

## **CABINET MEMBER FOR ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

<b>Venue:</b>	<b>3rd Floor conference room, Bailey House, Rawmarsh Road, Rotherham</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>Friday, 19 November 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. Opening of Tenders. (report attached) (Page 1)
  - to note the action of the Cabinet Member.
4. Minutes of meeting of the RMBC Leisure/Joint Service Centre Project Board held on 4th November, 2004. (copy attached) (Pages 2 - 3)
5. Petition - Request for the speed limit through Ravenfield Crossroads to be reduced. (report attached) (Pages 4 - 5)  
Schemes and Partnerships Manager to report.
  - to report receipt of a petition and notes of a site meeting.(Please note: Appendix A and Appendix B to this report will be provided separately)
6. Economic and Development Services: Performance Indicator Quarter 2 Results. (report attached) (Pages 6 - 27)  
Best Value Support Officer to report.
  - to report on performance issues that have been identified.
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 those paragraphs, indicated below, of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972:-
8. RiDO Business Development Team 6 month report. (report attached) (Pages 28 - 42)  
Business Development Manager to report.
  - to report the activity and performance of the RiDO Business Development Team for the period April to September 2004.(Exempt under Paragraph 9 of the Act – report relates to negotiations for contracts for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services)



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

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

**2. DATE: 19<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER, 2004**

**3. OPENING OF TENDERS**

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

on 8<sup>th</sup> November, 2004, for the following :-

- Supply and Installation of Traffic Signal Equipment and Controllers

**4. RECOMMENDATION**

That the action of the Cabinet Member be recorded.

**RMBC LEISURE/JOINT SERVICE CENTRE PROJECT BOARD**  
**4<sup>th</sup> November, 2004**

**Present:-**

Councillor Georgina Boyes	Cabinet Member, Education, Culture and Leisure Services <b>(in the Chair)</b>
Derrick Connolly	Capital Project Development Manager, Culture, Leisure and Lifelong Learning
Tony Preston	Business Development Manager, Education, Culture and Leisure Services
Peter Ross	Consultant
Graham Sinclair	Acting Strategic Leader, Resources and Information, Education, Culture and Leisure Services
Adam Wilkinson	Executive Director, Economic and Development Services

**Apologies for Absence:-**

Kath Atkinson	Director of Strategic Planning and Development, Primary Care Trust
Andrew Bedford	Executive Director, Education, Culture and Leisure Services
Councillor G. Smith	Cabinet Member, Economic and Development Services

**50/04 Minutes of Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the previous meeting of this Project Board held on 14<sup>th</sup> October, 2004, were agreed as a correct record.

**51/04 General Progress Report****Programme Update**

Graham Sinclair reported on discussions that had taken place since the last meeting. Consideration had been given to two options (removal of the St. Ann's scheme from the project and the splitting of the bid between construction contract and leisure management) and were currently not recommended for implementation.

The proposed option combined the remaining options previously identified but more work was necessary in order to prepare:-

- 'Priorities and Parameters' checklist
- Benchmarking mechanism
- Reviewing the outline business case

This meant a delay in issuing the ITN, now scheduled for 12<sup>th</sup> January, 2005. This should not cause an overall delay in the programme as the extra work undertaken would mean that the evaluation and negotiation periods could be concluded more speedily. The extra work also:-

- Allowed the maximum possible opportunity to achieve two full bidders
- Allowed an opportunity to continue to pursue the 'Two Bidders/One Bank' option
- Provided safeguards to enable progression with the 'One Consortium' option if necessary

Before the release of the ITN, the list of key issues for the Council had to be prepared, issued and responses received. This would form part of the pre-qualification process. Additionally, there would be tests to be undertaken which would now include acceptance of the existence of the indicators and preparation of the bench marking information (statistical and financial), to be issued with the ITN on the 12<sup>th</sup> January. Bidders then had 3 months to respond followed by 55 days for the Council's evaluation and subsequently 105 days for negotiation. The Council would be looking to a declaration of the potential partner in June, 2005 followed by detailed negotiation and a start on site in October, 2005.

It was proposed that a meeting be convened of the Leader, Cabinet Members for Education, Culture and Leisure Services and Economic and Development Services and the Chief Executive to appraise them of the current situation and the proposed option with a report being submitted to the 22<sup>nd</sup> December meeting of the Cabinet.

**52/04 Any Other Business**

There was no other business.

**53/04 Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the Project Board would take place at the Town Hall, Moorgate Street, Rotherham, on Thursday, 2<sup>nd</sup> December, 2004, commencing at 8.30 a.m.

<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>19 November 2004</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Petition – Request for the speed limit through Ravenfield Crossroads to be reduced; Ward 14</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Programme Area:</b>	<b>Economic and Development Services</b>

**5. Summary**

To report the receipt of a petition, requesting the speed limit on roads approaching Ravenfield Crossroads be reviewed and reduced, speed warning lights to be installed in the village, and for the crossroads to be signalised or converted to a roundabout.

The report also includes the notes of a site meeting to discuss road safety and traffic issues in Ravenfield.

**6. Recommendations**

**It be resolved that:**

- i) Investigations be undertaken to look into the possibility of reducing the existing 40mph speed limit to 30mph, on all roads approaching Ravenfield crossroads, and to report the findings to Members;**
  - ii) Investigations be undertaken into improving road safety at Ravenfield Crossroads and outside the school;**
  - iii) The petitioner be informed of the proposed investigations;**
  - iv) The outcome of the site meeting be noted.**
-

**7. Proposals and Details**

It is proposed to investigate a reduction of the speed limit on all roads approaching Ravenfield Crossroads from 40mph to 30mph, together with investigating road safety improvements at Ravenfield crossroads and outside the school.

**8. Finance**

Funding for any works identified will be available from the LTP Integrated Transport Programme for 2005/06.

**9. Risks and Uncertainties**

Not applicable in this instance.

**10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications**

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

**11. Background Papers and Consultation**

A 771–signature petition expressing concern about the traffic situation in Ravenfield has been received from Ravenfield Parish Council. In the petition they ask that the speed limit on all roads is reviewed and reduced; speed warning lights are situated in the village, particularly near the school; and that traffic lights or a roundabout are installed at the crossroads. A copy of the covering letter and first page of the petition are attached as Appendix A.

A copy of the minutes of the site meeting between Ravenfield Parish Council, Ward Members and officers from Rotherham's Streetpride Department is attached as Appendix B.

**Contact Name :** *Andrew Lee, Assistant Engineer, Ext. 2380,  
andrew.lee@rotherham.gov.uk*

---

1 page blank doc – Bus initiative



1 page blank doc – Bus initiative

## **Appendix B**

### **Ravenfield Traffic Issues – notes of a site meeting held on 18 October 2004, 8:15am**

Present:- Councillor Anne Russell, Councillor Pat Russell, Councillor Paddy Burke.

Together with representatives of Ravenfield Parish Council

And

Andy Pashley, Wentworth South Area Assembly Officer  
Richard Jackson, Streetpride Area Manager (Wentworth)  
Stuart Savage, Streetpride Highways and Traffic Group Section Engineer,  
Andrew Lee, Streetpride Highways and Traffic Group Assistant Engineer

### **Matters Arising**

The meeting was called by Ravenfield Parish Council and Ward Councillors to discuss concerns about road safety and traffic issues at Ravenfield cross-roads and outside the school on Moor Lane North.

#### **Ravenfield cross-roads**

The number of accidents occurring at the junction since it was modified approximately 3 years ago was discussed along with possible reasons for this. It was felt that the modifications had improved the safety and ease with which pedestrians can cross the road. However, the speed of traffic on Moor Lane North/South had not been reduced and this was contributing to the number of accidents involving vehicles turning into/out of Braithwell Road and Hollings Lane. Another contributory factor is vehicles parking on the area of land on the corner of Moor Lane North/Braithwell Road (outside the garage) obstructing visibility for vehicles emerging from the side road.

Possible solutions for reducing the speed of vehicles were discussed ranging from reducing the speed limit to 30 mph to introduction of vehicle activated electronic signs. It was pointed out that the police would not support the lowering of the speed limit without the introduction of supporting traffic calming measures such as speed cushions.

Resolved:- (i) That the provision of bollards be investigated to prevent parking on the area of land on the corner of Moor Lane North/Braithwell Road.

(ii) Solutions be investigated to reduce the speed of traffic and improve road safety at the junction and the outcome be reported back to the Area Assembly/Parish Council/Ward Members.

Moor Lane North outside Ravenfield school

Observations were made of the traffic situation outside the school at the time when parents were dropping off their children. It was noted that the footpath from Ravenfield cross-roads to the school is narrow and does not encourage parents to walk to school with their children. This results in parents driving to the school and creating parking/congestion problems.

A suggestion was made to introduce a part time 20 mph speed limit outside the school during arriving/leaving times. However, it was thought this would have little effect as the presence of parked cars at these times means that vehicles are already travelling slowly. It was agreed to look into other possible improvements although it was considered these were limited in scope. It was mentioned that it is already intended to renew the school sign triangles on the carriageway on each approach to the school although this may have to wait until next spring as it is not advisable to apply these markings when the road surface is wet/damp/covered in salt.

The number of HGVs travelling on Moor Lane North/South was noted. In view of the area wide environmental weight restriction in the Ravenfield area which includes these roads Streetpride officers will contact the police to ask them to take action to discourage HGVs using these roads.

Resolved:- (i) Options for improving road safety outside the school be investigated and the outcome be reported back to the Area Assembly/Parish Council/Ward Members.

(ii) South Yorkshire Police be asked to take action to discourage the use of Moor Lane North/South by HGVs.

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

<b>1.</b>	<b>Meeting:</b>	<b>Delegated Powers Meeting</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>19 November 2004</b>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Title:</b>	<b>Performance Indicators 2 nd quarter results April to September 2004/2005 All Wards are affected.</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Programme Area:</b>	<b>Economic and Development Services</b>

**5. Summary**

To ensure continuous improvement of their services the Council has introduced a system of quarterly reporting of performance indicators set against agreed targets and priorities of the Community, Members and senior managers.

**6. Recommendations**

**It is resolved that: -**

- a) **The Cabinet Member considers the position of the results with comparison to targets.**
- b) **The performance indicator second quarter results for 2004/2005 are noted.**

## 7. Proposals and Details

Performance indicators have been colour coded in order that reporting issues can be more focused and, where necessary, are addressed with explanations and improvement plans by the PI owners.

The performance indicator table layout has changed to facilitate a Corporate approach to reporting across the programme areas.

Please read the tables as follows: -

- In the **fixed** column, data for the quarter only is included.
  - In the **cumulative** column, data for the year, up to the end of the quarter.
  - In the **year-end target and projected outturn** column, changes to the set target are shown in brackets.
  - In the “**on target ✓ or X**” column, considers performance so far, and will the year-end target be met?
  - In the **rating** column, entries are in “red”, “amber”, or “green”.
- 
- **Green means the result is on target and unless there are future issues no further comments are necessary.**
  - **Amber indicates the result is within +/- 5% of the target and issues need to be explained also how the target can be achieved. Indicators are:- BV 99; LPI 14; LPI 15 and LPI 22.**
  - **Red means that the performance results have missed the target and we are in a high-risk situation. An explanation of what has caused the result and what the improvement plans are to remedy the situation is provided in the text. Indicators are:- BV 99 ksi a) ksi c) si d); Stats 19; New BV 99, BV 106; BV 156; LPI 7; LPI 12; LPI 14 and LPI 31.**

New crosscutting performance indicators have been established and quarter two results are contained in the report.

They include: -

- Emergency Planning LPI 9; LPI 10 and LPI 11.
- Health and Safety LPI 29 and LPI 30.
- Asset Management LPI 35 and LPI 37.

Please note that Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) and Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA) performance indicators have been identified.

They are: -

CPA BV 96; BV 97; BV 99; BV 100; BV 106; BV 109; BV 156; BV 165; BV 178; BV 180; BV 186; BV 187; LPI 13 and LPI 32.  
LPSA BV96; BV 109; STATS 19 (BV 99) and LPI 1.

The second quarter results show the following performance indicators in the red position :-

CPA: - BV 99; BV 106 and BV 156  
LPSA: - STATS 19 (BV 99).

	Green	Amber	Red	Total
CPA No	11		3	14
CPA %	79%		21%	100%
LPSA No	3		1	4
LPSA %	75%		25%	100%
All PI's No	51	6	10	67
All PI's %	76%	9%	15%	100%

## 8. Finance

Financial support for the indicators comes from set budgets, Local Transport Plan (LTP), Single Regeneration Budget (SRB), Objective 1 and in the case of LPSA performance indicators through Government match funding. A small percentage of indicators attract incoming subscriptions.

## 9. Risks and Uncertainties

Performance Management is key to the effective delivery and provision of services. It is also a specific area within the CPA framework and will be a significant feature for 2005 onwards.

Financial support plays a major part in ensuring that indicators achieve their targets, including: -

- Budget, for operational support and schemes.
- Grants, SRB, LTP, and Objective 1.
- LPSA funding BV 96, BV 99 (stats 19), BV 109
- Planning Support Grant.

## 10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Links to the Political Priorities are: -

- Investing in the Economy BV 96, BV 97, BV 100, BV 103, BV 104, BV 106, BV 109, BV 180, BV 186, BV 187, BV 200, BV 204, LPI 1, LPI 2
- A Place which Cares BV 165
- A Place to Live BV 199, LPI 3, LPI 4, LPI 4
- A Place for Enjoyment BV 178
- A Place for Everyone BV 156 BV 99, Stats 19, P2b, LPI 4, LPI 7, LPI 8, LPI 9, LPI 10, LPI 11, LPI12.
- A Quality Service Provider BV 179, LPI 13, BV 205, LPI14, LPI15, LPI 17, LPI 18, LPI19, LPI20 LPI21, LPI22, LPI23, LPI 24, LPI 25, LPI 26, LPI 27, LPI 28, LPI 29, LPI 30, LPI 31.
- A Quality Service Provider (Cost Based) LPI 32, LP1 33, LPI 34, LPI 35, LPI 36, LPI 37.

The performance information contained within this report has been presented to the Programme Area Management Team and analysed in accordance with the Council's Corporate Priorities. The information features CPA, LPSA and Corporate Plan PI's

**11. Background Papers and Consultation**





Report Includes: -

Appendix A, EDS Quarterly (2) Performance Report April to September 2004/05





**Contact Name:**

**Alan Platt  
Best Value Officer  
Telephone 2901  
[Alan.platt@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:Alan.platt@rotherham.gov.uk)**



**Economic and Development Services**


No	Definition	Links	02/03 Top Quartile	03/04 Actual	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr		2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr		3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr		4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr		Year End Target (Proj. Outturn)	On Target ✓ or ✗	Rating	Action Plan	Comments
					FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.					
<b>Corporate Priority – Investing In The Economy</b>																	
BV 96	Condition of principal roads New Definition 04/05 Condition of principal roads by the TRACS (mechanised survey technique) The % of the principal road network (A roads) in need of major strengthening. Method – deflectographs	CPA LPSA (CE)		10.75%	10.35%		10.33%						10.0% (10.0%)	✓	Green		Continuing progress evident. On Target. Now takes account of network changes at Manvers. TTS has been reordered from Babtie who have the SY survey programmed for mid-Feb 2005
BV 97	Condition of non-principal roads (a) Non-principal classified roads	CPA		14.24%	12.69%		11.24%						13.9% (13.9%)	✓	Green		Quarterly variance can be anticipated due to condition of individual roads treated. Step down due to last years programme being zeroed back. Ahead of target.
	(b) Based on proportion of the unclassified road network	CPA		11.53%	11.11%		11.05%						11.2%	✓	Green		Four year cycle now includes 81% of network surveyed. Closing in on upper quartile performance. On Target
BV 100	Number of days of temporary traffic controls or road closures on traffic sensitive roads caused by road works per km of traffic sensitive road	CPA		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.02 (0.02)	✓	Green		So far no road closures during traffic sensitive times. The projection has been set at 0.02 to cope with emergencies.




No	Definition	Links	02/03 Top Quartile	03/04 Actual	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr		2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr		3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr		4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr		Year End Target (Proj. Outturn)	On Target ✓ or ✗	Rating	Action Plan	Comments	
					FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.						
BV 106	% of new homes built on previously developed land	CPA		53%	47% Amended	36%	42%						60% not provided	X	Red		Critical Areas: Outstanding planning permissions on Greenfield sites still to be complete will continue to influence the target. Improvement Plans; Completion of the Urban Potential study and review of housing policies in the UDP/LDP review will allow a reassessment of allocations Measures are being put in place to address performance in the major category, such as monthly progress meetings on major applications, the introduction of a house builder's focus group to encourage pre-application discussion, and introduction of standard templates for Section 106 agreements.	
BV 109	% of planning applications determined in line with the Government's new development control targets to determine:	LPSA (CE)																
	(a) 60% of major applications in 13 weeks;	CPA		55.26%		56.25%	60.53%						60% (60%)	✓	Green		On target	
	(b) 65% of minor applications in 8 weeks; and	CPA		54.50%		70.45%	71.94%						60% (60%)	✓	Green		On target	
	(c) 80% of other applications in 8 weeks	CPA		79.77%		89.86%	89.62%						80% (80%)	✓	Green		On target	

No	Definition	Links	02/03 Top Quartile	03/04 Actual	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr		2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr		3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr		4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr		Year End Target (Proj. Outturn)	On Target ✓ or ✗	Rating	Action Plan	Comments
					FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.					
BV 180	The energy consumption/m2 of local authority operational property, compared with comparable buildings in the UK as a whole (a)  (i) Electricity	CPA		103%	63%	14%	77%						98% (93)	✓	Green	😊	This indicator will be revised by the Government (Defra).  A revision of the method of reporting now means that the figure provided is a positional figure at the end of Q2 as opposed to a projected year end figure. Quarterly
	(ii) Fossil Fuels	CPA		161%	40%	21%	61%						153% (120%)	✓	Green	😊	
	(b) Average lamp circuit energy consumption for street lights, compared with the UK National Average	CPA		378 kwh/unit /yr											N/A		Annual
BV 186	Roads not needing major repair																
	Principal			68.78									69.1				
	Non Principal			319.32									325				

No	Definition	Links	02/03 Top Quartile	03/04 Actual	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr		2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr		3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr		4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr		Year End Target (Proj. Outturn)	On Target ✓ or ✗	Rating	Action Plan	Comments
					FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.					
BV 187	Condition of surface footway	CPA		42.96%	43.54%	43.54%		34.01%					40% (40%)	✓	Green		Network applicable to this indicator has been reviewed to ensure only appropriate sites are included.
BV 204	% of appeals allowed against the authority's decision to refuse planning applications			30%	27.27% (3/11 allowed 8 dismissed)		0% (0/2 allowed 2 dismissed)	23.07% (3/13 allowed, 10 dismissed)					28% (28%)	✓	Green		On Target.

No	Definition	Links	02/03 Top Quartile	03/04 Actual	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr		2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr		3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr		4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr		Year End Target (Proj. Outturn)	On Target ✓ or ✗	Rating	Action Plan	Comments
					FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.					
LPI 1	<p>Improve Rotherham's overall employment rate</p> <p>A) Reduce the gap between Rotherham and the national ave in terms of working age population in employment. (8 quarter average)</p> <p>*****</p> <p>B) The same indicator – measured by slightly different method. Baseline – Spring 02: 3.1% gap</p>	LPSA CP		2.4% (Aug)	<p><b>0.9%</b> (Mar -May 2004)</p> <p>*****</p> <p><b>0.2%</b> (Mar -May 2004)</p>	<p><b>0.3%</b> (Jun - Aug 2004)</p> <p>*****</p> <p><b>-0.9%</b> (Jun - Aug 2004)</p>							<p><b>2.3%</b></p> <p>*****</p> <p><b>2.6%</b></p>	<p>✓</p> <p>✓</p>	<p><b>Green</b></p> <p><b>Green</b></p>		<p>The LPSA target has been achieved.</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter comment:</b> Rotherham's has closed the gap and achieved the employment rate that is 0.9% higher than GB's. However this could be just a temporary variance due to a small sample size of the survey. Despite this the target A) will be reviewed at the year end for next year to reflect the success achieved; B) has been set for us by the government through the LPSA and therefore won't change.</p>

No	Definition	Links	02/03 Top Quartile	03/04 Actual	1 <sup>st</sup> Qtr		2 <sup>nd</sup> Qtr		3 <sup>rd</sup> Qtr		4 <sup>th</sup> Qtr		Year End Target (Proj. Outturn)	On Target ✓ or ✗	Rating	Action Plan	Comments
					FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.	FIXED	CULM.					
LPI 2	Economic Inactivity Rate			23.4%									23.2%	✓	Green		<p>Economic Inactivity rate is calculated as a % of working population. To reduce the variances rolling average over last 4 quarters is used. Rotherham's performance is improving, but is still behind the national level which stands long-term at around 21%.</p> <p>Council's Employability Group actions (see Comment in 'Local 18') are aimed also at the Economic Inactivity Issue</p> <p><b>2<sup>nd</sup> Q Comment:</b>  <b>There has been a great improvement (by almost 1%) in the inactivity rate. Such a fast decrease, however, could be just a temporary variance due to a small sample size of the survey. Despite that the target will be reviewed at the year end for next year to reflect the success achieved.</b></p>








Corporate Priority – A Place Which Cares															
BV 165	CPA	The % of pedestrian crossings with facilities for disabled people	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	97%	100% (100%)	✓	Green	😊	We have a total of 62 sites and two do not have tactile paving installed or audible/tactile signals they are; Tickhill Road/Grange Lane/Muglet Lane. Bawtry Road/ Cross Street/ Flash Lane
Corporate Priority – A Place To Live															
BV 199		The proportion of relevant land and highways as defined under Environment Agency Act (EPA) 1990 Part IV Section 86 (expressed as a percentage) that is assessed as having combined deposits of litter and detritus (e.g. sand, silt and other debris) across four categories of cleanliness (clean, light, significant, heavy)	81% (19% sites below category B)	86% (14% sites below category B)	89% (11% sites below category B)						82% (18 sites below category B) (85%)	✓	Green	😊	Results at this stage are above the Target and are based on 399 surveys out of the annual total of over 900
LPI 3		The percentage of highways that are either of a high or acceptable standard of cleanliness.	97%	94.6%	100%	95.7%					96.0% (96.0%)	✓	Green	😊	Results have improved during the 2 <sup>nd</sup> quarter as can be seen from the 2 <sup>nd</sup> quarter performance of 100%, lifting the overall result to 95.7%.
LPI 4		CO <sub>2</sub> emissions in tonnes of carbon dioxide per sq m. Operational prop + markets and public toilets.	0.1678 tonnes/m <sup>2</sup>	0.00188 tonnes/m <sup>2</sup>	0.00402 tonnes/m <sup>2</sup>	0.0059 tonnes/m <sup>2</sup>					0.1774 tonnes/m <sup>2</sup> (0.1678 tonnes/m <sup>2</sup> )	✓	Green	😊	Emissions are subject to seasonal fluctuation but we are confident that the target will be met.

LPI 5 ac-e2	Average time taken to remove fly-tips (days)		0.87	1.1						0.88	0.98						1.0 (1.0)	✓	Green	😊	The slippage in the 1 <sup>st</sup> quarter has now been turned around and the indicator is on target. <b>NB:</b> No Housing data available for 2 <sup>nd</sup> quarter.
<b>Corporate Priority – A Place For Enjoyment</b>																					
BV 178	The % of total length of footpaths and other rights of way which were easy to use by members of the public	CPA		93.4%	98.8%					98.5%	88.8%	98.8%	98.8%				93.6% (93.6%)	✓	Green	😊	Well towards the top end of upper quartile demonstrating continued good performance. Q1 performance is a seasonal reflection. Q2 only 1.7% of network surveyed of 43.5% total in first 6 months. On target.
<b>Corporate Priority – A Place For Everyone</b>																					
BV 156	The % of authority buildings open to the public in which all public areas are suitable for and accessible to disabled people	CPA		0%	0%					0%	0%						10% (10%)	✗	Red	☹️	Proposed access improvements to meet the target have been approved by CSART and design work is underway. £200k will be used to finance this years programme of building alterations, and we will achieve the 10% target in the time scale. Funding of at lease £200k/year has been approved for further improvement and to meet future targets.

Corporate Priority – A Safe Place														
Ex BV 99	Road safety.	LPSA	(2003)											
	Number of casualties per 100,000 population:												Although components of this indicator are currently red and amber we are confident that by year end all elements will meet their year end targets and become green	
	(1) Killed/seriously injured (KS).		51	14	14	28						X	Amber	☹️
	(2) Slight injuries.		477	110	106	216						✓	Green	😊
	Road user types:													
	(a) Pedestrians total.		61											
	Killed/seriously injured.	CPA	9	4.8	3.2	8						✓	Green	😊
	Slight injuries.	CPA	52	11.25	14.75	26						✓	Green	😊
	(b) Pedal cyclists.		23											
	Killed/seriously injured.	CPA	3	0.4	.6	1						✓	Green	😊
	Slight injuries.	CPA	20	2.8	4.2	7						✓	Green	😊
	(c) Two wheeled motor vehicle users.		31											
	Killed/seriously injured.	CPA	8	3	5	8						X	Red	☹️
	Slight injuries.	CPA	23	4	6	10						X	Amber	☹️
	(d) Car users.		382											



BV 99	Killed/seriously injured.	CPA	30				5.6	5.4	11										
	Slight injuries.	CPA	352				93.8	57.2	151										
	(e) Other vehicle users.		31																
	Killed/seriously injured.	CPA	1			0	0	0	0										
	Slight injuries.	CPA	30			0	22	22	22										
	New Definition – Number of road accident casualties broken down by nature of casualties.	LPSA	(2003)																
	All (KSI)		127			35	35	70	70										
	Children (KSI)		16			5	6	11	11										
	All Slight Injuries		1191			276	264	540	540										
LPI 6	People killed or seriously injured on the roads of Rotherham as measured by STATS 19	LPSA	<u>2003</u> 127			35	35	70	70										

LPI <b>7</b>	Number of serious casualties per 1,000,000 kilometres travelled by a vehicle on principal roads	0.185	0.054	.052	0.111														0.195 (0.194)	<b>X</b>	<b>Red</b>		As above for time period. Target 2004 amended to reflect variance in Principal Roads length and million vehicle KM denominator. All figures are provisional until year end.
LPI <b>8</b>	Average time taken to repair a street lighting fault (days)	3.29	3.23	2.95	3.08														3.0 (3.0)	<b>X</b>	<b>Green</b>		New systems of work now delivering improved performance to assist in achieving the target.
LPI <b>9</b>	Staff training for the Borough Emergency Plan.			100%	100%														100%	✓	<b>Green</b>		The response from course attendees satisfaction came out as good or very good.
LPI <b>10</b>	Preparedness – Ensure that the Programme Areas are prepared to respond to a major incident in accordance with the Borough Emergency Plan			100%	100%														100%	✓	<b>Green</b>		Response from the programme area indicates compliance with the programme.
LPI <b>11</b>	Assessment and preparations of the risks which would give rise to an emergency response (BEP).			100%	100%														100%	✓	<b>Green</b>		Risk assessments and hazards identified – recorded and actioned. N.B – LPI 24, 25 and 26 are in compliance with the Civil Contingencies Bill
LPI <b>12</b>	Percentage of street lamps not working as planned. (At any one time throughout the year.)	1.07%	1.06%	1.18%	1.12%														1.04% <b>(1.10%)</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Red</b>		Increase in number of faults reported as a result of Streetpride (30%) Also improved scouting procedures has increased number of faults identified
<b>Corporate Priority – A Quality Service Provider</b>																							
BV 179	The % of standard searches carried out in 10 working days	100%	99.95%	99.87%	99.69%														100% (100%)	✓	<b>Green</b>		.On target

LPI 13	The number of decisions delegated to officers as a % of all decisions	CPA		85%						92.13%	91.63%	91.87%						85% (85%)	✓	Green	😊	On target	
BV 205	Quality of Service Checklist (Planning)			1	Not provided													2 Not provided	N/A				NLIS (National Land Information Service) – Electronically submitted searches
LPI 14	Land Search breakdown:																						Solicitors are being encouraged to use NLIS for their land searches. Report submitted to Delegated Powers detailing strategy for increasing requests for NLIS Searches. LLC1 figures provide an indication of Personal Search Volumes.
	(a) Electronic searches			6.4%																			Problems with RBT PC refresh program are delaying move to NLIS Level 3 (Automatic Searches) Solicitors are being encouraged to use NLIS for their Searches. Report submitted to Delegated Powers detailing strategy for increasing requests for NLIS Searches. LLC1 (National Land Information Service)
	(b) manual searches			63.9%	59.8%	59.8%	59.8%	59.8%	59.8%	59.8%	56.5%	58.3%	55% (55%)	✓	Amber	😐							
	(c) LLC1 only searches			29.7%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	30%	33%	31.6%	30% (30%)	✓	Amber	😐							LLC1 figures provide an indication of Personal Search Volumes



LPI <b>20</b>	Percentage of chargeable inspections of undertaker's work achieved.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	✓	<b>Green</b>		On Target
LPI <b>21</b>	Total number of actionable defects on roads and pavements per 100 kilometres of network inspected.	118	110.5	78.8	97.7								120 (115)	✓	<b>Green</b>		Performance exceeds annual target.
LPI <b>22</b>	Average reception waiting time, sample one day per week; <b>With appointments</b> <b>Total Number</b> No attended in 10 minutes % of total visitors seen in 10 minutes <b>Without Appointments</b> <b>Total Number</b> No attended in 10 minutes % of total visitors seen in 10 minutes	229 226 99.25%	8 8 100%	61 59 96.7%	81 76 94%								99.5% (99.5%) 97% (97%)	X X	<b>Amber</b> <b>Amber</b>	 	
LPI <b>23</b>	Customer complaints No: % of total achieved	92.86%			100%						90%		92% (92%)	✓	<b>Green</b>		Now back on target

LPI <b>24</b>	Revenue running costs of floor space per square metre.	£19.97/m <sup>2</sup>	£2.26/m <sup>2</sup>																	Clarification on figures/projections needed from Alan Platt
LPI <b>25</b>	Consumption, in kWh/sq m Operational prop + markets and public toilets	176.45 khh/m <sup>2</sup>	20.31 khh/m <sup>2</sup>	20.31 khh/m <sup>2</sup>	20.31 khh/m <sup>2</sup>	50.11 khh/m <sup>2</sup>	70.42 khh/m <sup>2</sup>	50.11 khh/m <sup>2</sup>	70.42 khh/m <sup>2</sup>	167.63 khh/m <sup>2</sup> (165kWh/m <sup>2</sup> )	✓	Green	😊	Costs no longer to be monitored due to the fact that the costs are controlled by External parties.						
LPI <b>26</b>	Consumption in litres/sq m Operational prop + markets and public toilets.	862.5 ltrs/m <sup>2</sup>	179.3 ltrs/m <sup>2</sup>	179.3 ltrs/m <sup>2</sup>	179.3 ltrs/m <sup>2</sup>	240 ltrs/m <sup>2</sup>	419.38 ltrs/m <sup>2</sup>	240 ltrs/m <sup>2</sup>	419.38 ltrs/m <sup>2</sup>	819.4 ltrs/m <sup>2</sup> (800 ltrs/m <sup>2</sup> )	✓	Green	😊	Costs no longer to be monitored due to the fact the costs are controlled by External parties.						
LPI <b>27</b>	Percentage of gross internal floor-space classified as good satisfactory categories A-B	65%	65%	65%	65%		66%		66%	68% (68%)	✓	Green	😊	Target will be met following completion of re-survey programme and data input						
LPI <b>28</b>	The number of reports received of blocked gullies per 1000 gullies. 41,543/1,000 = 41.543 150/41.543 = 3.61 * 2 = 7.22	3.95	2.55	2.55	2.55	1.06	3.61	1.06	3.61	6 (6.0)	✓	Green	😊	Sub total of 150 number reported blocked gullies out of a total of 41,543 gullies. NB – Localised flooding 26/4/04 and highest rainfall figures for June in a number of years. Followed by wettest August on record. Still on course to meet target.						

LPI 29	Working days lost from work related injuries and ill health (including stress) <b>Injuries only</b>																						Stress policy is being introduced	
LPI 30	Incidents rate fatal and major accidents National Performance target reduced by 10% by 2010.																						Incident rate to be calculated at year end.	
LPI 31	Informing the HSE of reportable injuries and dangerous occurrences within 10 working days as a % of the total																						Of 42 reports received, 12 came in late. The number of days lost during this period was 830.5. All Heads of Service must ensure compliance and this will be monitored directly by the Head of Asset Management, who will report to GMT in summary form.	
<b>Corporate Priority – A Quality Service Provider (Cost Based)</b>																								
LPI 32	Planning cost per head of population	CPA																						This indicator appears in the ODPM's Consultation paper for 04/05 and recommends deletion of this PI because they see it has a negative effect on planning.
LPI 33	The cost per square kilometre of keeping relevant land and relevant highways for which the local authority is responsible, clear of litter and refuse.																							Additional funding has been provided in 2004/05 to meet this priority.

LPI 34	Cost per square kilometre of keeping highways for which the local authority is responsible, clear of litter.																			£144,370 (£144,370)	✓	Green	😊	Additional Funding has been provided in 2004/05 to meet this priority.
LPI 35	Number of properties entering the property bank a)																							New PI Data recorded relates to first 2 quarters of 2004/05.
LPI 36	Number of priorities exiting the property bank. b) Net spend per head of population on street cleaning																							Additional funding has been provided in 2004/05 to meet this priority
LPI 37	Number of property assets reviewed against a checklist of 31 criteria																							New PI. This is the number of completed reports forwarded to the Property Board each quarter.



The following Performance Indicators are reported annually.

<b>Corporate Priority: A Place To Live</b>	
BVPI 89 CPA	% of people satisfied that the authority has met their duty to keep their relevant land and relevant highways for which the authority is responsible clear of litter and refuse (tri-annual survey)
<b>Corporate Priority: Investing In The Economy</b>	
BVPI 103 CPA	The % of respondents satisfied with local provision of public transport information (tri-annual survey)
BVPI 104 CPA	The % of all respondents satisfied with the local bus service (tri-annual survey)
BV 186 CPA	Roads not needing major repair: (a) % of the principal road network where major structural treatment is not considered necessary divided by the authority's average structural expenditure per kilometre on the principal road network over the past three years. (b) % of the non-principal road network where major structural treatment is not considered necessary divided by the authority's average structural expenditure per kilometre on the non-principal road network over the past three years. Do you have a development plan (or alterations to it) that has been adopted in the last 5 years and the end date of which has not expired?
BV 200	If 'no', are there proposals on deposit for an alteration or replacement, with a published timetable for adopting those alterations or the replacement plan within three years?
LPI	a) Increase the stock of VAT registered businesses in the Borough b) Increase the number of new VAT registrations per 10,000 head of Rotherham population
LPI	Vacancy rate for industrial and commercial property
LPI	Vacancy rate of Rotherham town centre only premises (number of vacant units)
LPI	Vacancy rate of town centre premises (number of vacant units across all the Borough)
LPI	Rotherham's Annual Average Earnings as a % of the GB Annual Average Earnings (full time workers including overtime); a) Workplace based comparison, b) Residence based comparison
<b>Corporate Priority: A Quality Service Provider</b>	
BVPI 111 CPA	The % of applicants satisfied with the service received (tri-annual survey)

**TOWN CENTRE INITIATIVE STEERING GROUP  
THURSDAY, 14TH OCTOBER, 2004**

Present:- Councillor G. Smith (in the Chair); Councillor Walker.

together with:-

Terence & Pauline Barker	Access Liaison
Colin Scott	Chamber of Trade
Chris Stanbra	RCAT
P.C. Paul Gray	South Yorkshire Police
Guy Kilminster	Manager, Libraries, Museum & Arts
Colin Knight	Streetpride
Zulfiqar Manzoor	Caprice
Phil Woodward	Yorkshire Water
Julie Roberts	Town Centre, Tourism and Markets

**1. INTRODUCTIONS/APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from:

Councillor R. S. Russell	Chair, Regeneration Scrutiny Panel
Sarah Crossland	Rotherham Churches Tourism Initiative
Karl Battersby	Head of Planning & Transportation Service
Srg. Chang	South Yorkshire Police
Patrick Middleton	Development Surveyor

**2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 22ND JULY, 2004**

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> July, 2004 were approved as a correct record.

**3. MATTERS ARISING**

(i) Three Cranes, High Street

Colin Scott asked if there was a current planning application for these premises.

It was reported that the shop was no longer tenanted and that there was no knowledge of any further planning applications.

(ii) Domine Lane Car Park

Colin Knight reported that cleansing had been carried out over the last two weekends and the issue of cleansing at weekends would be investigated further.

Colin Scott asked if the issue of cars parking without tickets had been

looked into.

Colin Knight agreed to follow this up.

(iii) Pavement Repair – Eastwood Lane

Chris Stanbra reported that no action had been taken to repair the broken slabs

Colin Knight reported that they had been checked and were within the Council's tolerance. He added that if at the end of the year there was any funding available he would look to see if they could be replaced through the Area Assembly's devolved budget.

(iv) Town Centre streetworks

The Chairman referred to the temporary tarmac repairs in the town centre and asked how long it would be before the setts were put back.

Colin Knight reported that it was taking a long time because work was only being carried out on Sundays but the setts had been stored and would be put back into place.

**4. EVENTS AND PROMOTIONS MANAGER**

Julie Roberts reported that an appointment had been made and Dawn Runciman would be joining the Local Authority on 18<sup>th</sup> October, 2004. Reference was made to her previous work experience in town centre management, tourism and economic development services.

An outline of Dawn's expected role was given.

P.C. Gray extended an invitation for Dawn to visit the Planning and Event Department at Maltby Police Station.

**5. TOWN CENTRE ACTION PLAN**

Julie Roberts distributed copies of the draft Action Plan which had incorporated the Group's previous comments.

She explained that the document was a three year rolling plan, and contained ten main objectives:-

- to create a welcome, safe and clean environment
- to establish a Town Centre Safety Task Group
- to provide excellent visitor services and facilities
- to conserve the character of the town centre, and enhance the heritage of Rotherham
- to improve accessibility and car parking within the town centre
- to increase visitors via an innovative events programme

- to develop a high quality retail offer
- to market the town centre as a destination
- to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness and performance of the town centre on an annual basis

Julie added that she proposed to organise a conference to look at what Rotherham could do differently.

Members referred to the need to ensure that enforcement action was taken in respect of the abuse of disabled parking. The potential impact of the creation of Business Improvement Districts on smaller town centre businesses was also highlighted.

The Group's input into the final document was requested and comments etc should be forwarded to Julie by 31<sup>st</sup> October, 2004. The finalised document would be submitted to the Group's November meeting.

## **6. ROTHERHAM RENAISSANCE - UPDATE**

Julie reported that at the last meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> September, 2004, the draft Master Plan was presented. The draft had now been sent to the LDA. Copies were provided for members of this Group.

The Chairman outlined the current position regarding Tescos and informed those present of other options for, and interest in, various town centre sites. He pointed out that there was an increasing interest from developers for investment in Rotherham.

## **7. FUTURE ROLE OF THE STEERING GROUP**

Julie presented members of the Group with a schematic diagram of the proposed new set up of the various town centre support groups under the Rotherham Renaissance umbrella.

Guy Kilminster provided further more detailed information about the function and remit of each of the following:-

- Town Centre Strategy Team (at the core)
- Town Team
- RMBC Regeneration Core Team
- LSP Economic Spoke
- Town Centre PR & Marketing Team
- Town Centre Planning Team
- Town Centre Management Team (to replace this Group)

The comment was made that a member from the Chamber of Trade should be included in the membership of the LSP Economic Spoke.

It was proposed that the next meeting of this Group be its last, and that the report author, Adam Wilkinson, Executive Director, Economic and

Development Services, be invited to present the proposed role, remit and new membership.

The Group congratulated officers on the proposals which were felt to be an excellent transition for this Group.

**8. ESTABLISHMENT OF TOWN CENTRE SAFETY TASK GROUP**

P.C. Paul Gray reported on the discussion that had taken place on the issue of tackling town centre safety and the decision to form a Task Group to look at violent crime in the town centre, shoplifting, nuisance etc along with an overview of the operation of CCTV and the Shop Link Radio network.

It was explained that it was proposed to hold two meetings in one, with the first part of the meeting being an open forum, which would then go into closed session to discuss issues raised and possible solutions.

**9. CHRISTMAS CAMPAIGN**

Julie reported that she had been working with staff in Culture and Leisure Services to group activities in order to promote them as a Winter Wonderland Festival in the town centre, involving an advertising campaign and Radio Hallam and Magic FM.

The programme would commence on Switch on Night on 18<sup>th</sup> November and include extended opening hours, new Christmas lights scheme, snow machine, ice statues, Frosty the Snowman in All Saint square, brass bands, Christmas Market from 10<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> December and Santa's Grotto.

In addition she had been working with the LSP to have a Memory Tree in the concourse of the bus interchange. The possibility of a children's lantern parade was also being explored.

**10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

(i) Toilets in All Saints Square

Colin Scott asked if the 20p charge was covering the cost of operation.

Julie replied that there had been no complaints about the charge and that it was necessary to help the staffing costs, cleaning and upkeep of the facility.

(ii) Young people with cars congregating outside the Town Hall

P.C. Gray asked for people's views on this issue and for ideas for possible action.

Those present discussed this issue and P.C. Gray noted the views

expressed.

(iii) Children working in the town centre with the cleansing operatives

Colin Knight reported on the success of this scheme.

(iv) Campaign against cigarette stubs

Colin Knight reported that a bid for funding had been made so that plastic stub holders could be provided. It was pointed out that the fine was currently £50, and that the bus station was now a No-smoking area.

(v) Rotherham Rugby Club

P.C. Gray reported on the valuable work being undertaken by the Club with young people from Clifton and Maltby Comprehensive schools.

(vi) Performance of the Town Centre

Julie distributed a bar chart which illustrated the results of the footfall count in the town centre over the past year and she highlighted various trends along particular streets.

(vii) Town Centre Business of the Year

Julie reported that Hambys, High Street, had won this award.

## 11. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

**It was agreed:-** That the next meeting of this Steering Group be held on THURSDAY, 25<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER, 2004 at 6.00 p.m. at the Town Hall, Moorgate Street, Rotherham.

**ROTHERHAM LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK STEERING GROUP**  
**Friday, 22nd October, 2004**

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

together with:-

Phil Turnidge	Senior Planner
Ken Macdonald	Service Solicitor
Ken Wheat	Transportation Unit Manager
Steve Holmes	Community Involvement Manager
Alison Penn	External Affairs Manager

**13. INTRODUCTIONS/APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from:-

Councillor G. Robinson, Cabinet Member, Community Planning  
 Phil Gill, Greenspaces Manager  
 Bob Crosby, Head of Environmental Health

**14. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 24TH SEPTEMBER, 2004**

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> September, 2004 be approved as a correct record.

**15. MATTERS ARISING**

The following issues were raised:-

(i) The Northern Way Growth Strategy

Information from the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly – Regional Planning and Infrastructure Commission’s agenda on 14<sup>th</sup> October, 2004 - regarding this issue was distributed to those present. The paper was an update on the progress of the strategy and aimed to highlight some of the implications for the Regional Spatial Strategy. Members were asked to note the implications for the production of Rotherham’s LDF and spatial study.

It was noted that to date there had been little information about this Strategy. A regional seminar/conference was due to be held, to involve local authorities and partner organisations.

(ii) Local Development Framework – component parts

A diagram from the ODPM was distributed which illustrated the documents comprising the LDF.

(iii) the Babbie Study

It was reported that this Study, which looked at the sustainable credentials of the individual settlements throughout South Yorkshire, would be completed shortly. The results of this study would be vital in compiling Rotherham's Core Strategy.

A report on the outcomes of the Babbie Study would be submitted to a future meeting of this Steering Group.

(iv) Continuation of the current Unitary Development Plan

It was pointed out that in the interim material from the current UDP would be saved until it was ultimately replaced by relevant parts of the Local Development Framework.

It was likely to take more than three years to completely replace the UDP. Consequently many parts of it would remain relevant. Planning applications would need to be considered according to what stage the documentation had reached and what weight was attributed to the particular document at that time.

Saved parts of the UDP needed to be specified in the Local Development Scheme. Although there was no statutory requirement for formal consultation on the Local Development Scheme it was proposed that the draft would be made available on the Council's Website in order to keep the public informed of what was happening.

(v) Local Strategic Partnership

Reference was made to the Government's emphasis that there should be closer working with stakeholders, the LDP and corporately within the Council.

It was reported that a further approach had been made to the LSP Spoke Managers to nominate representatives to sit on the Task Group to deal with the LDF, the LTP and the review of the Community Strategy. This was seen as an important vehicle.

(vi) Consultees

It was noted that the Statement of Community Involvement would identify discreet groups e.g. Parish Councils, Area Assembly Chairs etc, with whom consultation would take place.

**16. FUTURE MEETING DATES FOR 2005**



The following dates for future meetings in 2005 were agreed:-

Fridays, all at 10.00 a.m. at the Town Hall

28 <sup>th</sup> January	22 <sup>nd</sup> July
25 <sup>th</sup> February	August – propose no meeting
1 <sup>st</sup> April	23 <sup>rd</sup> September
29 <sup>th</sup> April	21 <sup>st</sup> October
27 <sup>th</sup> May	18 <sup>th</sup> November
24 <sup>th</sup> June	16 <sup>th</sup> December

**17. NEW DEVELOPMENT PLAN SYSTEM - GLOSSARY**

The Glossary for the new Development Plan System was received for future reference.

**18. FEEDBACK FROM GOVERNMENT OFFICE YORKSHIRE AND THE HUMBER - LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SEMINAR ON 12TH OCTOBER, 2004**

A paper was distributed which set out the significant points from the seminar that would influence how Rotherham would go about producing some of the documents.

The Government was changing the culture of planning and putting planning in a more central position in relation to the Community Strategy, spatial planning, sustainable places, empowering inclusive participation, community involvement etc.

Information from the Seminar was given on the following:-

- Regional Spatial Strategy - Reference will need to be made to this document when considering planning applications and should be declared on searches.
- Local Development Scheme - It was reported that the deadline for submission to GOYH was now 28<sup>th</sup> February, 2005 and not 28<sup>th</sup> March. The minimum submission would include: Core Strategy and Policies; site specific allocations; Proposals Map; Statement of Community Involvement; Annual Monitoring Report and Local Development Scheme.

It was emphasised that the submission had to be realistic and submitting the LDS on time had implications on the receipt of Planning Delivery Grant.

- Milestones - It was pointed out that these milestones would need to be co-ordinated with Council meetings.

- Supplementary Planning Documents – it was envisaged that producing a document would be a year long process. The documents would be subject to sustainability appraisal but not public examination.
- Statement of Community Involvement – this was required in the first submission. It was essential that the approach to consultation was clearly recorded and that there could be budget and staffing implications. Reference was made to the tensions between the requirement to consult and the creation of a speedier planning system.
- Front loading – the need to consult stakeholders and the community from the onset of the process was emphasised and this was likely to lead to less opposition at later stages in the process.
- Annual Monitoring Report – the first report would be required by 31<sup>st</sup> December, 2005. This would need new data management systems and the streamlining of numerous Performance Indicators. This would be a major challenge.
- LDF/Community Strategy – the role of the Community Planning Officers was discussed. It was pointed out that community planning needed to be embedded into all local authority processes and that this required a cultural change.
- Sustainability Appraisal – this also had significant implications for data collection and management in establishing a baseline against which the effects of the LDF would be judged.
- Soundness – there was a presumption from the outset that a DPD would be sound unless proved otherwise in evidence at the Examination. The Planning Inspectorate would be publishing Soundness Guidance in November.
- Public examination – a Public Examination Guide was expected in March 2005.
- Previous UDP work – It was pointed out that provision was made under the Transitional Arrangements Regulations to use earlier UDP Review Issues material, but these would need to be subject to Sustainability Appraisal. The more prominent issues would need to be related to spatial options arising out of the RSS, Babbie Study and the SY Spatial Study.

Resolved:- (1) That following consideration of the Local Development Scheme by this Group, the document be referred to the Cabinet for approval.

(2) That the Corporate Management Team be asked to discuss the following issues:-

- (i) the extent and resourcing of LDF consultation.
- (ii) Performance Indicators which had the most benefit for the Council related to the LDF, Community Strategy and Sustainability baselining.

**19. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

The following issues were raised:-

- (i) Scope of the draft Local Development Scheme

It was proposed to submit a first draft of this to the next meeting of the Steering Group and the recommended content was a Core Strategy, Development Control Policies (new policies for housing – including HMR Pathfinder), economic (including retail and transportation), Site Specific Allocations, Proposals Map and Statement of Community Involvement.

- (ii) Regional Spatial Strategy

It was confirmed that the new legislation would require the Council to consult the Regional Assembly on major planning applications and their compliance with the Regional Spatial Strategy.

- (iii) Feedback

Members of the Group were asked to provide feedback to the Forward Planning Team on any of the issues raised at this meeting or contained within the working papers.

- (iv) Further involvement of Members/officers and dissemination of information

Resolved:- (1) That as part of the Planning Board Training a session on the LDF be included for other Members, and that the Senior Planner and Area Partnership Manager discuss the most appropriate ways of briefing Community Planning staff.

(2) That a draft of the LDS be submitted to the next meeting of the Steering Group for consideration.

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

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Rotherham LDF Steering Group be held on FRIDAY, 26<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER, 2004 at 10.00 a.m. at the Town Hall.

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) 1, 8 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A  
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted