

## Summary Sheet

### Council Report:

Report to Cabinet and Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting – 11 July 2016

Cabinet Member – Councillor Lelliott  
Commissioner – Commissioner Kenny

### Title:

Rotherham Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document

### Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan?

Yes

### Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report

Damien Wilson, Strategic Director of Regeneration & Environment

### Report Author(s)

Ryan Shepherd, Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy  
[ryan.shepherd@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:ryan.shepherd@rotherham.gov.uk) 01709 823888

### Ward(s) Affected

Boston Castle

### Executive Summary

This report summarises the results of the public consultation undertaken on the draft Rotherham Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document. It recommends that Cabinet adopt the final document, as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), subject to the changes to be approved, to ensure that it has weight when determining planning applications and making planning decisions affecting the town centre.

### Recommendations

1. That Cabinet note the results of the public consultation on the draft Rotherham Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document.
2. That Cabinet is recommended to approve the document, incorporating the proposed changes resulting from consultation, be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document. The final document will be prepared following Cabinet endorsement.

**List of Appendices Included**

Appendix 1 – summary of representations received, the Council’s response and proposed changes to the Supplementary Planning Document

**Background Papers**

Draft Rotherham Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document

<http://rotherham.limehouse.co.uk/file/3848384>

Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2014)

[http://rotherham.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/cs/adopted\\_cs/adopted\\_cs](http://rotherham.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/cs/adopted_cs/adopted_cs)

**Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel**

The Draft Supplementary Planning document was considered by the Improving Places Select Commission at its meeting on 13th April, 2016

**Council Approval Required:**

No

**Exempt from the Press and Public:**

No

## **Title: Rotherham Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document**

### **1. Recommendations**

- 1 That Cabinet notes the results of the public consultation on the draft Rotherham Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document.
- 2 That Cabinet is recommended to approve the document, incorporating the proposed changes resulting from consultation, be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document. The final document will be prepared following Cabinet endorsement.

### **2. Background**

- 2.1 Rotherham's adopted Local Plan Core Strategy identifies Rotherham town centre as the borough's principal retail and service centre which will continue to be the main focus for shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities.
- 2.2 The economic landscape, especially regarding the town centre, has changed significantly since the original Urban Renaissance programme. Consequently Arup were appointed in September 2015 to prepare an update and specifically a SPD. The draft SPD was produced to update the original Urban Renaissance work, produced as part of Yorkshire Forward's programme in 2005, and to formulate goals that would result in the creation of a thriving, re-energised Town Centre and deliver the future vision for Rotherham. The document would then be used alongside Local Plan policies when determining planning applications and making planning decisions affecting the town centre.
- 2.3 In addition to the SPD the production of a town centre Masterplan (to include implementation, development and delivery) is recommended and also forms part of this Cabinet agenda.
- 2.4 Public consultation on the draft SPD was endorsed at the Cabinet/Commissioners' Decision Making Meeting of 14th March 2016. Consultation ran from 18th April to 16th May 2016.
- 2.5 Preparation of and consultation on the SPD has been undertaken in line with The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. Before a local planning authority can adopt a SPD it must undertake public consultation for not less than four weeks. It must then prepare a Consultation Statement setting out who was consulted in connection with the preparation of the SPD, the main issues raised in response to the consultation, and how those issues were addressed in finalising the SPD. A final consultation statement will be prepared to accompany the adopted SPD.

### **3. Key Issues: analysis of consultation responses**

3.1 The Council received comments from twenty individuals or organisations during the consultation period. Appendix 1 provides a summary of the comments received, the Council's response to these, and the proposed changes to the SPD as a result. The comments can be seen in full on the Council's website:

<http://rotherham.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/rctspd/rctspd>

3.2 The main issues raised in the consultation responses were:

- Broad support for the overall aspiration for the town centre – in particular the importance of the redevelopment of Forge Island.
- The creation of a prime walking route from the station to the civic area along Bridge Street and Bridge Gate.
- One respondent commented in detail regarding cycle routes, infrastructure and maintenance.
- Concerns over the level of detail provided in the SPD, particularly at a site specific level. Historic England and the Rotherham District Civic Society raised concerns around a number of detailed aspects of the document. Natural England suggested a number of areas where further detail could be provided.
- The document is a missed opportunity and that it is not daring enough.
- The feasibility and viability of the proposals raised concerns and whether funding would be available to maintain areas (of public realm for example) once completed.
- Broad support from the Canal and River Trust for opening up the riverside and promoting development in waterfront locations.
- The South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE) and Highways England broadly supported development in the town centre as a sustainable location, although Highways England raised some concerns around the cumulative impact of development on the strategic road network.
- The Environment Agency noted that a number of sites fall within Flood Zones 2 or 3 and that proposals on these sites would need to satisfy relevant policy. Detailed comments were provided on Forge Island. It was suggested that further information regarding flood risk should be provided.
- Errors and corrections were identified and alternative proposed wording suggested
- A number of comments suggested actions beyond the remit of the SPD, or beyond the powers of the Local Planning Authority.

3.3 The consultation responses were welcomed and a number of suggestions which will help to improve the accuracy and clarity of the document were made. There are however a number of comments and suggestions which were not accepted. In particular it is the intention of the SPD to provide a broad guide to the vision and aspiration for the town centre, building on the Local Plan policies; as such it is not the intention of the document to provide detailed site specific guidance across the full range of planning issues. A Masterplan is proposed for the town centre which will build on the SPD, provide more detail at a site specific level and address some of these concerns (please refer to the Cabinet report which also forms part of this Cabinet agenda). The Council will ensure that comments received to this

consultation are taken into account, where relevant, in taking forward this further masterplanning work.

- 3.4 Appendix 1 sets out the changes proposed to the SPD. In summary these are:
- Insert a foreword (as previously approved by Councillor Lelliott)
  - Include of a summary of the Planning Use Classes Order
  - Make minor amendments to the vision to make reference to well-maintained historic buildings
  - Amend Goals 3, 5 and 8 to reference improved access to Clifton Park and to make reference to conserving historic assets
  - Add references to the historic environment and heritage (including the location of Listed Buildings)
  - Include reference to cycle routes
  - Extension of the proposed Bridge Street pedestrian priority route to Frederick Street and Effingham Square and onwards towards Eastwood
  - Include additional references to flood risk
  - Address corrections

#### **4. Options considered and recommended proposal**

- 4.1 The Council could adopt the SPD without accepting any of the proposed changes to the document. This could result in a less robust and effective SPD being adopted and may undermine its implementation. It is therefore recommended to adopt the SPD incorporating the proposed changes.

#### **5. Consultation**

- 5.1 Consultation ran from 18<sup>th</sup> April to 16<sup>th</sup> May 2016. It was undertaken in line with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, which sets out how and when people can influence new planning documents. Printed copies of the draft SPD were available to view at the Council's main offices at Riverside House, and the Central Library at Riverside House. It was also made available to view on the Council's consultation website: <http://rotherham.limehouse.co.uk/portal>
- 5.2 Notification of the consultation was sent to almost 12,000 people on the Planning Policy consultation database along with other town centre stakeholders. These included the Rotherham Together Partnership - Business Growth Board (Town Centre Sub Group) and over 500 town centre businesses. Notices publicising the consultation were placed in the local newspapers during the week beginning 4<sup>th</sup> April 2016.

## 6. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

- 6.1 The table below sets out the timescale and accountability for implementing the recommendations in this report:

Stage	Date	Accountability
Report to Cabinet regarding adoption as SPD	11th July 2016	Cabinet
Undertake any required changes to document	August 2016	Planning Policy / Arup
Publish final SPD on website	September 2016	Planning Policy

## 7. Financial and Procurement Implications

- 7.1 There are no additional financial costs to the Council as a result of this report.

## 8. Legal Implications

- 8.1 The Council may be open to legal challenge should the SPD not be produced in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The public consultation on the document and implementing the recommendations of this report will meet the regulations and thus avoid the risk of challenge.

## 9. Human Resources Implications

- 9.1 There are no Human Resources implications associated with adoption of the SPD.

## 10. Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults

- 10.1 The SPD is intended to assist in delivering the Council's aspirations to deliver regeneration of Rotherham town centre. It will supplement Rotherham Local Plan Policies, including Core Strategy Policy CS13 which supports development which enhances Rotherham town centre's appeal as a family friendly destination and contributes towards creating a safe, attractive and accessible town centre.

## 11 Equalities and Human Rights Implications

- 11.1 There are no equalities or human rights implications associated with adoption of the SPD.

## **12. Implications for Partners and Other Directorates**

12.1 The implications for partners or other directorates are mainly associated with implementing the final SPD and to ensure partners and directorates are fully aware of the content of the document.

## **13. Risks and Mitigation**

13.1 Since the Council may be open to legal challenge should the SPD not be produced in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, legal advice has been sought as necessary.

## **14. Accountable Officer(s)**

Paul Woodcock  
Assistant Director - Planning, Regeneration and Transport

Approvals Obtained from:-

Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services:-  
Rob Harrison, Principal Finance Officer

Director of Legal Services:-  
Sumera Shabir, Planning Solicitor

Head of Procurement (if appropriate):- N/A

This report is published on the Council's website or can be found at:-

<http://modern.gov.rotherham.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx?Categories=>

## Appendix 1: Summary of representations received, the Council's response and proposed changes to the Supplementary Planning Document

The full representations received are available to view on our consultation website:

<http://rotherham.limehouse.co.uk/portal/planning/rtcspd/rtcspd?pointId=1460623733684&do=view>

The table below sets out a summary of the comments received, the Council's response to the issues raised, and any suggested changes to the SPD as a result. Proposed additions to the text are shown **bold and underlined**, and suggested deletions are shown ~~struck through~~.

For clarity the suggested changes to the document are also brought together and listed underneath the table.

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
SPD1	Mr William Tilling	Two suggestions: 1. A direct pedestrian link to the new Supertram. 2. The removal of the burger van from the town centre pedestrianised area.	The tram-train pilot project will see the Sheffield Supertram extended into Rotherham. It will stop at Rotherham Central train station which has good pedestrian access at present. The SPD also promotes a number of new and improved pedestrian 'Gold Routes' which will also improve pedestrian accessibility to the station.  The siting of mobile catering vans is beyond the remit of this document. Where such uses need planning permission there is opportunity for the public to have their say on the proposal as part of the statutory consultation period.	None
SPD2	Mrs Angela Somerset	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The knocking down of fantastic buildings like all saints buildings and the beautiful face of Doncaster gate hospital.</li> <li>I have not visited the town centre now for over three years, not because of the town itself but the people who go there. I find it</li> </ul>	Whilst recognising that the town centre has a number of important and historic buildings, the town centre has seen change over the past decade which has resulted in the positive improvement of the environment, such as the new public	None



Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>very sad that I do not feel comfortable in town. These are things that unfortunately cannot be changed by building</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clifton Park is excellent</li> </ul>	<p>open space at Minster Gardens.</p> <p>It is recognised that it may take some time to change the perception of the town centre; however the Council's focus is on improving the type and range of attractions within the centre and making it a family friendly destination.</p> <p>The SPD recognises the value and important role that Clifton Park plays, and seeks to improve linkages between the town centre and the park.</p>	
SPD03	Mr Michael Firth	<p>The main thrust of the plan is something that I can support although I have some scepticism as to whether it will happen particularly as the present government seem intent on destroying local government by cutting financial resources.</p> <p>To tempt people out of their cars and onto buses to visit Rotherham the bus service needs to improve - as well as what is on offer in the town centre.</p> <p>Why not design a sculpture/information trail around the centre to encourage interest and improve health? We need a new theatre in the centre as well as a cinema so that local as well as national groups can perform (a better bus service would help here).</p> <p>Why not have a Park and Ride system in Rotherham?</p>	<p>Your comments of support are noted. Public transport services are beyond the control of this SPD; however the SPD along with the Local Plan policies seek to improve the town centre offer and make effective use of linkages to public transport services (including the Tram-Train pilot project).</p> <p>There are no plans at present to replace the existing theatre. However should the need and opportunity arise in the future then this would be acceptable in a number of locations within the town centre and would not be precluded by the SPD.</p> <p>Rotherham town centre has already benefitted from arts projects such as Gallery Town. Whilst it is beyond the remit of the SPD the provision of sculpture or other trails in the town centre could help enhance the centre.</p>	None

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
			The provision of a park and ride facility is beyond the remit of this SPD; however there are considered to be sufficient existing opportunities to park close to the town centre.	
SPD04	Dr Edwin and Beatrice Jackson	<p>The council must be congratulated in restoring the City Centre. There is one street, where PRIMARK is located. If this is the promise of how the City Centre will look like, please definitely continue with the good work.</p> <p>It is desirable that the City Cleanliness is supported by all people, signs for no spitting, please pick up rubbish and rubbish bins available when possible.</p>	<p>Your comments of support are noted.</p> <p>Whilst it is beyond the remit of this document, the Council will continue to meet its maintenance and cleanliness responsibilities within the town centre.</p>	None
SPD05	Natural England	<p>We do not wish to provide specific comments, but advise you to consider the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. This should be in line with any GI strategy covering your area.</li> <li>• consider issues relating to the protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils within urban design plans</li> <li>• consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development</li> <li>• The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community</li> <li>• The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity</li> </ul>	<p>Green Infrastructure plays a key role in the SPD, from its potential role as part of pedestrian route and gateway enhancements, to opening up the riverside and contributing to a green network, particularly along the river corridor.</p> <p>The Local Plan adopted Core Strategy and emerging Sites and Policies document contains policies relating to amongst other things Green Infrastructure, air and water quality, and design. As such these will be taken into account in any planning applications and it is not considered necessary to repeat them in the SPD.</p>	None

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
SPD06	Mr. Ishaq Khan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some of the references made within the SPD are very similar to existing planning policy and literature used within plans for Sheffield city centre. Consider replacing words such as 'Gold routes' with more original and locally significant terms.</li> <li>third paragraph, page 43 - Would it not be more appropriate to say 'following the closure of retailers in the evening, the quarter becomes quiet'?</li> <li>Figure 5.6.2 on page 49 - in the caption you have misspelt 'footfall' as 'football'</li> <li>Referring to Figure 7.1.2 and text on page 60. The proposals for the Forge Island development site are very promising! However, the northern access route through the site can be improved by realigning the route and connecting it to Bridge Street instead of Central road/towards the station Establish a prime walking route from the station to the civic area of the town centre along Bridge Street and Bridge gate..</li> <li>Wayfinding from the Train Station to the civic and cultural areas of the town centre is poor. Although the proposals imply that this will be improved by a new route through the Forge Island site. This route should not be considered as a preferred option, as in practice the alignment will make it poorly legible and heavily reliant on the redevelopment of a large area of land across the river (adjacent to the Minister). Rather, a legible route can be provided along Bridge Street, up Bridge gate to the square outside the Minister. This route has not been considered in the SPD but should be given some thought.</li> </ul>	<p>Your comments of support are noted. Your wording suggestions and corrections on pages 43 and 49 are appreciated and changes will be made accordingly.</p> <p>Your comments regarding terminology are noted; however it is considered that the most important aspect is what is proposed rather than what they are called. In this respect it is considered that, for example, the gold routes are locally specific to Rotherham as they reflect the existing and future movement routes through the centre.</p> <p>Your comments regarding wayfinding and primary routes are appreciated. The routes shown through Forge Island are intended to demonstrate how the site could connect to the wider town centre following redevelopment. It is acknowledged that a route following Bridge Street / Bridge Gate to All Saints Square exists. The SPD would not prevent this route being improved or enhanced in future; however in terms of priorities it is considered that the proposed routes remain preferred in terms of linking points of interest and responding to areas of change (particularly around Forge Island / Corporation Street). It is however acknowledged that the priority route along Bridge Street which connects to outlying areas to the west should be extended along Frederick Street to Effingham Square and out past Tesco</p>	<p>Amend 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph on page 43: '...following the closure of retailers <del>on an</del> <b>in the</b> evening, the quarter becomes quiet'.</p> <p>Amend title of Figure 5.6.2 on page 49: 'Rotherham Town Centre: monthly average <del>football</del> <b>footfall</b> by year...'</p> <p>Extend the movement and connectivity priority route on Bridge Street to Frederick Street and Effingham Square and onwards towards Eastwood on figure 7.2.2, fig 7.7.1, the Masterplan extracts in section 7.1 and the standalone map accompanying the document.</p>

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I have a general concern that almost all prime land within or adjacent to the civic and cultural areas of the town centre have been allocated for housing, when in the long-term they can be appropriate for employment uses. Adjust policy with an aim to secure greater employment uses on prime sites near the civic and cultural area of the town centre.</li> </ul>	<p>towards Eastwood. This would help link with the area of change around the Interchange and reflect the importance of linking the town centre to communities to the north east.</p> <p>With regard to housing and employment uses, your concerns are noted. The SPD has been produced in conformity with the Local Plan adopted Core strategy and emerging Sites and Policies document. These policies seek to meet the borough's employment and housing needs. It is recognised that the town centre is well connected to existing employment locations, and that the SPD and Local Plan does accommodate appropriate employment uses in the town centre (in particular offices). As the borough's main public transport hub the town centre also provides good accessibility to employment opportunities in other locations. However it is also recognised that one of the key priorities is to increase the population within the town centre, which will help bolster and improve the vitality and viability of the centre. It is therefore considered that the document makes appropriate provision for housing and that a greater emphasis on employment uses is not necessary.</p>	
SPD7	Mr Andrew Burton	<p>A very interesting and exciting vision for the future that must surely be supported by all for the benefits it will bring to the town and borough. A number of comments/observations as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The forward appears to be in Latin?</li> <li>2) Should there be a consideration for a main</li> </ol>	<p>Your comments of support are noted.</p> <p>The latin text in the forward is used for illustrative purposes. A foreword will be included in the final version of the document.</p>	<p>Insert foreword</p> <p>Include Westgate on the key gateway plan on page 76 and the accompanying stand-alone map.</p>

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>gateway into the town centre along Westgate?</p> <p>3) Why does the draft document include an outdated aerial photo of the town centre with no title or reference date.</p> <p>4) An early page in the document (not numbered) refers to the 10 goals but these aren't described until later (page 17).</p> <p>5) Much of what is proposed will required a high level of maintenance that currently cannot be afforded. Will revenue be secured to ensure the proposals can be sustainable (eg. recently completed hardworks at the Central Railway Station have become weedy and unclean).</p> <p>6) On p.22 under '3.1 Progress' a list of projects refers to All Saints Square under the 2011 heading. This work was completed much earlier.</p> <p>7) On p.35 Clifton Park (no.5) isn't shown on the key.</p> <p>8) On p.62 (item 7.2) the text talks about improving connectivity and provision of new opportunities for town centre users to engage in different parts of the town centre. I believe the Landscape and public Realm should also concentrate on the existing fabric of the town centre generally (ie. improved paving, seating, signage, planting etc.). It also talks about the most important assets of the town centre...surely these are the actual retail outlets?</p> <p>9) Effingham Square appears to be identified as an area to be improved and indicated as a site for short term intervention. Long term inervention is shown for the entrance to Clifton Park (off Doncaster Road and Clifton Lane). We (Landscape Design Team) have recently been invloved with Highways to improve the area around the Clifton Park Entrance and the Effingham Square area was 'improved' as part of the Tesco development.</p>	<p>Westgate is a main gateway and is highlighted as an area for improvement on page 76. The figure on page 49 and the accompanying stand-alone map will be amended to better reflect this.</p> <p>The document has drawn upon a range of images; however it should be noted that Council resources do not stretch to commissioning new aerial photography of the centre. No more up to date aerial photographs have been identified for use.</p> <p>It is considered that the document is clear regarding the 10 goals; notwithstanding early references to these.</p> <p>The Council will continue to meet its maintenance and cleanliness responsibilities within the town centre. It is beyond the remit of the SPD to introduce new policy regarding maintenance of public spaces; whilst the planning system may offer some opportunities to consider longer term maintenance (through the negotiation of developer contributions or the use of Community Infrastructure Levy receipts) this issue will require consideration within the Council as a whole.</p> <p>Your comments regarding public realm improvements at All Saints Square are welcomed. This actually refers to the improvements adjacent to the Minster</p>	<p>Page 22 – progress - 2011 – amend title 'All Saints Square <b>Minster</b>'</p> <p>Add reference on page 62 to examples of public realm improvements such as improved paving, seating, signage, public art and planting.</p>

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>10) On p.61 of the report (and the masterplan generally) comments relating to the ten goals suggest any developments for goal no.10 (Land to the West of Westgate) needs to consider possible risk from flooding. Such comments are equally applicable to goals no.1, no.7 and no.9 as these include areas that fall within the 1:100 year flood zone.</p> <p>11) Referring to a concern raised about future sustainability: The Central Railway Station was rebuilt and our team (Landscape Design) were responsible for design and overseeing the delivery of the external landscape. This now forms an attractive 'gateway' into Rotherham but maintenance of the hard landscape is poor and weeds have become well established. The hard materials are also unclean. The soft landscape area is in its penultimate year of a maintenance contract but once this is complete the planted canalside will quickly revert to a weedy mess also. Any new proposals (hard or soft) for the public realm require appropriate and often high levels of maintenance which currently cannot be afforded by the Local Authority.</p>	<p>and not All Saints Square itself, or Minster Gardens. The reference will be clarified.</p> <p>Whilst detailed guidance regarding public realm and landscaping is beyond the remit of this SPD it is acknowledged that the discussion on page 62 could include reference to examples of the various elements of public realm which could be improved.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that improvements have been made to Effingham Square, however it is considered that there is scope for further improvement in this area.</p> <p>Clifton Park is included on the map in the document as an existing green space. It is specifically identified in the accompanying map which sits alongside the document and provides more detailed notation and commentary on particular sites.</p> <p>Your comments regarding sites within flood zones are noted. Please refer to the response below to the Environment Agency's comments regarding Flood Risk.</p>	
SPD8	Mr Andrew Denniff, Chamber of Commerce	I believe that it is essential in any successful redevelopment of the town centre to seriously address the future use of the Forge Island site. This needs to be developed in line with a purposeful leisure/evening economy offer and linked across the river with welcoming and user friendly accessibility to Corporation Street/All	Your comments are noted, and reflect the importance that the SPD places upon redevelopment of the Forge Island site.	None

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		Saints Square. In the short term the Forge Island site can be used positively for increased and enhanced parking by demolishing the present old Tesco building and improving access and footfall through to the town centre via Corporation Street.		
SPD9	National Grid	We have reviewed the above consultation document and can confirm that National Grid has no comments to make in response to this consultation.	Noted	None
SPD10	Historic England	<p>Historic England are concerned that this latest publication does not provide as informed an analysis as its predecessor of the character of the town centre nor are its proposals as detailed or guidance as well articulated.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned about the SPD's approach to the historic environment which is notably poorer than the 2005 Strategic Development Framework. The SPD makes scant reference to these assets or to the potential that the historic environment can play in delivering the regeneration of the town centre and in reinforcing its distinctive character.</p> <p>In addition, one might expect an SPD to amplify the Policies of the Local Plan. However, this document actually provides less information than the emerging Sites and Policies DPD (which actually sets out a range of Site Development Guidelines for all the potential allocations in the town centre).</p> <p>A number of detailed comments are provided.</p>	<p>Your comments and concerns are noted. Preparation of the original 2005 masterplan benefited from regional funding from Yorkshire Forward which is no longer available. Therefore this update document has been produced having due regard for the financial pressures under which the Council operates.</p> <p>The SPD should be read alongside other Local Plan policies, which do provide clear guidance regarding the historic guidance. The intention of the SPD is to provide a broad guide to the vision and aspiration for the town centre building on the Local Plan policies; as such it is not the intention of the document to provide detailed site specific guidance across the full range of planning issues. However it is acknowledged that section 4.1 regarding planning policy should be amended to include reference to relevant planning policy.</p> <p>The Council is however intending to undertake further work which will include more site-specific guidance for parts of</p>	<p>Amend Vision - "Attracted by quality design, <b><u>well-maintained historic buildings</u></b> and a strong sense of place ..."</p> <p>Goal 3 – add new sentence at end - "In particular this can be achieved by improving connectivity to and from Rotherham's historic Clifton Park."</p> <p>Goal 8 – amend: "Rotherham will <b><u>seek to ensure that its historic assets are conserved and</u></b> actively seek the best in architecture, urban design and public spaces..."</p> <p>Section 4.1: Amend sub title –: 'Local Adopted <b><u>and</u></b> Emerging Policy'</p> <p>Section 4.1 – second column, insert new</p>

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
			<p>the town centre. This could include further guidance regarding the historic environment.</p> <p>The suggested amendments to the vision and goals 3 and 8 are agreed. The Council does not agree with the proposed amendment to goal 2. Whilst the Council agrees that in some circumstances vacant and under-used floorspace could be suitable for housing there may be locations where this guidance conflicts with other emerging Local Plan policies (such as those relating to primary and secondary shopping frontages).</p> <p>It is agreed that goal 8 should be amended to reference the conservation of historic buildings; however the Council does not consider it appropriate to commit to a separate urban design framework or SPD which will be dependent upon Council resources and priorities.</p> <p>The town centre Conservation Area Appraisal and the 2008 Public realm Strategy will be reviewed and updated as and when resources allow. It is noted that the Conservation Area boundary is shown on figure 5.3.1. It is acknowledged that it would be helpful to include an indication of the location of Listed Buildings within the centre.</p> <p>Your comments regarding the Listing of the former Guest and Chrimes building</p>	<p>paragraph after second paragraph:</p> <p>‘Core Strategy Policy CS23, alongside the more general commitment to ensuring that Rotherham’s historic environment is appropriately conserved, states that the character and setting of Rotherham Minster and the Chapel on the Bridge will be conserved and enhanced and that proposals will be supported which respect and enhance key views and vistas to both these and other significant buildings.’</p> <p>5.5 Civic paragraph – amend: ‘The Grade II Listed <del>façade of the</del> former Guest and Chrimes <u>building site</u> is situated...’</p> <p>8.1 will be amended to provide appropriate words which indicate how increased vitality and viability of the centre could address many of the issues facing the historic assets in the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Add indication of the</p>



Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
			<p>is noted and the text will be amended to correct this.</p> <p>It is agreed that section 8.1 should reference how increased vitality and viability of the centre could benefit historic assets.</p>	<p>location of Listed Buildings to figure 5.3.1 and other maps as appropriate.</p>
SPD11	Ms Sharon Gill, ROAR	<p>There is talk of the Civic focus not being purely on governance but also on culture and the arts, however this theme is not carried through the plan.</p> <p>The plan is safe and sensible, but is not exciting and daring. This is a real opportunity to turn Rotherham into a destination for the visitor and tourist economy, to do something extraordinary bespoke to Rotherham and not done elsewhere.</p> <p>For example putting some restrictions on the retail offer to prevent further discount stores. There is no Cultural Quarter that would support and compliment the night time economy- theatres, live music venues, galleries, makers studios- live work spaces etc. This would also support the making and trading strand of the plan.</p> <p>Public art to enhance gateways and transport hubs, as well as the waterways, that compliment the environmental vision and encourage greater bio diversity, as well as helping to engage communities in taking ownership of their town and generating a real sense of pride in Rotherham, needs embedding.</p> <p>We would like to see much greater public involvement in the development and acceptance of any changes to large spaces and civic functions. This would take time, need to be creative and be resource demanding in man hours, but a new approach to making a</p>	<p>The document has been produced as a SPD. As such it must have regard to what is achievable within the planning system. As such the Council does not have the power to restrict the type of retail operators within retail premises.</p> <p>Whilst no specific cultural quarter is defined it is considered that the SPD does provide opportunity for a range of cultural activities to take place throughout Rotherham town centre.</p> <p>Whilst detailed guidance regarding public realm and landscaping is beyond the remit of this SPD it is acknowledged that the discussion on page 62 could include reference to examples of the various elements of public realm which could be improved, which includes public art (see proposed change in response to comments from Mr Andrew Burton).</p> <p>Developments requiring planning permission are subject to statutory public consultation and as such afford everyone the opportunity to provide views on any proposed development.</p> <p>It is noted that Riverside House does not</p>	<p>Page 22, 2011 – Civic offices – ‘...an integrated Library and <b>Arts-Centre art gallery</b>...</p>

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>successful town centre that is not dependant on the opinions of planners would be refreshing and potentially newsworthy, in a positive sense. The SDP is a lengthy document and is not going to elicit responses from those who use the town centre.</p> <p>pg 22- 2011. Riverside does not include an Arts Centre.</p>	<p>include an arts centre. It is proposed to amend the wording to refer to the library and art gallery.</p>	
SPD12	Peter Hawkrige, Rotherham District Civic Society	<p>The Society would wish to make the following points in relation to consultations of this nature:-</p> <p>(i) It would have been helpful if a monochrome copy of the report, supplemented by the coloured maps, had been available on the RMBC website. The Society does not have unlimited funds for printing costs.</p> <p>(ii) The inclusion of a schedule of Use Classes as an Appendix would have been appreciated.</p> <p>(iii) A one page summary describing the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District concept and its geographic extent would have been of assistance.</p> <p>In the Society's view there is only one purpose in employing an external consultant and that is to bring to the table expertise, knowledge and innovative thinking not already available within RMBC's Planning Service. This report however reads almost like a series of standard planning clichés, green corridors/riverside/town centre living etc containing warm words that the client likes to hear and skating over the significant difficulties the town centre faces.</p> <p>There is an old saying about consultants – “give them your watch and they'll tell you the time” This appears to be what has happened in this case with the report simply reflecting the views provided at the consultation event on the 8th</p>	<p>The document has been produced having due regard for the financial pressures under which Council operates. Whilst noting that the plan is provided in colour most printers allow printing in black and white. Furthermore the Council provided hard copies of the document for inspection at Riverside Library.</p> <p>Whilst a number of comments have been provided regarding the proposed uses in particular parts of the centre it should be noted that the SPD has been prepared to ensure that it is in conformity with and does not conflict with the emerging Local Plan, which identifies appropriate uses in specific locations including the town centre and in particular mixed use areas on the periphery of the town centre.</p> <p>The Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District is an emerging concept and not sufficiently advanced to warrant more detailed reference within the SPD.</p> <p>The intention of the SPD is to provide a broad guide to the vision and aspiration</p>	<p>Goal 5 - ...sporting assets such as <del>Rotherham Theatre on Bridgegate</del>, the Civic Theatre...</p> <p>Page 22 – progress section: 2007 – change ‘College Road’ to ‘College Street’ 2012 NY Stadium – include references to meeting goals 5 and 8 2015 – High Street – include reference to meeting goal 10 2016-2026 – ‘Implementation of the <del>Six</del> <b>Eight</b> Key Moves’</p> <p>Consideration will be given to the consistency of wording of Sections 7.1, 7.3 and 7.5 to aid clarity</p> <p>Visualisation of forge island – amend text to refer to view looking Eastward, not westward</p> <p>Include Westgate on the</p>

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>January 2016. If this is the case it is to be hoped that the consultancy fee has been minimal. There is no point in employing consultants simply to mediate stakeholders' views.</p> <p>The Society was involved in responding to the very professional and detailed May 2008 Draft Interim Planning Statement prepared by RMBC Planning Service and is surprised that this has not been used as a reference point for the current "refresh"</p> <p>A number of detailed comments are provided.</p>	<p>for the town centre building on the Local Plan policies; as such it is not the intention of the document to provide detailed site specific guidance across the full range of planning issues.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the identification of a number of corrections and amendments. Whilst it agrees with a number of these and various proposed changes are identified as a result, there are a number of suggestions or comments which the Council does not agree with.</p> <p>For example, reference is made to a number of policies which are already adopted as part of the Local Plan Core Strategy. With regard to Drummond Street car park this site is identified as a development site in the current adopted UDP and is proposed to continue to be identified as such in the emerging local plan.</p> <p>A number of comments have been made regarding the visualisation of Forge Island. This image is included to give a broad indication of how this area could look and feel following redevelopment as a new part of the town centre. It is not intended to provide a detailed picture of the exact type, range or design of development.</p> <p>The town centre is currently well served in terms of short and long stay parking provision. It is noted that some of this</p>	<p>key gateway plan on page 76 and the stand-alone map</p> <p>Page 80 – second paragraph – amend as follows: 'However, the current size of the <b>outdoor part of the</b> market provides some scope for remodelling in order to rationalise the existing occupiers into a smaller and better quality space.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to determining whether additional funding options related to the LEP or regional growth funds could be referenced</p> <p>Insert a summary of the Use Classes Order</p>

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
			<p>provision is on sites which could be redeveloped for other uses. As such the Council is considering the long term implications of development on parking; however this work is not sufficiently advanced to inform the SPD.</p> <p>It is agreed that the inclusion of a summary of the use classes order would be helpful.</p>	
SPD13	Phil Thornewell	Fig 5.6.2 on P49. Reference to 'football' should surely be 'footfall'?	Noted. This typographical error will be corrected.	Amend title of Figure 5.6.2 on page 49: 'Rotherham Town Centre: monthly average <del>football</del> <b>footfall</b> by year...'
SPD14	Mr and Mrs Stanley	Provided comments which object to the Bassingthorpe Farm Strategic Allocation	Your comments are noted; however Bassingthorpe Farm is allocated for development in the adopted Local Plan Core Strategy and is not included within the boundary of the town centre SPD.	None
SPD15	Mr Martyn Coy, Canal & River Trust	<p>We support the town centre goals especially goal 1.</p> <p>We support the improvement of connectivity for pedestrian/cycling. The Trust receives no specific central grant funding to invest in and maintain towpaths. It is therefore crucial to improve the pedestrian networks along the canal corridor by encouraging planning obligations to improve towpath surfacing and access for all, and create and more inviting, less intimidating routes. We welcome that the Masterplan focusses on the waterway and attempts to create successful waterside development orientated on the waterspace. Support proposals for mixed-use waterfront development.</p> <p>More detailed comments were provided</p>	<p>The comments of support are noted.</p> <p>The detailed comments provided are also noted. Whilst these are relevant considerations for detailed development proposals, the intention of the SPD is to provide a broad guide to the vision and aspiration for the town centre building on the Local Plan policies; as such it is not the intention of the document to provide detailed site specific guidance across the full range of planning issues.</p> <p>The information will however be useful for the further detailed work which the Council intends to undertake which will include more site-specific guidance for</p>	None

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>regarding lighting schemes, signage, ecology and public access. Detailed comments regarding development principles for Guest and Chrimes were provided.</p> <p>Comments on the key moves were also provided:  Key Move 1: Forge Island - The proposed development needs to fully embrace the waterfront  Key Move 3: Gold Routes  We welcome that the towpath has been recognised as a Gold Route and that developments along these routes will be asked to contribute to their improvement and upgrade.  Key Move 5: Riverside Links  The Plan fully acknowledges that the Town, at present, turns its back on the waterfront and needs to focus new development on opening up access to the waterfront.  Key Move 8: Green Infrastructure  The river and navigation are key components of green infrastructure through the Town centre, offering leisure, sustainable transport and a refuge for wildlife. The Draft Plan seeks to develop these components and we would support this approach in order that the multi-functional nature of the waterways are further enhanced.</p>	<p>parts of the town centre.</p>	
SPD16	Mr & Mrs Stamp	<p>Foreword - Not sure of the relevance of the latin text...</p> <p>Coloured Masterplan Drawing - Without the contextual name of locations/buildings, this is very difficult to envisage what the report is trying to demonstrate. In order to capture the essence and importance of the Document it needs to be more focused and detailed in order to attract the attention of the reader.</p> <p>Goals page 19 - Not sure where the "Rotherham</p>	<p>Your comments of support are noted.</p> <p>A foreword will be included in the final version of the document.</p> <p>Comments regarding the Masterplan drawing are noted. However it is considered that the more detailed map which sits alongside the document provides further notation and explanation, particularly in respect of key sites.</p>	<p>Foreword to be included in final version</p>

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>Theatre" is on Bridgegate....!</p> <p>5.4 Connectivity page 39 - It is pleasing to see the development of a Tram/Train link, but I believe that it is important to support this service with corresponding car-parking facilities.</p> <p>page 40 - If funding would allow, additional pedestrian walkways above or across Centenary Way would certainly improve access from the Rotherham Community Health Centre and surrounding businesses into the hub of the Town Centre;</p> <p>5.6 Economy page 49 - I would support attempts to focus on attracting "middle market" retailers into the town.</p> <p>7.5 Key Move 1 Forge Island page 68 - I would support any attempt to improve this area and encourage waterfront development to create a more "cafe society" image for the town.</p> <p>7.9 Key Move 5 Riverside Link page 78 - I would support the development of this area, which would encourage people to walk and cycle, whilst being aware and appreciative of the town's natural resource and wildlife. The development of the Guest and Crimes site is vital to the town;</p> <p>7.10 Key Move 6 Markets Regeneration page 80 - I would support the idea of multi-use for this area and encourage small scale manufacturing/sales units.</p> <p>8.1 Benefits page 88-89 - The concept of "Alive after Five" is a good idea but please, please, do</p>	<p>The town centre is currently well served in terms of short and long stay parking provision. It is noted that some of this provision is on sites which could be redeveloped for other uses. As such the Council is considering the long term implications of development on parking; however this work is not sufficiently advanced to inform the SPD.</p> <p>Highway improvements have already been implemented to provide 'at level' pedestrian crossings over Centenary Way. The Council will consider opportunities to further improve pedestrian linkages between the town centre and surrounding communities where opportunities and resources allow.</p> <p>It should be noted that the emerging Local Plan includes draft policies which seek to provide further control over the number and location of hot food takeaways within the town centre.</p>	

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		not encourage the influx of yet more fast food establishments; Rotherham already has its quota!		
SPD17	Elisa Atkinson, Highways England	<p>We are concerned about the impact of future development in Rotherham and in the wider Sheffield City Region on the strategic road network. We are currently undertaking Infrastructure Studies along the M1 and M18 and will seek to work with you to identify highways improvement schemes where required.</p> <p>New housing, leisure and retail opportunities have the potential to generate a significant volume of traffic. Smaller sites brought forward on their own, if not in the immediate vicinity of the SRN, may have a limited impact on the SRN. However an accumulation of these could significantly impact the on SRN.</p> <p>We are not aware if any detailed assessments have recently been undertaken to determine the impact of the town centre development and we would therefore welcome the opportunity to be involved to ensure the cumulative impact of sites is fully realised at later stages as required, to determine the scale of impact of the proposed development, any development phasing or mitigation measures which may be required.</p> <p>The SPD states 'Rotherham Town Centre will be at the centre of a public transport network that connects Rotherham's satellite communities into the town and joins the town to the rest of the sub-region including Robin Hood Doncaster-Sheffield airport and the future HS2 station. In addition, we want improvements to the highways network to accommodate growth and provide high quality sustainable transport access, such as walking and cycling into the Town Centre'. This approach</p>	<p>Your comments of support are noted, as are your concerns regarding the cumulative impact of development.</p> <p>Local Plan policies already address the requirements for providing travel plans; as such it is not considered appropriate to re-iterate this policy here as the SPD should be read alongside other relevant planning policy.</p> <p>The Council will look to work with Highways England where appropriate to consider the issues raised, although it is noted that highways and transport implications of proposed development will be subject to public and statutory bodies consultation through the planning application process.</p> <p>The intention of the SPD is to provide a broad guide to the vision and aspiration for the town centre building on the Local Plan policies; as such it is not the intention of the document to provide detailed site specific guidance across the full range of planning issues. The Council is however intending to undertake further work which will include more site-specific guidance for parts of the town centre.</p>	None

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>is supported as opportunities for maximising modal shift and accessibility for walking, cycling and public transport as important transport modes need to be considered to minimise development-associated car trips. We expect that the SPD will maximise opportunities to introduce travel reduction and demand management measures. Public transport measures should include the provision of bus stops and waiting areas as well as provision of information to promote modal shift.</p> <p>We welcome consideration given to infrastructure measures to improve pedestrian movement and circulation, sustainable transport measures to support public transport infrastructure, cycle parking and storage by planning obligations. We welcome proposals for an improved Transport Interchange with pedestrian and wayfinding improvements between the bus and rail stations in order to facilitate and improve linkages and integration with the town centre. We support your approach to capitalising on the town centre location in a working area that is liveable, walkable and bikeable, with good quality transport links. Measures to reduce car trips such as City car initiatives and car share schemes should be included in any travel planning. The provision of more opportunities for city living in proximity to work places is welcomed as it should contribute to a reduction in car travel.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to parking standards and their relationship to measures to reduce dependencies on the car:</p> <p>The SDP should address the requirement for effective travel plans to maximise use of</p>		



Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>sustainable modes and minimise provision of parking</p> <p>The degree to which new or re-designed networks of residential streets allow a high level of penetration by bus services on 'connector' residential streets in order to ensure that the public transport option is as attractive as possible in comparison to a car.</p>		
SPD18	Andrew Fosbueary, SYPTE	<p>Town Centre Goals</p> <p>SYPTE agrees with the location of new residential development in areas of high public transport accessibility. It welcomes RMBCs acknowledgement of the importance of the town centre as a hub for connecting both local and longer distance public transport trips. SYPTE agrees with the location of new residential/leisure development in areas of high public transport accessibility. It also agrees with the goal of making the town centre a key destination.</p> <p>Connectivity</p> <p>Tram-Train: Key in providing significant connectivity improvements as well as unlocking opportunities along the corridor.</p> <p>Main Line Rail: Work is currently ongoing to understand the relative merits of any future proposals to mitigate the segregation of Rotherham Central from the mainline.</p> <p>Bus Services: Due to the previously stated poor alternatives the Bus Network is key to providing a useable public transport network in Rotherham. The Rotherham Bus Partnership has resulted in improvements meaning passengers can travel around the town more easily. SYPTE noted and agrees there is potential for improvements to the quality of the environment at the interchange</p>	<p>Your comments of support are noted. A number of comments relate to issues beyond the remit of this document (such as the provision of temporary bus stops to facilitate any redevelopment of the transport interchange); however they will remain relevant to any activity taking place in the future.</p>	None

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>In general SYPTE welcome the proposals to improve the Town centre. Rotherham Town Centre is relatively well connected by bus and as such it makes sense to focus development in an area of high public transport accessibility. RMBC note the importance of connectivity in encouraging investment. SYPTE wholeheartedly agrees with this and notes the opportunities of connecting the town centre up with the existing AMID as well as providing opportunities for its growth.</p> <p><b>Key Move 7: Transport Interchange</b>  SYPTE welcome the opportunity to redevelop this site in partnership with RMBC and this SPD document for reinforcing the need of the interchange to maintain its use as a transport hub and that any additional uses, such as retail, be ancillary to its main use.</p> <p>Work is currently ongoing on various possibilities for the future of the Interchange and SYPTE welcomes the importance this document places on getting this redevelopment right. The interchange is key component to a successful town centre and in many cases the first place people travelling into the town will see.</p> <p>SYPTE understand there are a number of complexities when developing this site, including the current structural issues in the car park.</p> <p>It is important to consider what will happen to existing bus services as the interchanges is redeveloped. Rotherham Town Centre has limited street space available for centrally located bus stops and as such is important to consider</p>		

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>the phasing of development. There needs to be an allowance for the location of temporary stops as the redevelopment of the interchange goes ahead.</p> <p>Delivery</p> <p>It is important to insure the delivery is complimentary.</p> <p>In summary SYPTTE welcome this forward thinking document and the importance it places on connectivity as well as acknowledging the opportunities for co-operation it presents.</p>		
SPD19	Richard Bellamy	<p>The purpose of these comments is to try and encourage the Local Authority to be a little bit more accommodating to people who travel to, from and across the Rotherham town centre using cycles of various forms.</p> <p>Cyclists are known to make short journeys and spend money in their local areas, thus helping the local economy. Very often, their presence is particularly beneficial to cafés, restaurants and to other food shops.</p> <p>Rotherham should look to places such as Bath, Bristol, Cambridge and York as being cities which cater best for cycling.</p> <p>The cycling routes into and out of the Rotherham town centre are not especially inviting.</p> <p>Street cleanliness is important, too. Many shared pedestrian and cycling paths are strewn with broken glass and other debris (eg: the pathways beneath Centenary Way near to the Lidl store</p>	<p>Your comments are welcomed and concerns related to cycling are noted.</p> <p>It is noted that draft Local Plan policies promote sustainable and inclusive access to proposed development by public transport, walking and cycling, including the provision of secure cycle parking.</p> <p>Rotherham has recently been successful in securing funding from Sheffield City Region to improve pedestrian and cycle links to and from areas on the fringe of the town centre to and across the town centre. We will continue to develop attractive and obvious cycle routes into the town centre and to provide convenient and safe locations for cyclists to park their bikes once in the town centre as we acknowledge the benefits derived from a coherent cycle network.</p>	<p>Extend the cycle route notation along Westgate on fig 5.4.1, the Masterplan extracts in section 7.1 and the main map accompanying the document.</p> <p>In section 5.4 insert additional text under the 'cycling routes' section referring to longer term aspirations for strategic cycling routes linking the town centre with outlying areas via Wellgate and Westgate.</p>

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>and the railway station). Most of the cycle storage shelters in the town centre are not routinely cleaned, nor maintained adequately.</p> <p>To try and be more accommodating to cyclists, when reviewing its planning policies and documents, the Local Authority ought to be more receptive of the modern standards of highway design and cycling facilities.</p> <p>In the assessment of town centre cycling facilities and highway design, there should be a willingness for the Local Authority to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. learn from the experiences of the cities listed above;</li> <li>2. adopt the modern design guides such as 'Space for Cycling' (Cyclenation), the CPRE Transport Toolkit, the London Cycle Campaign and the Welsh Assembly (the latter for the design of road junctions); borrow a few ideas from the Netherlands as well;</li> <li>3. engage positively in discussions with national cycling groups (eg: Cycling UK and Sustrans), as well as local cycling clubs and groups, when proposing new facilities for cycling;</li> <li>4. improve the provision of secure cycle parking in the town centre;</li> <li>5. repair road surfaces as necessary (eg: Bridge Street, Chantry Bridge, Greasbrough Road, Sheffield Road);</li> <li>6. quash the byelaw prohibiting cycling in Clifton Park;</li> <li>7. ultimately decide whether cycling either is, or isn't to be permitted on High Street;</li> <li>8. permit cycling in the bus lane at Corporation Street (or at least explain properly the reasons why cycling isn't permitted there).</li> </ol>	<p>Many of the detailed comments provided are beyond the remit of the SPD, however the Council will continue to meet its maintenance and cleanliness responsibilities within the town centre.</p> <p>The intention of the SPD is to provide a broad guide to the vision and aspiration for the town centre building on the Local Plan policies; as such it is not the intention of the document to provide detailed site specific guidance across the full range of planning issues. However the SPD recognises that there will be a need for further cycle infrastructure as the population increases. There may be opportunities to improve cycle infrastructure through the 8 key moves identified in the SPD and in the development of other sites within the town centre.</p> <p>The information will be useful for the further detailed work which the Council intends to undertake which will include more site-specific guidance for parts of the town centre.</p>	

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>From time-to-time, the Local Authority has used funding wisely for cyclists (eg: the provision of a few cycle shelters; the A630 signalled crossing near to the Transport Interchange and the improvements at the St. Ann's roundabout). The 20mph vehicle speed limit in the town is welcome. There is scope for more and the Government has quite recently made a (much-criticised) pledge about the future funding of cycling facilities. Having thankfully abandoned the ridiculously inaccurate "listening Council" tag, is the Local Authority now beginning to accept and act upon the views of others ?</p>		
SPD20	Environment Agency	<p>Areas of Rotherham town centre are at risk from flooding, with a number of the project sites identified in the SPD located in Flood Zone 2 and 3 (medium/high risk). The SPD provides an opportunity to highlight flood risk issues and set out a proposed approach to reducing and managing flood risk in the town centre.</p> <p>The development projects and initiatives identified in the SPD should be informed by the sequential, risk-based approach to the location of sites to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property and manage any residual risk.</p> <p>All new developments will need to be in conformity with local and national planning policy and the Rotherham Flood Risk Toolkit.</p> <p>Any plans for the town centre should take into consideration the Rotherham Renaissance Flood Alleviation Scheme Phase 2 proposal and associated timescales to ensure that opportunities for partnership working and benefits</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. It is noted that a number of sites are within flood risk zones 2 and 3 and as such will be required to comply with national and local planning policy. This includes Core Strategy policy relating to water quality and meeting the Water Framework Directive. It is also noted that the SPD has been produced in compliance with existing and emerging planning policy in the Local Plan, which has been subject to sequential and exception testing. It is acknowledged that reference in section 7.1 overview and the accompanying stand-alone map should make reference to those sites within flood risk zones.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to provide additional wording in the planning policy section to highlight relevant flood risk policy and the flood alleviation scheme.</p> <p>It is noted that flood risk modelling work</p>	<p>Section 4.1 – include additional wording to highlight relevant flood risk policy and the flood alleviation scheme.</p> <p>In section 7.1 and on the stand-alone map, add the following wording to the text relating Forge Island, Law courts and Police Station, Land south of Main Street and Land to the west of Westgate:</p> <p>'The site includes land within Flood Zones 2 and / or 3. Development will need to satisfy relevant planning policy regarding flood risk and regard must be had to the Council's Flood Risk Toolkit.'</p>

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Suggested changes to SPD
		<p>are maximised wherever possible.</p> <p>The EA are currently revisiting the hydraulic modelling for the Middle and Lower Don and this includes the reach of the River Don through Rotherham. Outputs from this study may potentially result in changes to current flows, water levels and associated flood risk maps in this area. Initial outputs from the study are anticipated in late 2016 (although this could be subject to change). It is recommended that any plans for the area should take account of the new modelled data wherever possible, to ensure the most up to date data is utilised in decision-making for any possible schemes and developments.</p> <p>The SPD provides an opportunity to focus on the Water Framework Directive (WFD), and specific measures and actions referred to in the Humber River Basin Management Plan (HRBMP).</p> <p>The SPD presents an opportunity, through the provision of green infrastructure, to enhance the setting of the town centre and we are pleased to see this is reflected in the plan. River corridors (also known as blue infrastructure) are also an important feature of green infrastructure and this should be reflected in the SPD.</p> <p>Further detailed comments were provided regarding Forge Island and how it provides an opportunity to join up several initiatives and create an attractive environment and a step change in Rotherham's relationship with the River Don.</p>	<p>may update the situation regarding flood risk. The Council will naturally expect development proposals to utilise the most recent data available.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan contains policies relating to amongst other things Green Infrastructure, air and water quality, and design. As such it these will be taken into account in any planning applications and it is not considered necessary to repeat them in the SPD.</p> <p>Whilst the detailed comments regarding Forge Island are welcomed, the intention of the SPD is to provide a broad guide to the vision and aspiration for the town centre building on the Local Plan policies; as such it is not the intention of the document to provide detailed site specific guidance across the full range of planning issues. The information will however be useful for the further detailed masterplanning work which the Council intends to undertake. This will include more site specific detail.</p>	

## Summary of proposed changes

- Insert forward as agreed by Councillor Lelliott
- Amend Vision - "Attracted by quality design, well-maintained historic buildings and a strong sense of place ..."
- Goal 3, page 19 – add new sentence at end - "In particular this can be achieved by improving connectivity to and from Rotherham's historic Clifton Park."
- Goal 5 – amend: '...sporting assets such as ~~Rotherham Theatre on Bridgegate~~, the Civic Theatre...'
- Goal 8, page 19 – amend: "Rotherham will seek to ensure that its historic assets are conserved and actively seek the best in architecture, urban design and public spaces..."
- Page 15, third paragraph – amend as follows: The Town Centre Masterplan boundary differs from the ~~more expansive~~ smaller Local Plan Town Centre boundary, ~~being~~ which is more concentrated and spatially focused. The intention of this is to focus regeneration on a number of key sites and areas that will bring the greatest benefit to the Town Centre.
- Page 22 – progress section:
  - 2007 – change 'College Road' to 'College Street'
  - 2011 – All Saints Sq –this refers to the public realm area behind All Saints Minster, not All Saints Square itself – change title to All Saints Minster
  - 2011 – Civic offices – '...an integrated Library and ~~Arts Centre~~ art gallery ...
  - 2012 NY Stadium – include references to meeting goals 5 and 8
  - 2015 – High Street – include reference to meeting goal 10
  - 2016-2026 – 'Implementation of the ~~Six~~ Eight Key Moves'
- Page 26 – 4.1 sub title – amend: 'Local Adopted and Emerging Policy'
- Section 4.1 – second column, insert new paragraph after second paragraph: 'Core Strategy Policy CS23, alongside the more general commitment to ensuring that Rotherham's historic environment is appropriately conserved, states that the character and setting of Rotherham Minster and the Chapel on the Bridge will be conserved and enhanced and that proposals will be supported which respect and enhance key views and vistas to both these and other significant buildings.'
- Section 4.1 – include additional wording to highlight relevant flood risk policy and the flood alleviation scheme.
- Add indication of the location of Listed Buildings to figure 5.3.1 and other maps as appropriate.
- Extend the cycle route notation along Westgate on fig 5.4.1 and the main map accompanying the document.
- In section 5.4 insert additional text under the 'cycling routes' section referring to longer term aspirations for strategic cycling routes linking the town centre with outlying areas via Wellgate and Westgate.
- Amend 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph on page 43: '...following the closure of retailers ~~on an~~ in the evening, the quarter becomes quiet'.

- Section 5.5 Civic paragraph, page 46 – amend: ‘The Grade II Listed ~~façade of the~~ former Guest and Chrimes **building site** is situated...’
- Amend title of Figure 5.6.2 on page 49: ‘Rotherham Town Centre: monthly average ~~football~~ **footfall** by year...’
- Add reference on page 62 to examples of public realm improvements such as improved paving, seating, signage, public art and planting.
- Page 58 - second column, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph – ‘In order to conform with ~~Policy~~ **policy for mixed use area** MU9 **in Policy SP67** of the emerging...’
- Extend the movement and connectivity priority route on Bridge Street to Frederick Street and Effingham Square and onwards towards Eastwood on figure 7.2.2 , fig 7.7.1, the Masterplan extracts in section 7.1 and the standalone map accompanying the document.
- In section 7.1 and on the stand-alone map, add the following wording to the text relating Forge Island, Law courts and Police Station, Land south of Main Street and Land to the west of Westgate: ‘The site includes land within Flood Zones 2 and / or 3. Development will need to satisfy relevant planning policy regarding flood risk and regard must be had to the Council’s Flood Risk Toolkit.’
- Sections 7.1, 7.3 and 7.5 – revise wording to ensure consistency between these sections
- Visualisation of forge island – amend text to refer to view looking Eastward, not westward
- Include Westgate on the key gateway plan on page 76 and the accompanying standalone map (ie show as purple oval notation)
- Page 80 – second paragraph – amend as follows: ‘However, the current size of the **outdoor part of the** market provides some scope for remodelling in order to rationalise the existing occupiers into a smaller and better quality space.
- Section 8.1 p88/89 will be amended to provide appropriate words which indicate how increased vitality and viability of the centre could address many of the issues facing the historic assets in the Conservation Area.
- Consideration to be given to referencing any additional funding options (page 96/97)
- Include a summary of the Use Classes Order –as an appendix