

CABINET MEMBER FOR ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Venue: 3rd Floor conference
room, Bailey House,
Rawmarsh Road,
Rotherham

Date: Monday, 18 April 2005

Time: 9.00 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested, in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered later in the agenda as a matter of urgency.
3. Waverley Link Road. (report attached) (Pages 1 - 8)
Transportation Unit Manager to report.
 - to inform Members of the outcome of consultations on the need for a new road and possible routes.
4. Draft Tourism Plan 2005 - 2008.
Tourism Officer to report.
 - to present the draft Tourism Plan 2005 – 2008.

(An Email copy will be sent to Elected Members and Officers. Copies of the Plan will be available at the meeting.)

Exclusion of the Press and Public

The Chairman authorised consideration of the following item in order to progress the matter referred to.

5. Orgreave Community Fund - Consideration of Provision of Funding for a Bid from Treeton Parish Council. (report attached) (Pages 9 - 11)
Major Applications, Minerals and Waste Manager to report.
 - to consider provision of funding for a bid from Treeton Parish Council (Exempt under Paragraphs 5 and 8 of the Act – grants and expenditure)

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS
--

1.	Meeting:	Economic and Development Services matters
2.	Date:	18 April 2005
3.	Title:	Waverley Link Road – Consultation
4.	Programme Area:	EDS

5. Summary

In order to assess the benefits and implications of the proposed Waverley Link Road public consultation is necessary. Questionnaires asking for views on the options for a link road were sent to 9422 addresses. 1045 were returned fully completed. Analysis of the responses showed a majority in favour of a link road. 83.1% in support and 11.5% against. As far as the options are concerned the first choice responses showed 48% preferred option D (nature reserve option) and 39.6% option C (playing field option)

6. Recommendations

- 1) that the Waverley Link Road Consultation - Draft Report be received and noted,
- 2) that the results of the consultation be publicised when the draft report is finalised.
- 3) that a further report be submitted on which option should be pursued.

7. Proposals and Details

In summer 2003 the Council appointed Faber Maunsell to consider the options for a link road. Two options (C & D) were considered to be viable however option C was recommended for a number of reasons. This route was confirmed as the Council's preferred option for a link road at the meeting of the 22 December 2003. MVA consultants were appointed to further the scheme as part of their commission with Sheffield CC and Rotherham MBC to expand and run the SATRUN traffic model in the area. The draft summary of the report is attached as appendix A. A copy of the full draft report will be available at the meeting.

The objective of the consultation was to establish residents' views so that they can be considered before a decision on the way forward is taken.

1045 of the returned questionnaires were sufficiently complete to be used in the analysis of the views.

Respondents were asked to indicate how strongly they agree/disagree that a link road is needed. More than eight in ten (83.1%) respondents agree that a link road is needed (52.4% 'strongly agree'). Just over one in ten (11.5%) respondents 'disagree' or 'strongly disagree' that a link road is needed.

Consultation was carried out on four options; option A (do-nothing), option B (do-minimum), option C and option D. Respondents were asked to place them in order of preference where '1' is their most preferred option and '4' the least preferred option. Table 1 shows that option D was the most preferred option followed by option C.

Table 1 – Ranked Preferences

Option	Mean rank
Option D – link road near to nature reserve	1.75
Option C – link road across playing field	2.02
Option B – do minimum	2.70
Option A – do nothing	3.48

1 = most preferred, 4 = least preferred

Table 2 – Preferences

	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D
First choice	7.2%	5.2%	39.6%	48%
Second choice	6.5%	23.3%	34.4%	35.8%
Third choice	15.5%	68.1%	8.6%	7.9%
Fourth choice	70.9%	3.3%	17.6%	8.2%

In the report the number and percentage of responses as well as the responses themselves are broken down into 11 geographical areas.

The main reasons that respondents selected D as their most preferred option was because they felt it had less impact on residents and/or properties, and that they felt it gave the most relief from traffic, and it took the traffic away from residential areas.

The main reasons why respondents listed option D as their least preferred option, was because they believe it would be detrimental to the environment, and bring increased noise and pollution to the area. They also highlighted concerns regarding the cost of option D.

Respondents who chose option C as their first choice felt that this option would give the most relief from traffic in the area, was more cost effective than option D, and less damaging to the environment.

Respondents who highlighted that option C was their least preferred choice were mainly opposed to the link road being built across playing fields, and believe that the road would be detrimental to the environment.

The report also collates the reasons given for selecting their most preferred option, their least preferred option and the other comments respondents wished to make.

Three respondents suggested that the proposed road should join Retford Road near the old petrol filling station. Although this is a very low response rate there are reasons to suspect that most of those supporting a link road would also support this option. It is also possible that some of those who preferred do-nothing and do-minimum options might also support this option since their objections were based on the impact on the playing field and environmental concerns that a new road would cause. This route has become known as option E and the consultants preparing the scheme appraisal have been asked to include this option in their screening work.

The following methods are suggested for feeding back the outcome of the consultation;

- 1) Make the summary available to view on the internet when it is finalised.
- 2) Submit an article to *Rotherham Matters*
- 3) Send the finalised summary to the relevant local ward members, parish councils and other community organisations who might wish to be kept informed.

Three returned questionnaires were chosen at random for £50 prizes. The winners have been notified and it is hoped that they will allow us to publicise their first names and postal areas as part of the feedback process.

8. Finance

The cost of carrying out the consultation is part of the work on the preparation of the annex E and has not been separately identified. Funding for the development and promotion of the scheme is from the Council's LTP Integrated Transport Capital Programme with support from Objective 1.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The report on the consultation has not been finalised but it is considered that reporting the findings cannot be delayed since expectations have been raised. Any amendments are unlikely to affect the overall conclusions. If any significant changes are made this meeting will be advised.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Regeneration: - The project will contribute to providing an excellent and sustainable environment for business.

Sustainability: - The proposal is intended to meet people's transport needs. The options have a mix of environmental benefits and disbenefits which will be taken into account in the appraisal which is being carried out.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Waverley Link Road Consultation – Draft Report. March 2005.

Contact Name : *Ken Wheat, Transportation Unit Manager, extension 2953, e-mail:*
ken.wheat@rotherham.gov.uk

Appendix 1

Summary

The Waverley Masterplan

The Waverley Development Site is owned by UK Coal Mining Ltd and is the largest single source of brownfield land in Rotherham and the wider South Yorkshire area. The development of the site has the potential to bring major economic, social and environmental benefits to Rotherham, Sheffield and beyond.

The Waverley Masterplan has taken account of the Council's aspirations for a link road providing a connection between the B6200 and the Sheffield Parkway extending the existing Highfield Spring. This link would improve access to the M1 at J31.

Waverley Link Road

In order to provide adequate transportation links to development sites in the South Yorkshire Technology Corridor area (formerly known as the M1 SEZ), a study report by the Babbie Group recommended the construction of a link road, between the B6200 at Woodhouse Mill and B6066 Highfield Spring, amongst other things. Such a link road would relieve a significant proportion of the local community from the affects of additional traffic.

Public Consultation

In January 2005, MVA conducted research with residents in the area surrounding the proposed link road options via a postal survey. This report details the findings from this research.

Residents were presented with information about four possible options, including the predicted traffic flows on key roads surrounding the schemes. The options presented were:

Option A – Do nothing

- For: No cost. No environmental impact.
- Against: Large increase in traffic flows on many key roads. Residents of Retford Road in particular will face additional traffic.

Option B – Do minimum

- For: Relatively low cost. Little if any environmental impact. Some improvements to mitigate effects of additional traffic.
- Against: Provides minimal relief from increased traffic flows. Residents of Retford Road in particular will face additional traffic.

Option C – Link road across playing field forming a junction with Retford Road

- For: Provides greatest relief from increased traffic flows (on average a 9% decrease in traffic on surrounding roads). Additional traffic will divert from Retford Road to the new link road.
- Against: Across a playing field. Some traffic may be attracted from other routes. South end of link road impacts on B6200/B6064 junction in Woodhouse Mill. Proposed junction with Retford Road could impact on properties.

Option D – Link road around the sewage works forming a junction with Fence roundabout

- For: Provides reasonable relief from increased traffic flows (on average a 7% decrease in traffic on surrounding roads). Additional traffic will divert from Retford Road to the new link road and will bypass the edge of Woodhouse Mill.
- Against: Less likely to be viable due to additional environmental impacts and large cost. Possible impact on properties on Smallage Lane.

In addition to the postal survey, three public exhibitions were held close to the proposed routes. Members of the project team and the Council were available to answer questions and provide more detailed information.

Objectives

The main aim of the consultation was to establish residents' views on the proposed options for a new link road. The findings will be taken into consideration before a decision to proceed with the scheme and make a bid to the Department for Transport for the necessary funding.

Public Consultation

An information leaflet and questionnaire was developed in close consultation with Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, with due consideration for the aims of the consultation. The questionnaire was divided into sections to cover the key areas of interest. It was two pages long and was designed using a mixture of closed and open-ended questions.

Postal Mailout

9422 leaflets and questionnaires were distributed by post to all households within an agreed sample area around the proposed routes. Addresses were identified using the Address Point Data file. Envelopes were addressed to 'The Occupier'.

Leaflets and questionnaires were distributed during the week beginning 15th January 2005. The survey closing date was 11th February 2005. All questionnaires were returned to MVA for processing and analysis.

Overall 1059 questionnaires were returned from the residents' survey giving a response rate of 11.2%. An additional 12 questionnaires were returned from the public exhibitions, these were included in the analysis of the postal survey.

Key Findings

Support for New link Road

More than eight in ten respondents agree that a new link road is needed to support the proposed Waverley Masterplan, of which more than half 'strongly agree'.

The main reason that respondents feel that a new road is needed as it will help reduce traffic in the area on existing roads. Respondents highlighted that traffic has already increased and, at present, was highly congested in certain areas. Respondents believe that the Waverley Masterplan will bring more traffic to the area and thus believe a link road is required to deal with the further increase in traffic.

Just over one in ten respondents disagreed that a link road was needed. They expressed environmental concerns, such as the pollution a road would bring, and disruption to wildlife. They were also strongly opposed to the idea of the link road being built across a playing field.

Preference for Link Road

Respondents were given four options for a link road and asked to place them in order of preference, with '1' being their most preferred option, and '4' being their least preferred option. Table 1 shows that, overall, option D was the most preferred option for a link road.

Table 1 Preference of Options

Option	Mean Rank	Standard Deviation
Option D – Link road around the sewage works forming a junction with Fence roundabout	1.75	0.921
Option C – Link road across playing field forming a junction with Retford Road	2.02	1.093
Option B – Do minimum	2.70	0.644
Option A – Do nothing	3.48	0.920

1 = Most Preferred, 4 = Least Preferred

Further analysis by area (see Table 2) shows that although overall D was the most preferred option, option C was the preferred choice by the greatest number of respondents in four out of eleven of the smaller sample areas, and jointly with D for one area. Three out of the four areas located next to the proposed route actually preferred route C to D (Areas two, eight and ten).

Table 2 First Choice Option by Area

Area	Option A (%)	Option B (%)	Option C (%)	Option D (%)	Frequency
1	12.1	7.5	21.8	58.6	239
2	23.8	16.7	38.1	21.4	42
3	7.4	4.4	39.7	48.5	136
4	8.7	6.1	42.6	42.6	115
5	2.9	7.4	44.1	42.6	68
6	3.0	0.0	37.6	59.4	101
7	1.2	2.5	46.9	49.4	81
8	2.6	0.0	59.2	38.2	76
9	5.1	5.1	35.9	53.8	39
10	2.2	5.6	55.6	36.7	90
11	6.9	3.4	48.3	41.4	58
Total (%)	7.2	5.2	39.6	48.0	1045

The main reasons that respondents selected D as their most preferred option was because they felt it had less impact on residents and/or properties, and that they felt it gives the most relief from traffic, and it takes the traffic away from residential areas.

The main reasons why respondents listed option D as their least preferred option, was because they believe it would be detrimental to the environment, and bring increased noise and pollution to the area. They also highlighted concerns regarding the cost of option D.

Respondents who chose option C as their first choice felt that this option would give the most relief from traffic in the area, was more cost effective than option D, and less damaging to the environment.

Respondents who highlighted that option C was their least preferred choice were mainly opposed to the link road being built across playing fields, and believe that the road would be detrimental to the environment.

By virtue of paragraph(s) 5, 8 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted