approved by the Cabinet and Council in August, 2004. Copies were made available to those present at the meeting. Reference was made to this Group's wider representation.

The Chairman added that the work of the Group would need Member involvement and would be supported by Seminars.

**7. REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY/PLANET CONSULTATION**

Andy Duncan reported that a report on recent developments on Regional Planning Guidance and the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy had been considered by the Cabinet. Cabinet had endorsed a draft consultation response to the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly on "PLANet Yorkshire and Humber – Developing the Regional Spatial Strategy".

This was part of the selective review of regional planning guidance which was now coming to a close with Revised RPG expected to be published in December 2004. Comments had been made on each previous stage of the consultation process via reports to the Cabinet Member.

Reference was made to the emerging documentation under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, and it was pointed out that the Revised Regional Planning Guidance (RPG 12) would become part of the Development Plan for Rotherham along with the draft Local Development Framework and would have to be considered when determining planning permission for proposed development.

Programme Areas had been consulted on the PLANet document and a response had been drawn together. Copies of Rotherham's response submitted to the Regional Assembly were available at the meeting.

The PLANet document tried to put a spatial expression to the Regional Assembly's vision for the region set out in the "Advancing Together" document. The document promoted sustainable developments on a regional basis and there were no strong objections to this although the Council has raised a number of issues relating to the vision for Rotherham and South Yorkshire. The Council will have further opportunities to comment on, and influence, the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy at various stages of its development during 2005 and by continuing

involvement in the South Yorkshire Partnership and its drafting of the South Yorkshire Spatial Vision.

**8. HOUSING MARKET RENEWAL PATHFINDER AND THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK - MEETING WITH GOVERNMENT OFFICE YORKSHIRE AND THE HUMBER**

A verbal report was given regarding the above meeting which took place on 30<sup>th</sup> July with Government Office. Copies of the notes of the meeting were made available at the meeting.

The main issue discussed was to identify the work of the Pathfinder and to identify options and a way forward for the incorporation of this into the LDF.

The main concern was that the Pathfinder was moving very quickly and its timescale did not fit into that of the LDF. The conclusion of the meeting was that it would be satisfactory as long as the Pathfinder Strategy was reflected in the LDF and in the future Master planning initiatives from the Pathfinder could be taken in.

It was also agreed that the Pathfinder needed to increase its attention to consultation with the community. Details could be incorporated into the Statement of Community Involvement.

It was pointed out that there was already good corporate communication between Housing and Planning Services.

The following questions were raised:-

- how would community partnerships' planning activities be linked into the LDF?

The community consultation was being undertaken to inform the Master Planning process and this may be incorporated into the LDF at a later stage. It was added that a number of partnerships were working on the Master Planning and consultants were involved with them. The timeframe was aiming at April 2005.

- reference was made to the LDF being a strategy for the whole of the Borough, whereas the Pathfinder was only for certain areas. The Pathfinder would be mentioned within the LDF but it would not form the policy that was adopted. What were the connotations of this?

The Housing policies within the LDF would need to be sympathetic to the Pathfinder Strategy and intervention.

**9. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK INITIAL SUBMISSION -  
OUTLINE OF WORK TASKS**

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Senior Planner, which outlined component tasks for commencing the formal preparation of the first Local Development Framework submission.

It was pointed out that the new development plan arrangements required the Local Authority to produce a Local Development Scheme, i.e. a project plan for the preparation of the LDF to be agreed with GOYH by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2005, and the Government's target for achieving key milestones in preparing the LDF by March 2007.

Reference was made to the Government's Planning Delivery Grant which was an important source of enhanced funding to assist the preparation of the LDF. However, the receipt of this was subject to delivery to time and quality targets commencing with the Local Development Scheme being agreed with GOYH by 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2005.

Reference was made to the requirement to involve other stakeholders.

It was also pointed out that the format of the work of this Group may necessitate a more flexible reporting format.

A brief explanation was given of the following:-

- Core strategy – particular reference was made to the Babbie Study which identified areas for potential growth
- Supporting policies
- New detailed Development Control/Land allocation policies – it was pointed out that the minimum requirement was to include housing, economy and transportation
- Saved UDP policies
- Examination of available data and establishment of a baseline
- Statement of Community Involvement – links with the Local Strategic Partnership
- Town Centre Action Plan
- Spatial Options
- Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessments
- Supplementary Planning Documents
- Allocations/Proposals Map
- Annual Monitoring Report
- Local Development Scheme – this had to be issued within the next six months and had to be fit for purpose and achievable. This would need to be considered by this Group, then recommended to Cabinet and Council and forwarded to Government Office.

Agreed:- (1) That the outline of component tasks for the LDF First



Submission be noted.

(2) That a Glossary of Terms be provided for the next meeting.

**10. WORKING ARRANGEMENTS WITH THE LOCAL STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP**

It was reported that staff from the Forward Planning Section had made presentations to each of the six Partnership Spokes between May and July 2004, to inform them about the LDF and its scope and the need for joint working.

The following presentations had been made:-

18 May – Safer Rotherham Partnership

27<sup>th</sup> May – Community Development and Involvement Partnership

2<sup>nd</sup> June – Health and Social Well-being Partnership

2<sup>nd</sup> June – Strategic Housing Partnership

7<sup>th</sup> June – Lifelong Learning Partnership

14<sup>th</sup> July – Local Economic Development Partnership

The overall result appeared to be mixed understanding of what had to be achieved.

Consideration was given to a suggestion to form a LDF Task Group within the LSP, comprised of the Forward Planning Officers, other officers as appropriate and a representative from each of the Spokes. The aim being that the group could act as a clearing house for LDF and Community Strategy matters.

It was emphasised that Environment/Culture objectives were not reflected strongly in the Partnership set up; however, it was recognised that these themes should thread throughout each of the Spokes.

The view was expressed that there needed to be a better information flow between the LSP, Area Assemblies and the Community Partnerships.

Reference was made to the need to work with VAR, with Community Planning Officers and with the Area Assemblies.

It was recognised that there was pressure to deliver quickly and an issue relating to how good the consultation would be.

The importance of the production of the Statement of Community Involvement was re-emphasised.

**11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

No other issues were raised.

**12. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING**

Agreed:- That the next meeting of the Rotherham LDF Steering Group be held on FRIDAY, 22<sup>nd</sup> OCTOBER, 2004 at 10.00 a.m. at the Town Hall.

**HEALTH, WELFARE AND SAFETY PANEL  
FRIDAY, 16TH JULY, 2004**

Present:- (none) (in the Chair); Councillors R. S. Russell, Pickering, Sharman, Whelbourn, Hall and Darby. and Mr. J. W. Clay (ATL), Mrs. C. Maleham (UNISON), Mr. K. Moore (AMICUS), Mr. C. Oldfield (TGWU) and Mrs. H. C. Smith (UNISON)

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Burke, Senior, Mrs. S. D. Brook (NASUWT), Mr. R. Foster (NUT), Mrs. L. Heywood (UNISON), Mr. M. Martin (UCATT) and Mrs. P. Ward (GMB).

**1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN**

Resolved:- That Councillor R. S. Russell be re-appointed Chairman of the Health, Welfare and Safety Panel for the 2004/05 Municipal Year.

(Councillor R. S. Russell in the Chair)

**2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

Resolved:- That Mr. K. Moore be re-appointed Vice-Chairman of the Health, Welfare and Safety Panel for the 2004/05 Municipal Year.

**3. ILLNESS OF MR. MALCOLM MARTIN (UCATT)**

The Chairman informed Panel members of the illness of Mr. Malcolm Martin, health and safety representative of the UCATT trade union.

Agreed:- that a letter be sent to Mr. Martin wishing him a speedy recovery from illness.

**4. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HEALTH, WELFARE AND SAFETY PANEL HELD ON 22ND APRIL, 2004**

Agreed:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health, Welfare and Safety Panel, held on 22nd April, 2004, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

**5. MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 22ND APRIL, 2004**

(a) Occupational Stress (Minute 26(b))

The Health and Safety Executive's recommendations about stress at work were to be considered by the Council's Corporate Management Team; after which, a report would be submitted to the October, 2004 meeting of this Panel.

(b) Bramley Grange Junior and Infant School – Kitchens (Minute No. 27(e))

The Panel considered that the Principal Catering Officer must arrange for appropriate notices to be affixed to the entrance doors to all school kitchens, in order to prohibit anyone entering the kitchen who is not directly involved in the preparation of schools meals.

(c) Membership of the Health, Welfare and Safety Panel

It was noted that an additional member was to be appointed to this Panel, from the Members' Training and Development Panel.

**6. 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, occurring from the third quarter in 2001 to the second quarter in 2004.

Agreed:- That the information be noted.

**7. HEALTH AND SAFETY BULLETIN**

Consideration was given to the Health and Safety Bulletin, containing recent articles and reports of legal cases relating to health and safety. Eighteen recent health and safety articles and cases were highlighted.

Agreed:- (a) That the Principal Health and Safety Officer distribute copies of the bulletin throughout the Authority.

(b) That the Principal Health and Safety Officer submit a report to the next meeting of this Panel concerning the training provided for employees of the Council and its agents/contractors who are required to lift and handle heavy materials during construction works.

**8. REPORTS ON VISITS OF INSPECTION HELD ON FRIDAY, 2ND JULY, 2004**

Consideration was given to matters arising from the visits of inspection made by the Panel on Friday, 2nd July, 2004.

It was noted that the Executive Director, Economic and Development Services would investigate the relevant matters and the Heads of Service concerned would be notified accordingly.

Particular reference was made to:-

(a) Bungalow Unit, Godric Green

The footpaths around the centre would be repaired in the near future.

(b) Visits to Libraries

The Panel agreed that preventative action should be taken immediately to ensure that the mat wells in library entrances were not causing a tripping hazard.

(c) Primary Schools (Private Finance Initiative)

The Health, Welfare and Safety Panel would visit the following primary schools as part of the visits of inspection on Friday, 17th September, 2004:-

Thornhill Junior and Infant School (including youth and community centre)  
Ferham Junior and Infant School (including space for sports and arts)  
Rawmarsh Rosehill Junior School – air conditioning

**9. HEALTH AND SAFETY SECTION - AMALGAMATION**

The Chairman reported on the progress of this issue, stating that discussions between Councillors and senior management were still continuing. Further progress would be reported to the October, 2004, meeting of the Health, Welfare and Safety Panel.

**10. THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HEALTH, WELFARE AND SAFETY PANEL**

The Chairman reported that 30th July, 2004, was the thirtieth anniversary of the first meeting of the Health, Welfare and Safety Panel (formerly Committee).

The Chairman and Vice-Chairman spoke about the Panel's work and progress during the thirty years' period.

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

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Economic and Development Services Matters</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>18 October 2004</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Promotion of Travel Plans to businesses in Rotherham</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Programme Area:</b>	<b>Planning &amp; Transportation Service</b>

**5. Summary**

The report outlines the way in which it is intended to promote the uptake of travel plans and associated measures in Rotherham companies. It is proposed to employ a public relations company to manage a campaign promoting the uptake of grants for the provision of facilities and materials to encourage sustainable transport choices.

**6. Recommendations**

**Cabinet Member is asked to resolve that:**

**Authority be given to tender for relevant PR services including the provision of promotional materials and information packs and that the contract is awarded to the preferred bidder based on the criteria outlined in this report.**

## 7. Proposals and Details

Emerging guidance from the DfT on second Local Transport Plans (LTPs) places greater emphasis on tackling traffic congestion by improving links between land use planning and transport and by considering 'soft' measures (such as workplace travel plans) to promote sustainable travel. Indeed, the DfT is likely to introduce a requirement to include a number of mandatory indicators in the next round of LTP's to measure progress towards reducing congestion. The Government also expects local authorities to take the lead in promoting the benefits of travel plans. (DETR: *The benefits of Green Travel Plans* 1999). Encouraging existing businesses to take up travel plans would help the Council to meet that expectation and help establish Rotherham at the forefront of sustainable travel promotion.

Whilst the Council is in a position to insist that new developments over a certain size have an approved travel plan, existing businesses are not compelled to introduce them. As a result, there is virtually no voluntary take-up of sustainable travel initiatives by existing businesses in the Borough.

In order to comply with Government guidance and to increase the number, quality and effect of sustainable travel initiatives, it is considered that a major publicity campaign would be beneficial to inform businesses about the benefits of travel plans. This would be achieved by a carefully targeted promotional campaign involving direct marketing and press and local advertising.

The estimated cost of the marketing exercise, proposed to be funded through existing allocations in the LTP, is estimated at around £18,000 for the following areas of work (subject to a suitable tender brief being prepared):

- Campaign branding
- Promotional literature
- Promotional materials
- Display materials
- PR campaign over 6 month period
- Event
- Campaign management

It is suggested that tenders will be assessed on price (40%), quality (40%) and previous experience (20%).

Whilst awareness raising promotional campaigns may make some businesses more receptive to the concept of sustainable travel, the costs of introducing and maintaining travel plans could limit take up. It is therefore suggested that grants should be provided to companies wishing to improve their staff's access to sustainable transport. This might take the form of cycle lockers, stands for visitors' cycle parking, remarking car parking for car sharers, provision of information stands/cabinets etc. The individual schemes proposed would be carefully vetted to be certain that the right message is

conveyed and the best possible use made of transport funding. Such resources would nonetheless have to be prioritised within existing budgets

### **8. Finance**

It is recommended that the initiatives (both the PR consultants and the funding for grants to companies) be funded out of existing allocations of LTP funding for travel planning. It is envisaged that production of a video for the Council's Travel Plan will be included in the contract. The funding for this has already been agreed from the Planning delivery grant allocation to the Travel Plan.[see report to Delegated Powers Meeting 01 September 2004]

### **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

DfT guidance on Second Local Transport Plans is currently in draft format and could be subject to change. However, it is unlikely that the advice on 'soft' measures for reducing congestion or the related mandatory targets and performance indicators (which will contribute to CPA assessment) will change dramatically.

### **10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

The initiatives described will support the Council's Travel Plan, with its stated aim of promoting travel plans to the wider business community. In addition it will contribute to the council meeting Local Transport Plan, Service Plan and CPA targets.

### **11. Background Papers and Consultation**

Cabinet approved the Travel Plan which includes a section on future initiatives.

The Council's Travel Plan is available on the internet at:

<http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/graphics/Environment/Transport/>

**Contact Name** : Steve Brown, Policy Officer, Planning & Transportation Service, (extension 2186); [stephen.brown@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:stephen.brown@rotherham.gov.uk)



**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS**

1.	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Economic and Development Service Matters</b>
2.	<b>Date:</b>	<b>18<sup>th</sup> October 2004</b>
3.	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Local Authority Business Growth Incentives – ODPM 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation paper</b>
4.	<b>Programme Area:</b>	<b>Economic and Development Services Resources</b>

**5. Summary**

To inform members of the second consultation paper issued by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) and to seek approval for the response from RMBC.

**6. Recommendations**

- **That Cabinet Member notes the contents of the consultation paper and the implications for RMBC.**
  - **That Cabinet Member supports the proposed consultation response.**
-

## 7. Proposals and Details

A report approved by Cabinet on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2003 outlined to members the proposals for the Local Authority Business Growth Incentives Scheme, as set out in its first consultation paper. This first consultation paper contained information on the objectives and principles for the scheme, the wider policy context, detail about the variables for the scheme and the next steps/timetable for introducing the scheme. The second consultation paper sets out the Government's proposals based on responses to the first consultation paper and evaluation from the administrative dry run of the scheme during July 2004.

The scheme is designed to give local authorities an incentive to maximise local economic growth by allowing them to receive a proportion of increase in local business rate revenues to spend on their own priorities. All revenues generated by the scheme will be un-ringfenced. It is intended that the scheme will create positive financial incentives for local authorities to work in partnership with business and other partners to maximise economic growth.

It is intended that the scheme will become operational following the next business rate evaluation on the 1 April 2005. It will be evaluated within two to three years of its start.

How will the Scheme work?

- The Local Authority's success in generating growth is to be measured by growth in rateable value, resulting in an increase in business rate revenues.
- Local Authorities will receive a proportion of their increase in business rate revenues
- The amount they receive will be determined by a ceiling, floor and scaling factor.
- The floor is the minimum level of increase in Business Rates which the Local Authority needs to achieve before benefiting from the scheme.
- The ceiling is the maximum level of increase above which all increases go into the central Business Rates pool.
- The scaling factor determines the % of the business rate revenue which can be retained.
- The floor is determined by the authority's historic growth levels (i.e. their baseline) and is adjusted by a national adjustment factor, which has been set at -1.4%.
- The ceilings are determined by a modified form of the Environmental, Protective and Cultural Services (EPCS) part of the Formula Spending Share (FSS) scheme and have been set for the first 3 years at 3%, 6% and 9% of the EPCS FSS respectively.

The consultation paper seeks views on these proposals and asks consultees to respond to 4 key questions. The suggested response to these questions is attached at appendix A, including some notes to explain the reasoning behind the responses. This explanation is for the purpose of members and it is proposed to take this out of the response when it is finally submitted.

## Implications for RMBC.

There are two key issues which arise from the consultation which are a change from the first consultation paper:

1. Ceilings. In the first consultation the Government proposed that ceilings would be based on the total Formula Spending Share. It is now proposed that a more equitable way of setting the ceilings would be based on a modified form of Environmental Protection and Cultural Services (EPCS) element of FSS, particularly in two tier areas. For Unitary authorities (i.e. RMBC) the modified EPCS FSS would be calculated in the same way as for Revenue Support Grant purposes. In two tier authorities the scheme proposes a set of technicalities which will be used to calculate their modified EPCS FSS and therefore their ceilings for the scheme.
2. Baseline and Adjustment factor. The combination of the baseline and adjustment factor contained within the new proposals mean that RMBC will now have a zero floor, therefore, potentially benefiting immediately from any growth in its revenue from business rates. This is because the national historic growth baseline set for Rotherham is 1.4% and the national adjustment factor is -1.4%.

The proposed changes to the ceiling significantly reduce it for RMBC. An illustration of this is contained within Appendix A. The cumulative nature of the ceiling over 3 years, however, means that there is more scope to benefit from greater growth in years 2 and 3. The timing of this in terms of the regeneration of Rotherham, means that as new projects come on stream at Manvers, Waverley, Dinnington and in the Town Centre, RMBC should be able to benefit financially through this scheme. It should be noted, however, that levels of vacant properties will have a negative impact on growth levels and therefore the ability of the Borough to benefit from the scheme.

### Example:

RMBC experiences an increase in its rateable value of £1,000,000

RMBC's floor is zero, therefore the gain would be calculated as follows:

$£1,000,000 \times £0.422$  (national multiplier) =  $£422,000 \times 70\%$  (scaling factor) =  $£295,400$  Gain to the authority.

The maximum gain (i.e. ceiling) is £1,589,054 which would need a rateable value increase of £5,379,330.

RMBC took part in the administrative dry run. It was found from this that it would have taken a growth in rateable value of at least £3.5m before Rotherham would have benefited from the scheme. The new proposals giving RMBC a zero baseline are therefore a significant improvement on this.

It is proposed that RMBC support the proposals contained within the consultation document. It is by no means guaranteed that there will be high levels of additional

income generated by the scheme, however, it is certain that the Council will be no worse off financially by its introduction. In the response to the first consultation the Council made the following statements:

- The Council endorses the principle of returning business rates to local control. This was contained within its response to the Local Government Act 2003, at White Paper stage. The Council therefore welcomes the proposals contained within the consultation paper.
- The Council supports the three principles behind the scheme. It is important that the impact of the scheme is not disproportionately beneficial to some local authorities, for example current high growth areas and size of local authority. The Council therefore welcomes the principles which aim to prevent this and ensure that local authorities benefit as a result of relative future performance.

The changes being proposed in the second consultation paper are about making the scheme more equitable and fair; therefore they are in line with the Council's original response on this issue.

Maximising benefit from the Scheme for RMBC:

- Continued proactive work from RIDO's Business Development Team will encourage businesses to locate here, expand and develop. This could result in generating extra income for the Council through this scheme.
- The Town Centre Renaissance will start to tackle vacancies within the Town Centre and generate new commercial uses which should significantly increase the benefits from the scheme.
- RIDO's close working relationship with businesses and potential investors into the Borough needs to be utilised to ensure that all developments meet the needs of the market, to reduce the chance of new developments remaining vacant which would reduce the potential benefit from the scheme.

### **8. Finance**

The report highlights the potential financial benefits for the Council under the proposed scheme. There is no risk that the Council will be worse off financially by these proposals.

### **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

The main uncertainty about the proposed scheme is the extent to which the Council may benefit from it. It is therefore important that the response from the Council reflects the best opportunities for maximising income under the scheme, without increasing any risks.

### **10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

The scheme potentially supports many of the key initiatives and actions being generated by the Council's newly adopted Regeneration Plan. It acts as an additional incentive to work towards greater economic regeneration and growth. In particular it supports priority 2 of the Regeneration Plan "Provide an excellent and sustainable environment for businesses".

**11. Background Papers and Consultation**

Local Authority Business Growth Incentive Scheme – 4/8/04

Cabinet Report “Local Authority Business Growth Incentives – ODPM consultation”  
paper 29/10/03

**Contact Name : Deborah Fellowes, Economic Strategy Manager, ext 3828,  
[Deborah.fellowes@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Deborah.fellowes@rotherham.gov.uk).**

**Howard Brier, Senior Accountant, ext 3227, [Howard.brier@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Howard.brier@rotherham.gov.uk)**

**Alan Norcliffe, Principal NNDR Officer, ext 3579,  
[Alan.norcliffe@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Alan.norcliffe@rotherham.gov.uk)**

Appendix A: Consultation Response.

Generally, RMBC welcomes the recognition that local authorities have an important and continuing strategic role to play in Local Economic Development.

Being given the flexibility to use a proportion of the revenues according to local priorities is also an important element of enabling local authorities and their role as community leader. This brings a greater amount of control over the use of business rates revenue, generated as a result of local development activity and will therefore serve as a further incentive to local authorities.

More specifically, RMBC's response is as follows:

1. Do you agree with the Government's proposal to use a modified form of the ECPS part of the FSS rather than on total FSS for calculating ceilings?

The Council is satisfied with the proposals in that as a unitary authority, it will done in the same way as for the Revenue Support Grant. The Council believes that these proposals ensure that all authorities are treated fairly. The main issue the Council has with these proposals is that the ECPS FSS will result in a considerable reduction in its ceiling, compared to that calculated from the total FSS. The Council believes, as expressed in its original response to the first consultation paper, that the cumulative ceilings over a 3 year period provides a good further incentive for achieving business growth.

2. Do you agree with the Government's proposal of re-basing floors for authorities who fail to gain money under LABGI?

The Council supports this proposal.

3. Do you agree with the Government proposals on the technicalities of the scheme?

As the Council is a unitary authority, the proposed technicalities do not apply. It is understood, however, that both Sigoma and CIPFA support the proposals.

4. Do you agree with the proposal to administer the scheme as a single payment in the final quarter of each financial year?

The Council took part in the administrative dry run and believes that this is the best way for payments to be made. This is due to the fluctuations in rateable value which take place during the year, and

if it was paid incrementally, these fluctuations could result in money having to be re-paid.

### Notes:

1. Based on 2004/05 figures for the FSS, it is estimated that RMBC's ceiling based on total FSS would be £8.8m. This means that RMBC would be able to keep 70% of increase in revenue from business rates, between the floor and £8.8m. Anything exceeding this would go to the Central Business Rate Pool. Based on the modified EPCS FSS, this ceiling reduces dramatically to £1.6m. Therefore if RMBC was to generate an increase in revenue of £2m (after scaling), RMBC would keep £1.6m of this, with the remaining £0.4m going to the central pool. In the first year of the scheme, however, based on current figures, it is unlikely that the Council will achieve a growth figure of £2m. The cumulative ceilings proposal means that in years 2 and 3 when RMBC is likely to realise greater growth rates as regeneration projects come on stream, the ceilings will also increase.
2. The current position for RMBC of negative growth in revenue, means that the Council would fail to achieve its floor level of zero. Therefore, the proposal to allow such authorities to re-base their floors could be potentially beneficial to RMBC.
3. The technicalities of the scheme relate to the two tier system of calculating ceiling levels for two tier authorities. This does not apply to RMBC as it is a unitary authority.
4. The single payment system prevents any situations of having to pay back into the central pot. This could happen with incremental payments i.e. a high growth rate early in the year would result in a payment to the authority, but a large closure of a company later in the year could mean a net loss and money having to be repaid then. A single payment in the last quarter would avoid this happening.

**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS**

1.	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Economic and Development Services</b>
2.	<b>Date:</b>	<b>18 October 2004</b>
3.	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Town Centre, drunken pedestrian accidents – Beer mat campaign Ward 2 – Boston Castle</b>
4.	<b>Programme Area:</b>	<b>Economic and Development Services</b>

**5. Summary**

To report a proposal to conduct a publicity campaign to highlight to town centre drinkers the dangers of drunken walking.

**6. Recommendations**

**The proposed publicity campaign be supported.**

**The scheme be funded from the LTP Integrated Transport Programme for 2004/2005.**



## **7. Proposals and Details**

As part of the Local Public Service Agreement the Council have negotiated 12 stretching targets to improve performance. One of these targets is to achieve the planned reduction in the number of people, including children, killed or seriously injured on Rotherham's roads one year before the target year of 2006. A publicity campaign is one of the six key activities to be undertaken over the life of this Local Public Service Agreement.

During the three year period between 1 June 2001 and 31 May 2004, there were 25 injury accidents on Main Street, resulting in 32 personal injuries, two of which were serious. Of these injury accidents thirteen involved drunken pedestrians being hit by vehicles. Men were injured in twelve of these thirteen injury crashes.

The use of engineering measures to treat a drunken pedestrian problem is very limited and usually involves segregating cars and pedestrians. Given the nature of Main Street such a scheme would be difficult to implement. The only other way to treat this sort of problem is through a publicity campaign. A beer mat and poster campaign has been devised to target young male drinkers to inform them of the possible consequences of drunk walking. Details are attached as Appendix A and B.

It is intended to launch this campaign in late November early December when the number of town centre drinkers increases in the run up to Christmas. The beer mats and posters would be placed in around twenty town centre pubs and bars.

## **8. Finance**

The scheme is estimated to cost approximately £3,500 funding is available from the Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Capital Programme for 2004/2005.

## **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

None

## **10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

The proposed scheme would be in line with objectives set out in the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan, in conjunction with Council's Road Safety and Speed Management strategies, for improving road safety.

## **11. Background Papers and Consultation**

Appendix A - proposed beer mat

Appendix B - proposed poster

**Contact Name :** *Matthew Lowe, Assistant Engineer, Ext. 2380,  
matthew.lowe@rotherham.gov.uk*

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

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Economic and Development Services</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>18 October 2004</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Proposed mini roundabouts, speed limit reduction and traffic calming – Barnsley Road, Wath. Ward 7 - Hooper</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Programme Area:</b>	<b>Economic and Development Services</b>

**5. Summary**

To report a proposal to construct a double mini roundabout at the junction of the B6273 Pontefract Road with Wath Rd and Barnsley Road, a mini roundabout at the junction of the B6097 Melton High Street with Barnsley Road and the B6097 West Street and traffic calm Barnsley Road using speed cushions with a reduction in speed limit to 30mph from 40mph.

**6. Recommendations**

**The necessary consultations are undertaken regarding the proposal**

**Detailed design be carried out and subject to no objections being received the scheme is implemented**

**The scheme be funded from the LTP Integrated Transport Programme for 2004/2005.**

---

## **7. Proposals and Details**

An improvement to the junction of the B6273 Pontefract Road with Wath Rd and Barnsley Road was identified as a Local Safety Scheme for investigation in 2002. This was the subject of a report to Members on 30 September 2002, minute 195 refers and already has Member approval. It was progressed to the preliminary design stage in 2003 after which was suspended until the sector assessment for the Wath sector was complete.

Road safety and traffic related problems in the Wath areas have been identified and assessed. A ranked list of possible schemes has been produced and is attached as Appendix A. All schemes scoring 10 or above on the list were selected for further investigation. Of these schemes only two were considered suitable for implementation when considering how they would meet the objectives of the LTP and the related road safety, speed management, cycling and walking strategies.

It is proposed to combine these two schemes and the local safety scheme to produce one scheme that treats Barnsley Road from its junction with the B6097 Melton High Street to the junction with the B6273 Pontefract Road. The proposed scheme is shown on drawing number 129/0409/SK/01 attached as Appendix B

## **8. Finance**

The scheme is expected to cost £130,000. Funding is available from the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan for 2004/05.

## **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

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

## **10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

The proposed scheme would be in line with objectives set out in the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan, in conjunction with Council's Road Safety and Speed Management strategies, for improving road safety.

## **11. Background Papers and Consultation**

A copy of the ranked list of possible schemes is attached as Appendix A  
A copy of drawing number 129/0409/SK/01 is attached as Appendix B

**Contact Name :** *Matthew Lowe, Assistant Engineer, Ext. 2380,  
matthew.lowe@rotherham.gov.uk*

---

## APPENDIX A

### Wath and Swinton Sector Identified Problems

Location	Description	Comments	Score
Sandygate, Wath	Speed of traffic and request for crossing at Wath end	Scheme already implemented. Fixed and mobile speed camera route.	14
Fitzwilliam Street and Avenue, Wath	Speed of vehicles and parking	Concentrating on distributor roads. For consideration in a future LTP.	13
Brampton Road, West Melton	Speed of vehicles and parking	Concentrating on distributor roads. For consideration in a future LTP.	12
Coronation Road, Wath	Request for Traffic Calming (Petition)	Concentrating on distributor roads. For consideration in a future LTP.	12
Cemetery Road, Wath	Speed of traffic parking and crossing facilities	Concentrating on distributor roads. For consideration in a future LTP.	12
Festival Road, Wath	Request for traffic calming and look into parking problem and Zig Zag markings near to School	Festival Road will change as part of redevelopment of Wath Comprehensive. No Works proposed.	12
Melton Green, West Melton	Rat running traffic calming and crossing facilities	Concentrating on distributor roads. For consideration in a future LTP.	12
Barnsley Road, Wath	Request for traffic calming reduction in speed limit and crossing facilities	Several existing islands towards Wath end.	10
Manvers Way	Provision of bus stop hard standings (Barnsley Bound)	No bus route using Manvers Way.	10
Junction B6097 Melton High St with West St/Barnsley Road	Mini roundabout or traffic signals	Mini roundabout proposed due to scheme cost.	10
Junction of Sandygate/Festival Rd/Burman Road, Wath	Request for traffic lights		10
Chestnut Avenue, Wath	Request for traffic calming		9
Knollbeck Avenue Housing Estate	Request for 20mph zone		9
Manor Road, Brampton	Request for traffic calming	Possible rat run to avoid crossroads by	9

## APPENDIX A

Location	Description	Comments	Score
		town hall.	
Junction of B6097 High Melton St with Barnsley Rd, Wath	Request for Traffic Lights	Crossing does not stand out, markings indistinct.	9
Melton High Street, West Melton	Speed of traffic and parking problems		9
Quarry Hill Road, Wath	Request for traffic calming		9
Doncaster Road junction with Sandygate entrance to Woodgate Surgery	Request for measures to avoid right turn conflict		8
Doncaster Road, Wath	Request for parking and crossing	Assuming Biscay Way end.	8
Gipsy Green Lane, Wath	Footway Alterations and hedge trimming		7
Brampton/Wath/West Melton in general	Request for crossing facilities	Difficult to assess, main problems should have come out as individual sites.	7
Manor Rd, Brampton	Visibility	SLOW marking and junction warning sign.	6
Wentworth Road between Blackamoor Rd and Warren Vale	New footway	Already wide verge, lots of people walking.	5
Derwent Way junction with Pontefract Rd,	Poor visibility	Yes, scrappy hedge blocks the view. Could be taken down.	5
Packman Road, West Melton	Traffic calming Request	Can't use vertical calming on main route.	5
Oak Road Wath	Traffic Calming request		4
Mill Lane jn with Packman Lane, Brampton	Visibility	Difficult to do anything here would involve land take to improve visibility. May encourage more use of route.	3

Last Updated ML 29 Oct 2004

**ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS**

1.	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES</b>
2.	<b>Date:</b>	<b>18 October 2004</b>
3.	<b>Title:</b>	<b>WINTER SERVICE : 2004/05</b>
4.	<b>Programme Area:</b>	<b>ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES</b>

**5. Summary**

The report considers the change in statutory duty relating to highway maintenance due to amendment of Highways Act 1980 by Section 111 of the Railways and Transport Safety Act 2003, and proposes amendments to the existing Winter Maintenance Policy.

**6. Recommendations**

**That it be resolved that the Statement of Winter Maintenance Policy presented with the report be adopted as the basis for future Winter Services by the Council.**

---

## **7. Proposals and Details**

In a landmark ruling of the House of Lords, published in June 2000 (*Goodes v East Sussex County Council*) the Law Lords held that a highway authority's duty under section 41(1) of the Highways Act 1980, to keep the fabric of the highway in a good state of repair so as to render it safe for ordinary traffic at all seasons of the year, did not include a duty to prevent or remove the formation or accumulation of ice and snow on the road.

Parliament addressed the loophole so created by including a section (111) in the Railways and Transport Safety Act 2003 that amended section 41(1) of the Highways Act 1980. The amended section states "In particular, a Highway Authority are under a duty to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable that safe passage along a highway is not endangered by snow and ice".

The significance of the amendment to the Highways Act rests in the use of the word "highway" which applies the duty to all highway surfaces including footways and cycleways.

Due to the greater element of potential risk to highway users occasioned by frost, snow or ice on carriageway surfaces precautionary treatment has traditionally been targeted towards the salting of roads. Our current schedule of salting routes totals 320 miles (46% of all maintained roads) and includes all main traffic routes, public transport routes and roads linking rural communities.

In light of the legislative change an evaluation has been undertaken on the practicality for pre-treatment of our busiest sections of footway. Due to the nature of the borough these tend to be of limited lengths and widely dispersed geographically. Any route devised to treat these footway lengths would be very inefficient (a list of these footways is attached as an appendix to the report). This is not, however, the case with Rotherham Town Centre footways where the close cluster of high usage footways in and around the centre allows for a reasonably efficient operation to be mounted.

It should be noted that because highway surface temperatures tend to be significantly higher in the town centre different criteria to those applying to carriageway treatment will be used to decide when the footways are to be treated.

In order to address potential problems due to frost, ice or snow on the outlying footway sections additional salt bins will be provided for use by cleansing personnel on lengthman routes and by traders and other members of the public. In addition the list of sites is included within the operational manual for Winter Services and these footways will be treated as a priority during any responsive action undertaken.

The Stand-by period for Winter Services commences on 8 November 2004.

## **8. Finance**

Winter Services are financed from the Streetpride Revenue Account. Additional precautionary action treating footways within Rotherham Town Centre and its

environs on appropriate occasions during the winter period will increase expenditure on winter services that will need to be contained within this account.

## **9. Risks and Uncertainties**

It is worth noting in the Encyclopaedia of Highways Law Vol 1 that the annotated notes to Subs. 1(A) state in part *"This is not an absolute duty but is governed by reasonable practicality and it is specifically aimed at ensuring safe passage. As this provision is separate from the duty to maintain the highway it would appear that the statutory defences in S.58 are not applicable. The local highway authority would simply have to demonstrate that it had acted within the bounds of reasonable practicality."*

The legislation is relatively new and what the courts may perceive as "reasonably practicable" in regard to the treatment of footway surfaces has yet to be tested. Future case law may require a re-evaluation of the policy proposed.

## **10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

The Winter Service aims to provide for the safe and free movement of traffic on Rotherham's highway network assisting businesses by protecting the continued movement of goods and ensuring that public transport can provide alternative travel options during periods of adverse weather.

## **11. Background Papers and Consultation**

Highways Act 1980

Railways and Transport Safety Act 2003

*Goodes v East Sussex CC*, House of Lords June 2000

SYLTE are consulted annually about any changes relating to public transport routes.

Reciprocal arrangements exist with all adjacent authorities for salting action on cross boundary routes.

**Contact Name** : *Robert Stock, Streetpride Network Principal Engineer, telephone ext. 2928, e-mail bob.stock@rotherham.gov.uk*



**ROTHERHAM METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**STREETPRIDE SERVICE**

**STATEMENT OF WINTER MAINTENANCE POLICY**

Precautionary salting shall be carried out when ice formation on the highway can be reasonably anticipated from the daily Meteorological Office reports and data from the Icelert stations. The network of roads to be treated will only include roads important to the free flow of traffic, e.g. Principal roads, other well used classified roads, bus routes, and access roads to hospitals and fire stations. Treatment will normally be completed prior to the morning rush hour. Where action is deemed necessary in Rotherham Town Centre, on pedestrianised areas and footways, this will be undertaken before the morning rush hour.

When conditions of laying snow pertain, then snow ploughing and associated salting will be undertaken with routes being cleared in the order of their traffic importance. Once the Priority Network of roads is clear then secondary action will be undertaken on more minor routes with the priorities for action being those areas where people are most at risk, e.g. sheltered housing, footways near hospitals, schools, etc. Available resources will be distributed evenly across twelve geographical zones.

Because of the geographical nature of the Borough the busier pedestrian routes are widely spread in the outlying townships. Because of this it is not practicable to pre-treat these footways. Where appropriate salt bins will be provided in these areas and the footways will be treated as a priority during secondary action.

Salt bins will be provided and maintained for the "self-help" of highway users at sites which are known to be trouble spots not covered by salting routes or at very steep locations on the salting routes.

All Winter action will be confined to highways maintainable at public expense and those highways which are to become maintainable.

**Footways - Groups 1 and 2 (August 04)**

	District	Ward
Ryton Road (Main Street to Worksop Road)	Anston	1
Lodge Lane (Worksop Road to Hepworth Drive)	Aston	6
Worksop Road (Church Lane to Aughton Lane)	Aston	6
Worksop Road (Aughton Lane to Lodge Lane)	Aston	6
Cross Street (Main Street to Bawtry Road)	Bramley	20
Flanderwell Lane (The Crescent W to Brook Lane)	Bramley	20
Main Street (Flanderwell Lane to Cross Street)	Bramley	20
Doe Quarry Lane (Outgang Lane to Howard Street)	Dinnington	4
Laughton Road (Breck Lane to New Road)	Dinnington	4
Lordens Hill (New Street to Clarence Street)	Dinnington	4
New Road (Laughton Road to Nursery Road)	Dinnington	4
New Street (Laughton Road to Addison Square)	Dinnington	4
Doncaster Road (Middle Lane to Far Lane)	East Dene	12
Fitzwilliam Road (St Ann's Road to Doncaster Rd slip rd)	East Dene	12
Middle Lane (Badsley Moor Lane to Doncaster Rd)	East Dene	12
Munsbrough Rise (Fenton Road to Munsbrough Lane)	Greasbrough	21
Potter Hill (Coach Road to Munsbrough Lane)	Greasbrough	21
Union Street (Northlands to South Farm Avenue)	Harthill	18
Winney Hill (Union Street to Crescent)	Harthill	18
Chaucer Road (Middle Lane South to Dryden Road)	Herringthorpe	17
Herringthorpe Valley Road (Wickersley Rd to Far Lane)	Herringthorpe	17
Middle Lane South (Dryden Road to Wickersley Rd)	Herringthorpe	17
Church Street (High Street to Ewers Road)	Kimberworth	13
High Street (Fellowsfield Way to Meadowhall Road)	Kimberworth	13
Kimberworth Road (Ewers Rd to Charnwood Grove)	Kimberworth	13
Kimberworth Park Road (Rhodes Avenue to Morley Rd)	Kimberworth Park	13
Hooton Road (Wharf Road to Noblethorpe Rd)	Kilnhurst	14
Victoria Street (Wentworth Road to Wharf Road)	Kilnhurst	14
Wentworth Road (Highthorne Road to Victoria Street)	Kilnhurst	14
Chestnut Avenue (Wales Road to end of cul de sac)	Kiveton	18
Station Road (Kiveton Lane to Wales Road)	Kiveton	18
Wales Road (Station Road to Chestnut Avenue)	Kiveton	18
Braithwell Road (High Street to Lily Hall Road)	Maltby	9
Grange Lane (High Street to Dunns Dale)	Maltby	9
High Street (Blyth Road to Muglet Lane)	Maltby	9
Muglet Lane (High Street to Morrell Street)	Maltby	9
Rotherham Road (Cliff Hill to Blyth Road)	Maltby	9
Coronation Bridge (Masbrough Street to Ferham Rd)	Masbrough	13
Ferham Road (Coronation Bridge to Ferham Park Ave)	Masbrough	13
Masbrough Street (Centenary Way to Coronation Bridge)	Masbrough	13
Broad Street (Rawmarsh Hill to Great Eastern Way)	Parkgate	10
Bellows Road (Dale Road to High Street)	Rawmarsh	10
Blyth Avenue (Dale Road to High Street)	Rawmarsh	10
Dale Road (Blyth Avenue to Warren Vale Road)	Rawmarsh	10
Dale Road (Blyth Avenue to Bellows Rd) (unclassified)	Rawmarsh	10
Haugh Road (Green Rise to Blyth Avenue)	Rawmarsh	10
High Street (Blyth Avenue to Rawmarsh Hill)	Rawmarsh	10

Kilnhurst Road (Dale Road to St Nicholas Road)	Rawmarsh	10
Monkwood Road (Middle Avenue to Estate Road)	Rawmarsh	10
Rawmarsh Hill (High Street to Broad Street)	Rawmarsh	10
All Saints Sq (Bridgeway-Effingham St-Upper Millgate-College St)	Rotherham	2
Bridgeway (Frederick Street to the end)	Rotherham	2
College Street (Effingham Street to High Street)	Rotherham	2
Corporation Street (Frederick Street to Market Street)	Rotherham	2
Domine Lane (Market Street to Corporation Street)	Rotherham	2
Doncaster Gate (Wellgate to Catherine Street)	Rotherham	2
Doncaster Road (Catherine Street to Clifton Lane)	Rotherham	2
Effingham Square (Frederick St to Drummond St)	Rotherham	2
Effingham Street (College Street to Effingham Square)	Rotherham	2
Frederick Street (Corporation Street to the end)	Rotherham	2
High Street (Moorgate Street to Wellgate)	Rotherham	2
Main Street (The Statutes to Westgate)	Rotherham	2
Market Place (Corporation Street to Church Street)	Rotherham	2
New Zealand (Bridgeway to the end)	Rotherham	2
Rawmarsh Road footpath (Rawmarsh Rd to the subway)	Rotherham	2
Vicarage Lane (College Street to the end)	Rotherham	2
Wellgate (Doncaster Gate to Hollowgate)	Rotherham	2
Westgate (Moorgate Street to Canklow Road)	Rotherham	2
High Street (Main Street to Nursery Road)	Swallownest	6
Main Street (Mansfield Road to Rotherham Road)	Swallownest	6
Park Street (High St to Main St to Rotherham Rd)	Swallownest	6
School Street (High Street to Rotherham Road)	Swallownest	6
Church Street (Queen Street to St Johns Road)	Swinton	16
East Avenue (Valley Road to end of cul de sac)	Swinton	16
Lime Grove (Carnoustie Close to Fitzwilliam Street)	Swinton	16
Piccadilly Road (Fitzwilliam Street to Valley Road)	Swinton	16
Rockingham Road (Warren Vale Rd to Broadway)	Swinton	16
South Avenue (Valley Road to East Avenue)	Swinton	16
Valley Road (Broadway to Brookside)	Swinton	16
Brook Hill (Sough Hall Road to New Street)	Thorpe Hesley	8
Upper Wortley Road (Eldertree Road to Lodge Lane)	Thorpe Hesley	8
Green Arbour Road (Woodhouse Green to School Rd)	Thurcroft	11
Katherine Street (Sandy Lane to Green Arbour Road)	Thurcroft	11
School Road (Green Arbour Rd to Recreation Ave)	Thurcroft	11
Burman Road (William Street to Sandygate)	Wath upon Dearne	19
Festival Road (Strump Cross Road to Sandygate)	Wath upon Dearne	19
Fitzwilliam Street (Church Street to Stump Cross Road)	Wath upon Dearne	19
High Street (Church Street to Dearneway)	Wath upon Dearne	19
Sandygate (Dearneway to Wath Wood Road)	Wath upon Dearne	19
Warehouse Lane (Biscay Way to Church Street)	Wath upon Dearne	19
West Street (Barnsley Road to Church Street)	Wath upon Dearne	19
West Street (unclassified) (West Street to Church Street)	Wath upon Dearne	19
Main Street (Cortworth Lane to Barrow Hill)	Wentworth	7
Melton High Street (Oak Lea Avenue to West Street)	West Melton	7
Oak Lea Avenue (Stokewell Rd to Melton High Street)	West Melton	7

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

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