



Integrated Impact Assessment
of the Proposed Main Modifications to the
Publication Sites and Policies Document

January 2018



Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Polices

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

Integrated Impact Assessment for Main Modifications

Document No. | 0

January 2018

Document history and status

Revision	Date	Description	By	Review	Approved
0			Martin White	Meryl Leung	Michael Robinson

Distribution of copies

Revision	Issue approved	Date issued	Issued to	Comments

Rotherham Sites and Policies Local Plan

Project No: 60SG2801
Document Title: Main Modifications IIA Addendum
Document No.: Document No.
Revision: 0
Date: January 2018
Client Name: Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Client No:
Project Manager: Michael Robinson
Author: Martin White
File Name: Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies, IIA Addendum.

Jacobs U.K. Limited

1 City Walk
Leeds, West Yorkshire LS11 9DX
United Kingdom
T +44 (0)113 242 6771
F +44 (0)113 389 1389
www.jacobs.com

© Copyright 2017 Jacobs U.K. Limited. The concepts and information contained in this document are the property of Jacobs. Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of Jacobs constitutes an infringement of copyright.

Limitation: This document has been prepared on behalf of, and for the exclusive use of Jacobs' client, and is subject to, and issued in accordance with, the provisions of the contract between Jacobs and the client. Jacobs accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever for, or in respect of, any use of, or reliance upon, this document by any third party.

Contents

Non-Technical Summary	1
1. Background	3
2. Methodology	4
2.1 The IIA Assessment Process	4
2.2 IIA Methodology for Main Modifications	4
2.2.1 Assessment of Additional Housing Sites for the Wath-Upon-Deerne, Brampton Bierlow and West Melton Settlement Grouping.....	5
3. Which Main Modifications Require Further IIA Assessment	6
3.1 Summary of Assessment	6
4. Update of IIA Assessment	8
5. Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA)	13
6. Conclusions	14
Appendix A: Detailed Assessment of the Main Modifications	
Appendix B: Wath-Upon-Deerne, Brampton, Bierlow and West Melton consultation sites, dated 26th June 2017	
Appendix C: HRA Screening Letter	

Non-Technical Summary

The purpose of this IIA Addendum is to update the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) for the Rotherham Sites and Policies Local Plan to reflect changes proposed by Main Modifications (MMs). In particular, it reviews and updates the assessments already provided by the IIA Report 2015, revision 4 (March 2016) Volume 2 (SD08B) Assessment of Allocations and Alternative and Site Selection and Volume 3, Assessment of Policies (SD08C).

This assessment outlines any changes to the IIA as a consequence of the changes proposed in the MM. It does not reassess policies against all Sustainability Appraisal indicators, unless they are new policies but considers any likely impacts arising from policy changes.

The suggested MMs set out by the Inspector in letters dated 10th March, 2017 (ID024) and 3rd November 2017 (ID031) are necessary to make the plan sound. This report provides the following steps:

1. Setting out the MM and the reason why it is necessary.
2. Considers if the proposed MM could potentially alter the IIA through either different impacts or a change in the magnitude of impacts on each of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) topics.
3. If some or all the SA topics could potentially change as a result of the MM, identify whether the level of residual effects is sufficient to require the current assessment to be updated.
4. Where the IIA needs to be amended, assess the magnitude of potential change in accordance with the IIA methodology using the following impact scale:

Table 2.1: Guideline on identifying the significance of effects of an alternative

Symbol	Significance of the Effect
+++	Major beneficial
++	Moderately beneficial
+	Slightly beneficial
0	Neutral or negligible
-	Slightly adverse
--	Moderately adverse
---	Major adverse

5. The assessment will also identify if any of the individual residual effects will have an impact “in combination” and if any mitigation is required.
6. The majority of MMs relate to the clarification of policies and therefore do not have the potential for residual impacts. This is described by the table in Appendix A. A number of Main Modifications propose site allocations be deleted these include: employment land allocation E16 and Policy SP21 Todwick North, Dinnington (MM55/ MM20 respectively); deletion of residential land allocation (H84) to west of Kiveton Lane, Todwick (MM71). None of these Main Modifications result in the potential for residual effects requiring mitigation through Local Plan policies. Given the overall neutral change arising from these modifications no further changes are required to the Integrated Impact Assessment.
7. The assessment covered by points 3 to 5 identifies that only the following MMs may potentially give rise to residual effects and therefore require further SA assessment: **MM1, MM2 MM16, MM17, MM47, MM49, MM51, MM52, MM56, MM57, MM61, MM63 and MM68.**

8. It is concluded that where the MM alters the current IIA, almost all of the MMs result in either a slightly beneficial or moderately beneficial change, e.g. an improvement in the sustainability of the plan. The exceptions are MM1, MM47, MM68 and MM63 which have a slight adverse effect.
9. Appendix B provides a more detailed analysis of the additional Wath-Upon-Dearne, Brampton, Bierlow and West Melton housing sites, which together provide land for up to 500 houses.
10. This report at section 5 also provides a further update of the Habitat Regulation Assessment screening. To date this has been “screened out”. Section 5 and Appendix C provides information which concludes the proposed modifications do not alter this position.

1. Background

The Council's Local Plan for Rotherham (2013 to 2028) sets out broadly how housing and employment development should be distributed throughout Rotherham's settlements. It comprises two key documents, which are the Core Strategy and the Sites and Policies.

The Council submitted its Local Plan Sites and Policies document to the Secretary of State on 24 March 2016 for independent examination. The examination is underway and in response to the Inspector's letters of March 10th, 2017 (ID024) and 3rd November 2017 (ID031), the Council is preparing a number of proposed modifications for the plan to be found sound. The Modifications consist of:

- A schedule of Main Modifications (MMs) which are subject to public consultation along with this IIA Addendum.
- A schedule of minor amendments which the Council intends to make to the Publication Sites and Policies document. The changes address errors or areas of clarification which have come to light after consultation on the Publication Sites and Policies document. These are not subject to public consultation. The Council considers that these minor changes do not materially alter the substance of the Sites and Policies document and do not impact upon the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA).

Changes proposed in the MMs include:

- Updated policy wording to reflect the safeguarded route of HS2.
- Amendments to site allocations to reflect their current planning situation.
- Amendments to site boundaries to include new areas of land to extend allocations.
- The addition of two housing sites at Wath-Upon-Deerne to provide land for approximately 500 additional homes within this settlement grouping. This MM has also been subject to a further specific public consultation exercise (see separate document provided as Appendix B).
- Allocate an additional housing site at Swinden Technology Centre, Moorgate.
- Delete housing allocation H84 land to west of Kiveton Lane, Todwick
- Combining existing employment and housing sites at Aston, Aughton and Swallownest to form a mixed use allocation.
- Delete employment allocation E16 at Todwick North
- The relaxation of employment policies to allow residential uses within employment areas where evidence is provided to support this.
- Updates to the table on Safeguarded Land; and deletion of SG16, land to north of Aston Bypass.
- A new Special Policy Area relating to the Waverley new community.
- Changes to Policy SP35 Green Infrastructure and Landscape.
- Updates to the policy maps to reflect revised allocations, policy notations and revised site boundary's including sites granted planning permission in the intervening period since publication (2015) and now.
- Inclusion of land south of Brampton Meadows in Green Belt.
- Updates to the Site Development Guidelines.

2. Methodology

2.1 The IIA Assessment Process

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the Council produce an accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. Guidance on these documents states that they should also meet the requirements of the Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) Regulations. The Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) of the Sites and Policies document incorporates four processes:

- Sustainability Appraisal, and meeting the requirements of SEA regulations;
- Health Impact Assessment;
- Equalities Impact Assessment; and
- Habitats Regulation Assessment screening which aims to ensure that there will be no significant adverse effects on a European nature conservation site, except in exceptional circumstances.

The IIA includes details of the Council’s site selection methodology, setting out why sites have been proposed as development allocations, or alternatively why sites have not been considered to be suitable.

2.2 IIA Methodology for Main Modifications

The methodology and approach to this report reflects Part 1 of the IIA (document reference SD08A) as outlined in the Non-Technical Summary of this report. The following sections of the report reflect this approach:

- The first part of the IIA process is to identify if a MM could potentially lead to a change in an IIA sustainability objective and whether the potential for residual effects requires a further review of the current assessment.
- As many of the MMs relate to the clarification of a policy they do not lead to any potential residual effects.
- Section 3 concludes if any residual environmental effects are expected as a result of the main modifications supported by the analysis at Appendix A.
- Where Appendix A concludes that a review of the IIA is necessary, section 4 sets out the nature and magnitude of residual effects in accordance with the IIA methodology. This section also considers any “in combination” effects and whether any mitigation is required.

Table 2.1: Guideline on identifying the significance of effects of an alternative

Symbol	Significance of the Effect
+++	Major beneficial
++	Moderately beneficial
+	Slightly beneficial
0	Neutral or negligible
-	Slightly adverse
--	Moderately adverse
---	Major adverse

- Section 5 provides further assessment of the MM to determine if the Habitat Regulations Assessment is necessary;
- Section 6 provides a summary and conclusions.

2.2.1 Assessment of Additional Housing Sites for the Wath-Upon-Deerne, Brampton Bierlow and West Melton Settlement Grouping.

The main modifications include two additional housing sites which have been subject to additional consultation. A separate report "the Integrated Impact Assessment and Site Justification-Wath-Upon-Deerne, Brampton, Bierlow and West Melton Consultation Sites, June 2017 (RMBC064a) was produced to support this consultation setting out the IIA process to selecting individual sites. This report is provided as Appendix B.

2.2.2 Proposed Site Deletions

Two sites are proposed for deletion at Todwick: employment land allocation E16 and Policy SP21 Todwick North, Dinnington (MM55/ MM20 respectively); deletion of residential land allocation (H84) to west of Kiveton Lane, Todwick (MM71); it is concluded that these two sites do not require further assessment within this IIA Addendum because they have already been assessed and the results included within volume two of the submitted IIA (SD08B); see also Site Selection Methodology in Appendix 2-C of SD08B. Their deletion will have a neutral change to the IIA.

Section 4 of this Addendum report only considers those sites where SA constraints are noted. It is considered these constraints could be overcome through policy mitigation. As policy mitigation is no longer required for the two sites which are to be deleted at Todwick (employment land allocation E16 and residential land allocation H84), then further assessment within this IIA is also not required, and there are no residual IIA effects arising from construction or operation of future development on site.

3. Which Main Modifications Require Further IIA Assessment

3.1 Summary of Assessment

Appendix A provides a detailed assessment spreadsheet to assess whether the MM could change the IIA assessment. This process has concluded that the following main modifications could have a different residual effect requiring evaluation in stage 4 of this report:

Table 3.1: Changes to MM1, MM2 MM16, MM17, MM47, MM49, MM51, MM52, MM56, MM57, MM61, MM63 and MM68.

MM	Reason	Why a Potential Residual Effect?
MM1 (see also MM47 & MM68).	Reflects the preferred route of HS2 and updates the policy map.	Whilst the Local Plan is neutral on HS2 as it is promoted by the Government, the safeguarded route now crosses an employment allocation.
MM2	Site allocation tables are updated to add, delete and amend site descriptions.	New sites are allocated, existing sites deleted or existing site boundaries amended and extended. This is to meet overall Core Strategy targets and to reflect changes in the planning status of sites. Therefore, this potentially alters previous assessments.
MM16	This policy relaxes development in employment areas to allow for residential uses in certain circumstances.	The addition of housing potentially gives rise to a different type and level of impacts than previously assessed.
MM17	This policy focuses on amenity within employment areas, restricting/constraining inappropriate development where this is necessary.	This policy supports MM16 to ensure development does not give rise to any negative effects.
MM47	This removes the previous safeguarded alignment and adds the new safeguarded route.	Whilst the Local Plan is neutral on HS2 as it is promoted by the Government, the safeguarded route crosses an employment allocation, as shown under the change to the Policy Map MM68.
MM49	This change reflects national policy on Petroleum Exploration and Development Licenses (PEDL) as of January 2017.	This MM means this activity can take place Borough wide.
MM51	Provides an additional housing allocation at Swinden Technology Centre, Moorgate.	Allocates the site for 219 homes. This site has come forward for development and as it was not previously allocated it has the potential for additional effects.
MM52	This removes land from the Green Belt and includes it within site H35 to allow for improved access.	This alters the current assessment as it removes land from the Green Belt to provide improved accessibility to this housing site.
MM56/MM57	This provides two additional housing allocations within the Wath-Upon-Deerne, Brampton and Bierlow settlement grouping. This includes	The addition of these two housing sites that were not previously allocated and have not been assessed to date.

MM	Reason	Why a Potential Residual Effect?
	amalgamating land that is currently green space to provide a suitable access.	
MM61	This partly removes land from the Green Belt at Maltby and includes it in the site allocation for H70, to facilitate improved access arrangements.	This alters the current assessment as it removes land from the Green Belt to provide improved accessibility to this housing site.
MM63	This change removes land from the Green Belt to redefine the site boundary of E23 to a defensible Green Belt boundary and to ensure the Core Strategy target on employment land allocations is met.	This removes land from the Green Belt and includes the loss of Ancient Woodland.
MM68	This removes land from the Green Belt and extends the existing land allocated for employment at site E32.	This change extends the land allocated under site E32 through removing land from the Green Belt. The extended employment area “washes over” the safeguarded area for HS2.

4. Update of IIA Assessment

The table below updates the assessment of the IIA

Table 2.1: Guideline on identifying the significance of effects of an alternative

Symbol	Significance of the Effect
+++	Major beneficial
++	Moderately beneficial
+	Slightly beneficial
0	Neutral or negligible
-	Slightly adverse
--	Moderately adverse
---	Major adverse

Table 4.1: Assessment of Changes to MM1, MM2 MM16, MM17, MM47, MM49, MM51, MM52, MM56, MM57, MM61, MM63 and MM68

Main Modification	Topics Affected	Overall magnitude of Residual Effect	Reason	Mitigation Required
MM1	Economy and Employment	- Slightly Adverse	The safeguarded HS2 route passes through a proposed employment allocation.	See MM47 and MM68.

Main Modification	Topics Affected	Overall magnitude of Residual Effect	Reason	Mitigation Required
MM2	All	++ Moderately Beneficial	Overall these changes enable RMBC to effectively implement the Core Strategy through providing development which meets the long terms needs of the Borough.	<p>Sites are assessed specifically by Policy Map MM's:</p> <p>MM51: Swinden Technology Centre (additional housing site)</p> <p>MM52: Removes land from the Green Belt and includes it within housing site H35.</p> <p>MM56 & MM57: Wath-Upon Dearne Housing Sites (additional housing sites)</p> <p>MM61: This partly removes land from the Green Belt at Maltby and includes it in the site allocation for H70.</p> <p>MM63: This change removes land from the Green Belt to extend the site boundary of E23 (extended employment site).</p> <p>MM68: Wales and Kiveton Park, North of School, Waleswood,(extended employment site).</p>
MM16/MM17	Economy & Employment Transport Flood Risk Housing	++ Moderately Beneficial	<p>Overall this change is consistent with National Planning Policy in that land should not be held indefinitely if the prospects for employment are not forthcoming. Potentially, the change could result in different transportation impacts and lead to amenity issues between employment and housing land uses. It is also noted that sequential test flood risk requirements are more stringent for residential uses than employment uses.</p> <p>Overall, this change is considered to have a positive impact through providing opportunities</p>	The mitigation required is covered by MM17, which controls the type and nature of development which would be permissible.

Main Modification	Topics Affected	Overall magnitude of Residual Effect	Reason	Mitigation Required
			for bringing forward under-used and derelict employment sites, and those on the edge of non-strategic and established older employment areas.	
MM47	Economy and Employment	- Slightly Adverse	See MM68	See MM68
MM49	All Topics	Neutral	This change reflects national policy on this matter.	This change extends the potential for exploration activities from defined areas to the whole Borough. In terms of mitigation, Policy SP53 only allows this activity if certain environmental criteria are met.
MM51	Housing and Economy and Employment	+Slightly Beneficial	This site (Swinden Technology Park) is now surplus to requirements and is available for development. It is within the Rotherham Urban Area and is therefore well located. This change provides the opportunity for new housing to bring a vacant site back into use.	Nothing site specific.
MM52	Landscape Housing Transport	+Slightly Beneficial	The release of this small area of land enables housing site H35 to be delivered by providing opportunities for new access to be created. The change therefore ensures housing sites are deliverable in accordance with National Planning Policy Guidance.	Nothing site specific
MM56/MM57	Transport Education and Skills Health and Well Being Biodiversity Flood Risk Natural Resources	++ Moderately Beneficial	The two additional sites are required to meet a shortfall of housing sites against the Core Strategy target for the Wath-Upon-Deerne, Brampton, Bierlow and West Melton settlement grouping. Whilst these sites were not previously allocated	Nothing site specific.

Main Modification	Topics Affected	Overall magnitude of Residual Effect	Reason	Mitigation Required
	Townscape Soil, land use and geology Housing Landscape Accessibility/Community Facilities		they have already been assessed in earlier versions of the IIA and have been subject to separate justification and SA analysis in the Wath-Upon-Deerne, Brampton, Bierlow and West Melton consultation, dated 26 th June 2017, (RMBC064a) provided as Appendix B. Overall, the addition of these two housing sites is considered to be moderately beneficial as it ensures sufficient housing sites are available within a settlement grouping which the Core Strategy determined to be sustainable.	
MM61	Landscape Housing Transport	+Slightly Beneficial	The release of this small area of land enables housing site H70 to be delivered by providing opportunities for new access to be created. The change therefore ensures housing sites are deliverable in accordance with National Planning Policy Guidance.	Nothing site specific.
MM63	All topics	- Slightly adverse	This allows the extension of the Maltby Colliery employment site to meet the employment needs of the Borough and to provide a defensible Green Belt boundary. This requires land to be released from the Green Belt and development would result in the removal of Ancient Woodland. This is why a slight adverse impact is recorded.	The loss of Ancient Woodland cannot be mitigated directly although replacement planting at other locations at a greater scale can go some way to offsetting this loss.
MM68	Economy and transport Transport Flood Risk Landscape	- Slightly adverse	Whilst the extension to this site meets strategic employment needs set out in the Core Strategy, its potential to be developed in its entirety is limited by the safeguarded HS2 route. The extension area is released from the Green	As MM1, further consultation with HS2 Ltd will be undertaken as part of the MM.

Main Modification	Topics Affected	Overall magnitude of Residual Effect	Reason	Mitigation Required
			<p>Belt so has slight adverse effects.</p> <p>No combined effects with HS2 are assumed</p>	

5. Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA).

Evidence of the need, or otherwise, for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA, also sometimes referred to as 'Appropriate Assessment') is a requirement when submitting a local development document under Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. This must, as a minimum, include the 'screening' stage of HRA. This stage determines whether or not a plan or programme present the potential to significantly affect a 'Natura 2000' European nature conservation site, as previously required by Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) and superseded by Regulation 63 of the 2017 (No.1012) 'Wildlife Countryside | The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations' on 30/11/2017.

At each earlier stage of Local Plan preparation, Natural England determined that the Sites and Policies Local Plan was 'screened out' of HRA.

For the reasons set out in Appendix C, it is concluded that there are no likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites and therefore an Appropriate Assessment is not required of the Main Modifications proposed to the Sites and Policies document before adoption.

6. Conclusions

The majority of MMs relate to the clarification of policies and therefore do not have the potential for residual impacts. This is described by the table in Appendix A.

It is important to note that a number of Main Modifications provide sustainability improvements to the Local Plan; these include: boundary changes to development site allocations; refinement to policy wording; deletion of employment land allocation (E16) and Policy SP21 Todwick North, Dinnington (MM55/ MM20); and deletion of residential land allocation (H84) to west of Kiveton Lane, Todwick (MM71).

The assessment in this IIA addendum identifies that only the following MMs may potentially give rise to residual effects and therefore require further SA assessment: **MM1, MM2 MM16, MM17, MM47, MM49, MM51, MM52, MM56, MM57, MM61, MM63 and MM68.**

It is concluded that where the MM alters the current IIA assessment, almost all of the MMs result in either a slightly beneficial or moderately beneficial change, e.g. an improvement in the sustainability of the plan. The only exceptions are MM1, MM47, MM68 and MM63 which have a slight adverse effect.

Appendix B provides a more detailed analysis of the Wath-Upon-Deerne, Brampton, Bierlow and West Melton housing sites, which would provide land for up to 500 houses.

To date HRA has been “screened out”. Section 5 and Appendix C provides information which concludes the proposed modifications do not alter this position.

Appendix A.

Detailed Assessment of Main Modifications.

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
2	MM1	Policies Map and relates to MM47 & MM68		<p>Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike-through below:</p> <p>3.5 The Council is mindful of national infrastructure projects and the proposed route of Phase 2 of the High Speed 2 (HS2) rail line is shown on its Policies Map. This reflects the Government's preferred route for which Safeguarding Directions (made by the Secretary of State for Transport) came into force on 15 November 2016. A decision on the final route has yet to be made. The HS2 rail line is not a Rotherham Council proposal and the route in question will not be determined through the development plan process. The route will be considered in Parliament under hybrid Bill procedures, which will provide appropriate opportunities for petitions to be made to Parliament by those directly affected by the scheme route which was subject to consultation between July 2013 and January 2014. The Secretary of State for Transport has not formally issued Safeguarding Directions for Phase 2.</p> <p>3.6 When a final route is announced and/or formal safeguarding directions are issued, the most up-to-date route of HS2 Phase 2 will be shown on the Policies Map at that time.</p>	Clarification for the decision making process for the HS2 route. To outline the formal process for the Hybrid Bill. This will ensure that the plan is up-to-date and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	HS2 Ltd has confirmed the route for the second phase of HS2 from the West Midlands to Leeds and Manchester. The land within this route is subject to a safeguarding direction. This safeguarding direction includes land within allocation site E32, covered by MM68.	Yes - mainly Economy and Employment as the safeguarding impacts on a proposed employment allocation.	Yes.
3				<p>Table 2: Changes to developable housing numbers for specific sites to reflect the planning permissions and completions data. Two additional sites proposed in the Wath-upon-Deerne, Brampton Bierlow and West Melton area to provide approximately 500 dwellings; an additional allocation at Bluemans Way, Catcliffe to reflect a planning permission and a further new residential allocation at Swinden Technology Centre as this land is now available for development. In addition, a change of use from business to residential at land off Rotherham Road, Maltby.</p> <p>Table 4 - deletion of site reference E25.</p> <p>Table 5 - deletion of site reference E16.</p> <p>Table 7 - update of the remaining housing requirement between 2016 and 2028.</p> <p>Table 8 - update of the remaining balance required per settlement group.</p>	The MM is required to reflect sites which have already been granted planning permission or construction has completed or nearing completion and to meet a shortfall in the Wath-Upon-Deerne settlement grouping. In response to the Council's Housing Land Supply Position Statement (January 2017), sites have come forward for development over the plan period. Changes include additional / new site allocations, changes to the site boundaries and increases / decreases to the capacity of site allocations. These tables will ensure that the plan is up-to-date and is coherent.	All topics	<p>Table 2: The site at Swinden Technology Centre (currently site HXX on the policy map) is previously an employment use class that is now available for redevelopment. The MM proposes to allocate it for housing site to reflect that it has become available for development and is an existing residential area. Within Volume 2 of the IIA: Assessment of Allocations and Alternative Site Selection (March 2016), the site scored red against water / sewerage capacity, flood risk and being adjacent to a watercourse. All these issues can be mitigated. Within Volume 4: Site Survey Summary Sheets of the IIA, the Council considers that residential use on this site is an appropriate alternative to employment uses. There is also potential to convert the listed building on site to residential use. If, in the future, approval is given to proposals for residential development, any scheme will need to be built to a high standard to reflect the presence of the grade 2 listed building. The SA assessment scores for this site scored well and the only potential constraint is its brownfield status which could be mitigated by the application of policy SP57 by ensuring that development demonstrates that there will be no significant harm and by proposing remediation.</p> <p>The two additional residential allocations proposed in the Wath Upon Deerne settlement grouping have been subject to public consultation and are also covered by a separate report 'The IIA and Site Justification - Wath-upon-Deerne, Brampton Bierlow and West Melton Consultation Sites' dated 26 June 2017. This report was produced in preparation for public consultation which took place on 3 July 2017 as recommended by the Planning Inspector (PINS) on page 5 of his letter dated 10 March 2017 and the need to find additional housing allocations in the Wath-upon-Deerne, Brampton Bierlow and West Melton settlement grouping.</p> <p>The MM also proposes an allocation, identified as land at Bluemans Way, Catcliffe, This reflects the recent residential planning permission won on appeal.</p> <p>Table 4: Site allocation E25 is deleted. The former business use allocation has been granted planning permission for residential purposes so it is now included within Table 2. Site allocation E28 is deleted and is included within Mixed Use allocation MU22 as proposed to be amended by MM42.</p> <p>Table 5 - Site allocation E16 is discussed in more detail under MM20. Site allocation E23 is changed into a Special Policy Area (SPA) 2.</p> <p>Table 6 - Site allocation R4 is deleted as planning permission is already granted and is nearing completion.</p> <p>Table 7 - Factual update to the figures following the proposed changes to site allocations.</p> <p>Table 8 - Factual update to the figures following the proposed changes to site allocations.</p>	Yes - these changes potentially give rise to a different magnitude of effects than assessed in the current IIA. This is also developed further from MM50 onwards, where MM for the Policy Maps are proposed.	Yes.
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14	MM2	SPA1 & Policies Map changes (as reflected by MM50 to MM71, but excluding MM46)	Table 2, Table 4, Table 5, Table 7 and Table 8						
15									
16									
17									
18	MM3	Insert after Map 2		<p>Additional policy is shown in bold below:</p> <p>Safeguarded Land Safeguarded Land, as shown on the Policies Map and listed in table x, comprises land removed from the Green Belt which may be required to serve development needs in the longer term. Core Strategy Policy CS5 Safeguarded Land will apply to these sites. For clarity, Safeguarded Land is not allocated for development at the present time but is identified to meet possible longer term development needs. Policy CS5 makes clear that the principles of protection enshrined in national Green Belt policy will apply to Safeguarded Land. Development of Safeguarded Land will require a review of the Local Plan and assessment of the land in relation to the need for development at that time and the identification of the most appropriate locations for development to take place. Without prejudicing any future assessment, table x highlights any currently known key constraints or requirements for these sites. It also estimates, in accordance with current practice, the estimated capacity of the safeguarded land sites. However this capacity could change in any future development proposals and is a theoretical estimate only. Temporary developments which assist in ensuring that the land is properly managed may be permitted where they do not conflict with other relevant Core Strategy or Development Management policies. No development which would prejudice later comprehensive development will be permitted. (Note that Table X Safeguarded Land sites will be inserted here which discusses the future constraints and requirements) Reason: To identify safeguarded land and explain the overall approach to its release.</p>	To provide further clarity on the terminology of 'Safeguarded Land' within the Sites and Policies Publication Version 2015, revision 4 (March 2016). Also to identify the sites designated as 'Safeguarded land' in terms of its reference, size and estimated capacity for dwellings. Where known, future constraints and requirements have been highlighted. Table x titled Safeguarded Land Sites will identify safeguarded land and explain the overall approach to its release.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
19	MM4	SP2		Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike through below: In considering planning applications for new development, including improvements to essential infrastructure such as operational Waste Water Treatment Works, and mineral workings within the Green Belt and to ensure proposals minimise the impact of the development on the openness of the Green Belt particular regard will be had to the following factors: the size, scale, volume, height, massing, position, lighting and any proposed enclosures of the proposals; or screen banks and demonstrate that regard has been had to the appropriate Landscape Character Area management strategy for the area. All new buildings should be well-related to existing buildings, where relevant, ...Where possible proposals should reflect the architectural style of original buildings if appropriate, and / or the vernacular styles in the locality.... All proposals will require careful assessment and agreement prior to their submission, as to their impact and appropriateness and to their long term sustainability. Consideration will be given to the location of the site in relation to other settlements outside of the Green Belt.	Emphasis is added into the explanatory text to clarify how new development must meet the standards set out in other policies; 'SP 58 Design Principles' and 'CS 28 Sustainable Design'. This will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not affect the Sustainability Appraisal objectives of the IIA.	N/A	No
20	MM5	SP3	Paragraph 2	Deletion of text is shown as strike through below: 'Where a permanent house is proposed to be built, high standards of design appropriate to the setting of the proposal are required and the impact of the proposed development on the openness of the Green Belt is minimised. In considering a planning application for new development regard will be had to the size, scale, position, screening, enclosures, lighting and design of the proposals to ensure they minimise the impact of the development on the openness of the Green Belt.	Emphasis is added into the explanatory text to explain how new development must meet the standards set out in other policies; 'SP 58 Design Principles' and 'CS 28 Sustainable Design'. This will ensure that the policy is effective. The policy as it stands incorrectly applied Central Government guidance (NPPF79 refers to impact of development on the openness of the Green Belt); therefore appropriate changes to policy and text are required to ensure Local Plan policies are consistent with guidance in the NPPF.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
21	MM6	SP4		Deletion of text is shown as strike through below: 'Consideration will be given to the size, scale, position, screening, enclosures, lighting and design of any such extensions or alterations to existing buildings, to ensure that proposals reflect the architectural style of the original building and / or the vernacular styles in the locality.	Further guidance 'Development in the Green Belt Supplementary Planning Document' produced by the Council is available, and together with Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document to assist applicants. This will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
22	MM7	SP5		Deletion of text is shown as strike through below: All proposals affecting a heritage asset will require careful assessment as to the impact and appropriateness of such changes to ensure that the historic, architectural, natural history, or landscape value of the building and / or its setting are safeguarded and conserved in accord with the policies of this Plan.	Sustainable development in rural areas with regards to heritage assets is covered by paragraph 55 of the NPPF. The MM will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy. It is also consistent with the guidance referenced at MM6/SP4.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
23	MM8	SP6		Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike through below: The Council considers that an increase in excess of 10% in the volume of the existing building would make the proposals materially larger and therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt. However replacement buildings will not be permitted where they would result in the loss of a building which makes a positive contribution to the surrounding landscape character or the building is of local architectural or historic interest – a non-designated heritage asset...Proposals for replacement buildings should not detrimentally affect the character or openness of the Green Belt and a All proposals requiring planning permission will require careful assessment as to the impact and appropriateness of the development; consideration will be given to the size, scale, position, screening, enclosures, lighting and design of replacement buildings, to ensure that proposals reflect the vernacular styles in the locality. In considering applications that affect directly or indirectly designated and non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.	The policy as it stands incorrectly applied Central Government guidance (NPPF79 refers to impact of development on the openness of the Green Belt); therefore appropriate changes to policy and text are required to ensure Local Plan policies are consistent with guidance in the NPPF. The policy is proposed to be amended to provide clarity regarding any increase in volume of extensions to properties within the Green Belt, to minimise the impact of new development on the openness of the Green Belt.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
24	MM9	SP7		Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike through below: New agricultural or forestry buildings should not detrimentally affect the character or openness of the Green Belt and a All proposals will require careful assessment as to the impact and appropriateness of the development; consideration will be given to the size, scale, position, screening, enclosures, lighting and design of the buildings, to ensure that proposals are justified, and that any harm or potential harm to the openness of the Green Belt is minimised.	Changes to policy SP7 will allow for greater flexibility re: proposed buildings for agriculture and forestry in the Green Belt. This will ensure that the policy is effective and in line with the first bullet point of paragraph 89 of NPPF. The policy incorrectly applied Central Government guidance (NPPF79 refers to impact of development on the openness of the Green Belt); therefore appropriate changes to policy and text are required to ensure Local Plan policies are consistent with guidance in the NPPF.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
55	MM16	SP16			paragraph 22 of the NPPF which avoids the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. MM16 is also supported by MM17 that will ensure residential amenity will be taken into consideration and that the ongoing viability of the remaining economic activity is not compromised by residential development.	Transport	Risk: Residential development can increase pressure on the transport network as this gives rise to different travel patterns than employment uses, for example new employment development often requires a sustainable travel plan. Opportunity: A greater mix of employment and housing development could provide potential improvements to public transport accessibility.	Residential development can have a different impact on the transport network than employment development, therefore the magnitude of impact could be different.	Yes.
56						Education and Skills	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
57						Health and Well-Being	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
58						Biodiversity	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
59						Pollution and Emissions	Risk: All new development has the potential to increase air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Opportunity: Reduction in the emissions of key pollutants due to less travelling for a mixed use area allocation. Also promoting walking and cycling as alternative forms of transport. Installation of integrated renewable and low carbon technologies into new development.	Policies SP29, SP55, SP58 and SP60 will help ensure that the potential for increase in air pollution, noise and greenhouse gas emissions are reduced, thus minimising impacts on human health. In particular, policies SP58 and SP60 advocate sustainable design and integration of renewable and low carbon technologies into new development.	No
60						Flood Risk	Risk: The NPPF has different criteria for residential development in terms of flood risk. Opportunity: Policy requirement that new development seeks to reduce the extent and impact of flooding through mitigation, such as SUDs and promotion of natural/semi natural flood storage.	The NPPF has a criteria based policy to flood risk which has greater restrictions on where residential development can be located. Therefore, the magnitude of impact is potentially different. Policy SP50 will need to be adhered to in any forthcoming development proposals.	Yes.
61						Natural Resources (other than Fossil Fuels)	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
62						Townscape	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
63						Soil, Landuse and Geology	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
64						Housing	Risk: That new housing in close proximity to employment activities, raises amenity issues, such as noise complaints and employment uses are restricted by housing. Opportunity: Improved housing opportunities and choice, including affordable housing as well as designing housing for all stages of life.	Policies SP1, SP12, SP17 and SP67 will assist in locating new housing development in the most appropriate areas. The provision of housing opportunities and affordable housing also provides the opportunity for better social inclusion whilst SP29 promotes accessible and sustainable travel.	Yes.
65						Landscape	Risk: No different to employment uses - scoped out. Opportunity: As above.	N/A	No
66						Historic Environment	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
67						Accessibility / Community Facilities	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
68						Population and Equality	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
69	MM17	SP17		Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike-through below: 'Within areas allocated for business, or industrial and business use on the Policies Map, proposals for alternative uses other than those identified as not acceptable in business use allocations in Policy SP 15 'Land Identified for Business Use' and Policy SP 16 'Land Identified for Industrial and Business Uses' will be considered positively on their merit having regard to other relevant planning policies and whether the following criteria are satisfied: 1 it can be demonstrated that the continued use of the site for business or industrial purposes would cause unacceptable planning problems which cannot be adequately mitigated, and alternative proposals are compatible with adjacent existing and proposed land uses, and the impact on amenity can be appropriately mitigated; or 2 proposals are compatible with adjacent existing and proposed land uses and any impact on amenity can be appropriately mitigated; and either a. proposals positively contribute to the range and quality of employment opportunities in the borough; or b. the site is no longer required for employment use on the basis that adequate provision of employment land would remain within the borough to meet its economic strategy and development needs (based upon an assessment of existing land supply including amount, type, quality and use of land, and current and future demand), or, the site is no longer viable for employment use as demonstrated by: i. having been marketed for at least 12 months, including both traditional and web-based marketing, and regular advertisement in local, regional and/or national publications as appropriate; and ii. opportunities to re-let premises having been fully explored; and iii. the premises/site having been marketed for sale or to let (as appropriate), at a price which is commensurate with market values (based on evidence from recent and similar transactions and deals); and iv. the terms and conditions set out in the lease being reasonable and attractive to potential businesses, and that no reasonable offer has been refused.' a. their contribution to the range and quality of employment opportunities in the borough; b. compatibility with adjacent existing and proposed land uses and any impact on amenity; c. that adequate provision of employment land would remain within the borough and the locality of the site based upon an assessment of existing land supply (including amount, type, quality and use of land) and current and future demand; and d. that there is compelling evidence which clearly demonstrates that the site is no longer viable for employment use on the basis that: i. The site or premises have been marketed to the Council's satisfaction for at least 12 months and included both traditional and web-based marketing, and regular advertisement in local, regional and/or national publications as appropriate; and ii. opportunities to re-let premises have been fully explored; and	The MM provides revised criteria to enable delivery of residential land uses in / on the edge of employment areas. This ensures the policy is effective and consistent with paragraph 22 of the NPPF which avoids the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose.	All topics	MM17 mitigates the potential negative impact of allowing residential development in predominantly industrial areas. It also seeks to protect viable employment opportunities and prevent their re-development to a higher value land use through this new criteria based policy.	Policies SP29, SP55, SP58 and SP60 will help ensure that the potential for increase in air pollution, noise and greenhouse gas emissions are reduced, improving amenity and minimising impacts on human health. In particular, policies SP58 and SP60 advocates sustainable design and integrating renewable and low carbon technologies into new development.	Yes

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
70				iii. The premises/site have been marketed at a price which is commensurate with market values (based on evidence from recent and similar transactions and deals) and iv. it has been demonstrated that the terms and conditions set out in the lease are reasonable and attractive to potential businesses, and that no reasonable offer has been refused.					
71	MM18	SP18		Deletion of policy SP18 Industrial and Business Development in Relation to Sensitive Areas of Land Use is shown as strike through below: Where sensitive land uses are situated within or close to areas allocated for industrial and business use or Mixed-Use Areas, all development must have regard to the presence of the sensitive land use and be designed in such a way that residential amenity or the special characteristics of the sensitive area are not adversely affected. Sensitive land uses should not be located close to industrial and business uses where the environmental needs of residents or other occupiers or users of the proposed development would constrain the neighbouring business or industrial activities.	The key principles of this policy will be incorporated into policy SP58 'Design Principles'.	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
72	MM19	SP19		Deletion of policy SP19 Waverly Advanced Manufacturing Park is shown as strike through below: To protect and enhance this regionally important cluster development within the Advanced Manufacturing Park, site allocation E22 as shown on the Policies Map, will be restricted to proposals within Classes B1(b) research & development / studios / laboratories / high-tech, B1(c) Light Industry; and B2 general industry (specifically advanced manufacturing / engineering) which can demonstrate that they contribute towards the advanced manufacturing and materials sector. Proposals for B1(a) offices will only be acceptable where they are ancillary to the main use of the Advanced Manufacturing Park be supported where they contribute to the overall growth of the Advanced Manufacturing Park. Alternative employment proposals within Classes B1 and B2 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order, 1987 (as amended) will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that: a. The proposed use would support the activities of existing and future occupiers of the Advanced Manufacturing Park; or b. there is no reasonable prospect of the site being developed for advanced manufacturing and materials purposes; and c. development would not compromise the development of other sites within the Advanced Manufacturing Park for uses within the advanced manufacturing and materials sector; and d. there are no other sites suitable for the proposed development which are available or will become available within a reasonable period of time	Following on from the hearing sessions during the Local Plan Examination which took place 2016, the viability of designating Waverley Advanced Manufacturing Park for specific uses was discussed. Further to this discussion, the restrictive nature of the policy for advanced manufacturing purposes only was deemed to be unviable and thus the allocation has changed into general industrial use and to enable greater flexibility in attracting new occupiers of premises.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
73	MM20	SP21 and relates to MM55		Deletion of policy SP21 Todwick North is shown as strike through below: Within site allocation E16 as shown on the Policies Map, development proposals for B1b, B1c (business) and B2 (general industry) uses will be permitted and should form the majority of floorspace within the area. B8 (storage and distribution) uses will only be acceptable where they are ancillary to the main proposed use. Offices falling within Use Class B1a will only be acceptable where they are ancillary to the main proposed use or the proposals satisfy the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS12 'Managing Change in Rotherham's Retail and Service Centres' and other relevant planning policy. Other uses will not be permitted. The site is intended to attract major inward investment by accommodating one or more large users or through the development of smaller plots which comprise a high quality business park. Where smaller plots are developed the preferred outcome is the creation of a cluster responding to the borough's economic priorities set out in Core Strategy Policy CS9 'Transforming Rotherham's Economy'. Development will be of a high quality of design and of an appropriate scale that is sensitive to its surroundings. A high quality landscaping scheme will be required, incorporating and enhancing natural environmental features. Appropriate mitigation of adverse impact on ecological interests will be required. Masterplanning will be required in line with Core Strategy Policy CS2 'Delivering Development on Major Sites', to enable a comprehensive vision for development of this area.	The allocation was deleted for numerous reasons; the allocation lies in Green Belt, has significant protected species issues, accessibility to public transport and fluvial / surface water flooding issues. Although the Council had considered (at the time of Submission of the Local Plan) that these issues were capable of mitigation or appropriate compensation in accordance with other policies of the Local Plan. Due to its isolated location, the site could not be developed into an urban extension and was not promoted as such by the Council. Thus the allocation was deemed to be not justified and not consistent with national policy.	All topics	The land was previously allocated for Special Policy Area. There is neutral change from the modification as the site will retain its current status as Green Belt i.e. there will be no construction nor operational effects from proposed development. Initially the Sustainability Appraisal concluded mitigation could overcome these issues but on further detailed examination, this was not the case. Therefore deletion is consistent with SA objectives as the methodology is clear sites with constraints should only move forward if mitigation can be provided.	No.	No
74	MM21	SP23		Additional text in the policy is shown in bold below: 'To protect and enhance the concentration of A1 shops within Primary Shopping Frontages proposals for A2 financial and professional services and A3 restaurants and cafés uses at ground floor level will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they would: a. not dilute the concentration of A1 shops in the Primary Shopping Frontage below 65%, or further reduce the current percentage of A1 shops where the concentration is already below 65%... '	The policy seeks to protect existing shopping areas from non-A1 retail activities and the additional text makes this objective even stronger.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
75	MM22	SP25		Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike through below: 'Hot food takeaways (including A3 restaurants with takeaway facilities) outside of town and district centres will be required to satisfy Core Strategy Policy CS12 and will not be permitted where they: e. Are within 800 metres of a primary school, secondary school or college (measured in a straight line from any pedestrian access to the school or college), except where they are within a defined town, district or local centre and satisfy criteria a, b, c and d above; f. Would result in more than two A5 units being located adjacent to each other.'	The link between planning and health has been established in the NPPF and acknowledges that planning has an increasingly important role to play in creating health promoting environments and reducing health inequalities. This will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy or any subsequent replacement policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	NA	No
76	MM23	SP31		Additional text in the policy is shown in bold below: 'Careful consideration will be given to any potential adverse impacts of development on the Key Transport Routes and the Strategic Road Network, having regard where relevant to guidance in circular 02/2013 or any subsequent replacement.'	Sustainable transport with regards to key or strategic routes is covered by paragraph 32 of the NPPF. This will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy or any subsequent replacement policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
95	MM27	SP37	Paragraph 1	Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike through below: 'Development or changes of use on land within or outside a statutorily protected site (either individually or in combination with other developments) which would adversely affect the notified special interest features interest; fabric or setting of the statutorily protected site will not be permitted.'	Sustainable development with regards to conserving and enhancing the natural environment is covered by paragraph 118 of the NPPF. This MM is consistent with national policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
96	MM28	SP38	Paragraph 1	Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike through below: 'Planning permission for development likely to have a direct or indirect adverse impact on the following will only be granted if they can demonstrate the need for the development in that location, that there are no alternative sites with less or no harmful impacts that could be developed and that mitigation and/or compensation measures can be put in place that enable the status of the species to be conserved maintained or enhanced.'	Sustainable development with regards to conserving and enhancing the natural environment is covered by paragraph 118 of the NPPF. This will ensure an effective policy that is consistent with national policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
97	MM29	SP40		Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike through below: Residential development proposals, will be expected to provide Green Space in line with the following principles: a. Residential development schemes of 36 dwellings or more shall should normally provide 55 square metres of Green Space per dwelling, on site where necessary to ensure that all new homes are: i. Within 280 metres of a Green Space; and ii. Ideally within 840 metres of a Neighbourhood Green Space (as defined in the Rotherham Green Space Strategy 2010); and iii. Within 400 metres of an equipped play area. The exception to this will be where the characteristics of the site and the nature of the proposals are likely to impact on the delivery of the Green Space or the overall development scheme. In these circumstances, then evidence shall be provided with the planning application to justify any lower level of Green Space provision on site or off site contributions. This shall take into account the nature of the proposed development, and the particular characteristics of the site and the wider local area. b. Proposals for Green Space should include a variety of experiences for different age groups, depending upon the size of the scheme and the type of development proposed. c. The Council will consider the cumulative impact of development proposals of all sizes, on existing green space and the need to enhance / expand existing Green Space provision within a locality, through financial contributions. d. In all cases where new Green Space does not have to be provided on site, then developer contributions will be sought to enhance existing Green Space based on an assessment of need within the local area at the time of any planning application and proportionate to the scale and nature of the planned development. e. Where new on site Green Space provision on site is required, the applicant will be expected to review national, regional and local information where available and, in discussion with the Council and any other body as necessary , prepare and submit an appropriate assessment of demand, that is proportionate to the scale and nature of the development proposed. that a Consideration shall be given to the borough-wide standards for playing pitches and play spaces to determine as appropriate, the composition of any provision that will assist in achieving these standards;	Clarification provided to define sustainable residential development regarding good design and optimising the site to provide satisfactory green space to benefit the local community and so it is consistent with national policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
98	MM30	SP41		Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike through below: 'Development proposals that result in the loss of Existing Green Space including open space, sports and recreational land, including playing fields, as identified on the Policies Map or as subsequently provided as part of any planning permission, will only be allowed in exceptional circumstances, where should not be built on unless: a. An assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, sports and recreational land to be surplus to requirements shows and it's loss would not detrimentally affect the existing and potential Green Space needs of the local community. The assessment will consider the availability of sports pitches, children's play areas and allotment provision, to determine existing deficits and areas for improvement; or b. the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by Appropriate replacement Green Space of at least equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or community benefit, accessibility and value is provided in the area which it serves; or c. The development is for alternative sports and recreational provision and facilities of appropriate scale and type needed to support or improve the proper function of the remaining Green Space in the locality, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss. These criteria will not apply to Green Space that performs an irreplaceable amenity or buffer function. These sites will be protected from future development as it is considered that their loss cannot be compensated for given the location , purpose and function of the allocation. Development proposals will be required to demonstrate how any likely negative impact on the amenity, ecological value and functionality of adjacent Green Space and other Green Infrastructure within the immediate vicinity has been mitigated. Development that will results in the loss of any small incidental areas of green space, not specifically identified on the Policies Map, which make a significant contribution to the character of residential areas and/or green infrastructure, and function as a facility for the benefit of the local community , will not normally be permitted.'	Clarification given to protecting the existing network of green spaces which includes open space, sports and recreational land. This will ensure an effective policy that is consistent with national policy and that it is consistent with Policy SP64, as proposed to be amended by MM38.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
99	MM31	SP46	Paragraph 1	<p>Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike through below: Policy SP 46 Conserving Understanding and Recording the Historic Environment 'All proposals affecting a heritage asset will require careful assessment as to the impact and appropriateness of development to ensure that the historic, architectural, natural history, or landscape value of the asset and / or its setting are safeguarded and conserved, and any conflict avoided or minimised in accordance with the policies of this Local Plan.</p> <p>Development proposals that affect known or potential heritage assets will need to provide supporting information in sufficient detail that the impact of the proposed scheme on those heritage assets can be established, in line with the following approach: a. Where proposals involve sites which have been assessed as part of the Council's Archaeological Scoping Studies evidence base, Heritage Statements will be required where sites are identified as having 'major', 'potential' or 'uncertain' objections to development. Where this applies to sites allocated through Policy SP 1 'Sites Allocated for Development' it is identified in the site specific development principles guidelines at Chapter 5 'Site development principles guidelines...'</p>	These changes help to support Core Strategy Policy CS23 Valuing the Historic Environment. This will ensure an effective policy that is consistent with national policy.	All topics	All IIA topics were reviewed relative to conserving and recording the historic, architectural, setting or landscape value of the asset. Opportunities may increase where sites are being redeveloped, whilst risks remain the same.	N/A	No
100	MM32	SP49		<p>Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike through below: 'Where development proposals may impact upon War Memorials or their siting, Memorials should be retained in situ, if possible, or otherwise sensitively relocated following appropriate community consultation. Where demolition of structures which house War Memorials is undertaken developers should first inform, through Prior Notification, the Council of the presence of the War Memorials.</p> <p>4.249 In most cases planning permission for the demolition of buildings is not required, however the Council will need to approve how the demolition will be carried out (through a "prior approval application") where such activity involves a War Memorial. Alongside the process for considering planning applications (including pre-application discussions), this provides the Council an opportunity to ensure that the implications of demolition or development on war memorials are appropriately considered in line with the Policy. To ensure that War Memorials can be recorded and re-sited where possible, the Council will encourage notification of the presence of War Memorials where buildings are proposed for demolition but where planning permission is not required.</p>	The change strengthens SP49 so that alternatives to demolition are investigated by the developers. This aligns with the last sentence of paragraph 132 of the NPPF; "Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional." This will ensure an effective policy that is consistent with national policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
101	MM33	SP53	Part C	<p>Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike through below: 'c. infrastructure and associated facilities are sited in the least sensitive location from which the target resources can be accessed, so as to minimise avoid the environmental and ecological impact of development wherever possible;</p>	Strengthens the policy in relation to avoiding adverse environmental and ecological impact of the development. This will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
102	MM34	SP54	Part C	<p>Additional text in the policy is shown in bold below: 'c. infrastructure and facilities are justified in terms of their number and extent, sited in the least sensitive location from which the target resources can be accessed, and designed and operated to avoid or minimise environmental and amenity impacts'.</p>	Strengthens the policy in relation to avoiding adverse environmental and ecological impact of the development. This will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
103	MM35	SP58		<p>Additional text in the policy is shown in bold below: 'All forms of development are required to be of high quality, incorporate inclusive design principles, create decent living and working environments, and positively contribute to the local character and distinctiveness of an area and the way it functions....All development proposals must have regard to the presence of sensitive land uses and be designed in such a way that the amenity of any land use and the specific characteristics of the sensitive area are not adversely affected.'</p>	Strengthens the policy and seeks to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. This will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy. In a workshop that Jacobs had with Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council on 3 August 2017 regarding the Integrated Impact Assessment for the latest Main Modifications, there was unanimous agreement that the word "decent" in the proposed additional wording of the policy would be replaced with "safe". The new paragraph ensures that development within the Green Belt has regard to the sensitivity of its location and the Green Belt is not adversely affected.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
104	MM36	SP60		Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike-through below: 'Policy SP 60 Sustainable Construction and Wind Energy. 1-Sustainable Construction To enable high quality, functional and sustainable design to be clearly embedded in future development, proposals will need to be designed to withstand and adapt to the predicted impacts of climate change. The evidence supporting the planning application should be proportionate to the scale of the development and: a. Identify how recycled materials will be used during construction unless it can be demonstrated that it would not be technically feasible or financially viable or the nature of the development requires appropriate use of local materials; b. meet the relevant BREEAM 'very good' standards or better for non-residential buildings over 1,000 square metres unless it can be demonstrated that it would not be technically feasible or financially viable; c. Demonstrate how the installation of integrated renewable and low carbon energy technologies in new and existing non-residential developments, in order to off-set CO2 emissions and mitigate the impacts of climate change change , has been assessed and included within the development unless it can be demonstrated that it would not be technically feasible or financially viable. These could include (but are not limited to):...'	Separation out of the two different policies so Sustainable Construction is a stand alone policy. Clarification of the standards required for non-residential developments. This will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
105	MM37	SP6x		Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike-through below: Policy SP 6x Wind Energy 2-Wind Energy 'Planning permission will only be granted for wind energy development involving one or more wind turbines where: a. Proposals are within an Area of Search for Wind Energy Developments as shown on the Policies Map; and b. Proposals satisfy the requirements of Policy CS30 'Low Carbon & Renewable Energy Generation', and any other relevant planning policy; and c. Cumulative D development would not lead to significant coalescence of areas dominated by wind energy development; and d. In respect of visual amenity, any proposed turbine would be located at least 6 times its overall height from any residential property, unless it can be demonstrated that it would not be overbearing or that a greater distance is required to mitigate the impact on visual amenity ; and e. it can be demonstrated that any potential for visual distraction has been avoided wherever possible or has been minimised, and that turbines will be constructed with materials that eliminate dazzle ; and e-f. In respect of shadow flicker, any proposed turbine would be located at least 10 times its rotor diameter from a susceptible dwelling house, community facility or workplace, unless it can be demonstrated that shadow flicker would not occur, or would be prevented from occurring; and f g. Any adverse impacts on radar systems, utility telemetry links, TV reception, communications links or telecommunications systems are capable of being acceptably mitigated; and g h. Any proposed turbine would be setback from any highway boundary, railway line, canal, public footpath or bridleway by the height of the turbine plus 50 metres, or 1.5 times the height of the turbine, whichever is the lesser; and i. Acceptable access to the site for construction, maintenance and de-commissioning can be achieved. '	Separation out of the two different policies so Wind Energy is a stand alone policy. Clarification of distance away from residential property regarding impact on visual amenity, minimising dazzle through materials and acceptable access for the development. This will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
106	MM38	SP64 and relates to SP41		Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike-through below: 'Those areas allocated on the Policies Map for Community Facilities will be retained or developed for such purposes. In addition, land or buildings currently used or last used for community purposes, including sport and recreational facilities but not identified as such on the Policies Map will be similarly safeguarded. Development involving the loss of existing sports and recreational buildings will only be permitted where: a. an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown them to be surplus to requirements; or b. the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or c. the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss. Development proposals which involve the loss of other key community facilities shall only be permitted where the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that adequate alternative provision has been made or where some other overriding public benefit will result from the loss of the facility, or that the retention of the land or building in community use is no longer viable, on the basis that: a- d. the site or premises have been marketed to the Council's satisfaction for at least 12 months and included both traditional and web-based marketing, and regular advertisement in local, regional and/or national publications as appropriate; and b- e. opportunities to re-let premises have been fully explored including the formation of a social enterprise or charitable group that can take over the premises; and e. f. the premises/site have been marketed at a price which is commensurate with market values (based on evidence from recent and similar transactions and deals); and d- g. t has been demonstrated that the terms and conditions set out in the lease are reasonable and attractive to potential businesses, and that no reasonable offer has been refused.'	Clarification added into the policy to ensure that it is consistent with paragraph 74 of the NPPF; and that it is consistent with Policy SP41, as proposed to be amended by MM30. This will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
107	MM39	SP65	Part D	Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike-through below: d. there is not an defined identified need for a the public house based on the following: i. there are alternative licensed premises within 800 metres reasonable walking distance of the public house; and ii. where the public house provides a wider variety of ancillary uses there are alternative premises which offer similar facilities within 800 metres reasonable walking distance of the public house.	Clarification added regarding what determines an identified need. This will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
108	MM40	SP66		Additional text in the policy is shown in bold below: 'Residential development should have good access to a range of shops and services. On larger scale residential developments of 10 or more dwellings the majority of homes (minimum of 80%) should be within 800 metres reasonable walking distance (measured from the centre of the site, taking into account barriers such as main roads, rivers and railway lines) via safe pedestrian access of a local convenience shop and a reasonable range of other services or community facilities. This may require the provision of local services or facilities by developers where these requirements would not otherwise be met or where new development would place an unacceptable burden upon existing facilities, unless it can be demonstrated that such provision would not be viable or would threaten the viability of the overall scheme.'	Clarification added to the policy on what is classed as a reasonable walking distance, and any barriers present. This will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
109	MM41	SP67	MU14	Additional text is shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike-through below: Motorway service area. Refer to Policy SP-33 'Motorway Service Areas' for acceptable uses within motorway service areas. A3 restaurant, A4 drinking establishment, sui generis car park.	Amendment added into the policy to allow C1, A3, A4 + car park (sui generis) so that the policy is justified, is consistent with national policy and reflects the current planning permission.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
110	MM42	Formerly allocations H89, E28 and E27, but also relates to MM65	Policy xx Mixed Use Area 22	<p>Insertion of new policy reference MU22, Land at Aston Common, Aston. The policy is shown in bold below and will cover the New Mixed Use Area at Aston Common.</p> <p>Policy xx Mixed Use Area 22: Land at Aston Common, Aston</p> <p>The development of Mixed Use Area 22, as shown on the Policies Map, for a mix of residential and employment uses will be supported in principle. Appropriate uses are:</p> <p>a. C3 (residential).</p> <p>b. B2 (general industry).</p> <p>c. B1b, B1c (business).</p> <p>d. B1a (offices) where Core Strategy Policy CS12 Managing Change in Rotherham's Retail and Service Centres can be satisfied.</p> <p>Approximately 150 dwellings shall be developed, predominantly on the eastern part of the site. Not less than 4.65 hectares (gross) of land shall be developed for employment uses, close to the existing industrial estate.</p> <p>A masterplan, agreed with the Local Planning Authority, for the comprehensive development of the site will be required to support any planning permission. The masterplan and any development proposals shall have regard to the site development guidelines in Chapter 5 and in particular shall provide appropriate mitigation measures to ensure there is no detrimental impact on the amenity of either residential or employment occupiers.</p> <p>Having regard to the topography of the site and to the proximity and layout of the existing Mansfield Road industrial estate, the Council will need to be satisfied that proposals for residential and employment uses on Mixed Use Area 22 are viable, attractive to the market and deliverable.</p>	This policy combines site H89 allocated for residential use (indicative 150 dwellings), E28 allocated for business use and E27 allocated for industrial and business use so that it becomes a Mixed Use Area allocation. This will ensure that the policy is effective in ensuring the area is developed comprehensively and is consistent with national policy.	Economy and Employment	Risk: The MM incorporates the existing employment site as a mixed use allocation. This needs to be planned sensitively with the other uses proposed. Opportunity: Mixed use development provides more opportunity for live work spaces.	Policies SP16, SP29, and SP69 promotes access to employment, community facilities and sustainable transport opportunities.	No
111						Transport	Risk: These allocations scored poorly during the assessment of locations and site selections of the submitted Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) 2016 against access to public transport. Opportunity: The combined mixed uses potentially provides better opportunities to support viable public transport.	Policies SP29 and SP70 will ensure good and timely infrastructure provision, including public transport.	No
112						Education and Skills	Risk: Potential short-term pressures upon existing educational capacity when supporting infrastructure for new residential development is not yet operational. Opportunity: The mixed use allocation potentially provides for a financial contribution to education facilities if these are required in this settlement grouping.	Policies SP29 and SP70 ensures good, accessible and timely infrastructure provision such as junior and infant schools.	No
113						Health and Well-Being	Risk: Short-term pressures upon existing health facilities when supporting infrastructure for new residential development is not yet operational. Opportunity: The mixed use potentially supports a contribution towards medical facilities.	Policies SP35, SP42, SP58, SP66, SP67 and SP69 will ensure the promotion of healthy communities	No
114						Biodiversity	Risk: Development has the potential to have impacts upon habitats and species in its vicinity. Key issues include habitat loss, recreational pressure, light and noise disturbance. Opportunity: The mixed use masterplan may potentially provide for some biodiversity enhancements, such as bird boxes through gapping up of hedgerows etc.	Policies SP35, SP36, SP37, SP38 and SP41 seek to protect biodiversity and the natural environment from inappropriate development. Policies SP50, SP55 and SP70 aim to protect the natural environment from the adverse impacts associated with new development proposals.	No
115						Pollution and Emissions	Risk: All new development has the potential to increase air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Opportunity: Reduction in the emissions of key pollutants due to less travelling for a mixed use area allocation. Also promoting walking and cycling as alternative forms of transport. Installation of integrated renewable and low carbon technologies into new development.	Policies SP29, SP55 and SP60 will help ensure that the potential for rises in air pollution and noise emissions are reduced minimising impacts on human health.	No
116						Flood Risk	Risk: Any development has the potential to have impacts on flood risk through the increase in hard standing. Opportunity: Policy requirement that new development seeks to reduce the extent and impact of flooding through mitigation, such as SUDs and promotion of natural/semi natural flood storage.	Policies SP35 and SP50 aim to reduce flood risk through a number of measures including mitigation, siting of development, sustainable drainage systems, flood risk assessment etc.	No
117						Natural Resources (other than Fossil Fuels)	Risk: These allocations scored poorly during the assessment of locations and site selections of the submitted Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) 2016 against potential sewerage capacity issues. In addition, development is anticipated to increase levels of waste. Opportunity: More sustainable use of natural resources. Securing contributions from developers towards essential infrastructure provision through the Section 106 agreement e.g. increasing green infrastructure and habitat creation, more energy efficient buildings, improved habitat quality and management.	Policies SP55, SP58 and SP70 ensures that natural resources such as water to be reused / recycled will be considered and incorporated into design principles. Policy SP60 promotes renewable energy and sustainable construction, which can reduce reliance on fossil fuels.	No
118						Townscape	Risk: Poorly designed development has the potential to affect the quality and/or character of settlements, areas or buildings. Opportunity: The Masterplanning process provides the opportunity for a well thought out design code and careful consideration of all policies and their application to the development proposals to shape a high quality development scheme.	Policies SP35 and SP58 protect against development that is inappropriate in scale and character, and promotes strong structural landscape frameworks, within which development proposals will sit.	No

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
119						Soil, Land Use and Geology	Risk: Potential that new development will adversely impact on greenfield land through the increased land take required. Opportunity: Appropriate management and handling of soils during the development process.	Policy SP39 aims to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land and appropriate management and handling of soils during the development process. Policy SP57 aims to protect soils from contamination by ensuring that development demonstrates that there will be no significant harm and by proposing remediation.	No
120						Housing	Risk: New housing development has the potential to increase disparity between the most and least deprived areas in Rotherham. Opportunity: Meeting the settlements role established in the Spatial Strategy detailed in planning policy CS1. Application of planning policies CS2, CS6 and CS7 will help increase the number of affordable homes and provide a range of houses to meet identified needs.	Policies SP1, SP12 and SP67 will assist in locating new housing development in the most appropriate areas. The provision of housing opportunities and affordable housing also provides the opportunity for better social inclusion whilst SP29 promotes accessible and sustainable travel.	No
121						Landscape	Risk: The change to a mixed use has no further landscape implications. Opportunity: As above.	N/A	No
122						Historic Environment	Risk: All new development has the potential to affect the quality or character of settlements, areas or buildings. Opportunity: Minimise the adverse landscape impacts of new development, and through mitigation, can protect specific features in Rotherham, including townscapes, which can contribute to the distinct identity of Rotherham.	N/A	No
123						Accessibility / Community Facilities	Risk: Potential for risks to the accessibility for those without a car related to new community provision. Opportunity: The mixed use allocation provides the opportunity for a more cohesive development.	Policies SP10, SP29, SP35, S40, SP42, SP58, SP64 and SP66 include for the provision of sufficient community facilities, including greenspace, sport and recreation, which combined with the right location for development can greatly enhance accessibility overall.	No
124						Population and Equality	Risk: The mixed use allocation provide no further potential impacts. Opportunity: As above	N/A	No
125	MM43	SP69	Parts 1 & 3	<p>Addition of text in the policy as shown in bold below:</p> <p>1 Land north of, and including, the University of Sheffield training centre Appropriate uses in this location are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B1a, B1b, B1c (business) • C1 (hotel) • D1 (conference centre) • Car parking/public transport interchange facilities. <p>3 Land north of Mitchell Way and south of the University of Sheffield training centre ...A1 retail floorspace shall not exceed 2,300 square metres gross and no more than 1,500 square metres gross of A1 retail floorspace shall be provided in a single unit, unless demonstrated by an up to date sequential and impact assessment.</p>	Clarification given to the retail sequential test which will support the viability and vitality of the site known as Land north of Mitchell Way and south of the University of Sheffield training centre. This will ensure that the policy is effective and is consistent with national policy. This will ensure that the policy is effective	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
126	MM44	Chapter 5	All Site Development Guidelines	<p>Refer to separate document which contains the deletions, additions and amendments to Chapter 5 Site Development Guidelines. These changes have been proposed following PIN's request that the Council examine each set of Site Development Guidelines critically and robustly to ensure that the specified requirements are clear and justified. It also includes changes to the introductory paragraphs and a site status update table clarifying those sites for which site development guidelines are not provided.</p> <p>The document includes changes identified by PINS as proposed Main Modifications in his letters referenced SD024 (dated 10 March 2017) and ID031 (dated November 2017).</p> <p>For new additional site allocations without planning permission and a small number of sites which previously did not include them the Council proposes to include site development guidelines to provide clarity regarding key issues which any future planning applications would need to address. These sites are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - H1, E1 and E2 - Bassingthorpe Farm Strategic Allocation - New housing allocation - Swinden Technology Centre, Moorgate - Employment allocation - E19 Manvers Way / Dearne Lane, Brampton - New housing allocation - Land off Far Field Lane, Wath upon Dearne - New housing allocation - Land between Pontefract Road and Barnsley Road, West Melton - Mixed use Area MU22 - Aston Common, South of Mansfield Road - to reflect the replacement of housing allocation H89 and employment allocations E27 and E28 with the new mixed use area. 	Further clarification given to Chapter 5 which identifies specific key development principles for these sites, which should be taken into account in any proposed development. Due to the size, the Site Development Guidelines will be in a separate document to the Schedule of Main Modifications. The additional Site Development Guidelines specifically references to topics; provision of new green space and community facilities through an assessment of local needs, protection of rural setting of heritage assets, wider historic environment, archaeological surveys, ecological surveys, highways access, flood risk assessment, landscape assessment, Green Infrastructure or specific Masterplanning design. PINS wanted the Council to work more closely with key development consultees including planning consultants to clarify key requirements for a specific site in any forthcoming planning application and each will be assessed on its own merit. Each of the Site Development Guidelines arise from the previous SA work and are reflected by various policies in the Local Plan and the revised Policies Map Sheets.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
127									
128	MM45	Policies Map sheets 1, 2 & 3	Key	<p>Under the 'Environment' section of the key, the following additional text has been added as shown in bold below: 'Register of Historic Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest' and 'Refer to to Policy SPxx for Landscape Character Area Sensitivity inset map'</p> <p>Under the 'Housing' section of the key, the following text has been amended as shown in bold and deletion of text is shown as strike-through: AMP-SP18-Advanced Manufacturing Park SPA1 SPxx Waverley New Community MC-SP49 SPA2 SPxx Former Maltby Colliery TN-SP20-Tedwick-North SL Safeguarded Land</p> <p>Replace Special Policy Area allocation references with SPA1 / SPA2 labels as indicated above. Include Safeguarded Land references for each Safeguard Land site as indicated above.</p>	To correct omissions and reflect the Main Modifications; to remove reference to special policy areas which are proposed to be deleted and addition of special policy area to be added; to update special policy area allocation labels; to reflect the addition of the new allocations or changes to previous land use allocations.	All topics	The Policies Map sheets 1, 2 and 3 shows policies and proposals for specific sites and locations on an Ordnance Survey map. These modifications do not significantly alter the Plan nor result in significant effects.	N/A	No
129	MM46	Policies Map and relates to MM25		Delete the notation for Areas of High Landscape Value and associated entry in the map key.	To reflect MM25 in providing the highest level of protection to sensitive landscapes as supported by PINS letter referenced ID031, dated 3 November 2017.	All topics	This Main Modification does not change the IIA Assessment.	N/A	No
130	MM47	Policies Map and relates to MM1		Delete the existing proposed HS2 route and include the recently issued safeguarded route on the Policies Map. Under the 'Transport' section of the key, the following text has been amended as shown in bold and the deletion of text is shown as strike-through below: HS2 Line subject to Safeguarding Directions issued July 2017 Consultation Line published 2013 (route still to be finalised by Government)	This will ensure that the plan is up-to-date and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	See MM1	Yes - mainly Economy and Employment as the safeguarding impacts on a proposed employment allocation.	Yes
131	MM48	Policies Map		Delete the following Highways Development Control Lines from the Policies Map: - Doncaster Road, Thrybergh - Morthen Lane/York Lane, Morthen - Doncaster Road, Hooton Roberts	This will ensure that the plan is up-to-date and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	These three schemes are completed or no longer required. This modification relates to policy SP30 Development affecting designated "Highways Development Control Lines" where a development proposal is likely to affect the designated highways development control lines, the onus is on the developer to show how their proposed development will accommodate relevant future highways improvements or deliver that improvement as part of the development. All IIA topics were reviewed relative to SP30 from the IIA Report 2015, revision 4 (March 2016) Volume 3: Assessment of Policies. The risks and opportunities remain the same.	N/A	No
132	MM49	Policies Map		Delete the notation for Petroleum Exploration and Development Licence as shown by the strikethrough and addition of text in the policy as shown in bold below: Amend the map key: Petroleum Exploration and Development Licence (PEDL) areas (as at June 2015) Rotherham Boundary (also indicates the extent of Petroleum Exploration and Development Licence (PEDL) areas (as at January 2017).	This will ensure that the plan is up-to-date and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	The map key for PEDL has been incorporated into the Rotherham Boundary, instead of being a stand alone notation. The areas displaying PEDL will now include the whole Borough.	The criteria as set out in policy SP53 ensures that any proposals for the exploration and appraisal phases will be permitted if environmental and development criteria are satisfied.	Yes
133	MM50	Policies Map changes (as reflected in MM2)		Delete the following residential allocations but retain washed over for residential use: - H12 land adjacent Barbers Avenue, Rawmarsh - H36 land off Field View, Brinsworth - H41 Milking Lane, Brampton Bierlow - H42 Land at former Brampton Centre, Brampton Road, Wath-upon-Dearene - H45 Land at Manvers Way, Manvers - H46 Land off Valley Drive, Wath-upon-Dearene - H47 Land at Park Road, Wath-upon-Dearene - H55 Front Street, Treeton - H56 Bradshaw Avenue, Treeton - H59 Land adjacent Companions Close, Wickersley - H60 Land off Hall Croft / Lindum Drive, Wickersley - H63 Former Council Depot, Wadsworth Road, Bramley - H74 Outgang Lane, Laughton Common - H77 Old School site, Doe Quarry Road / East Street, Dinnington Delete the following retail allocation but remain washed over as a Local Centre - R4 Main Street / Bawtry Road, Bramley	This main modification reflect sites which have already been granted planning permission and construction has completed or is nearing completion therefore the sites are no longer relevant in the plan period from 2016 up to 2028. This will ensure that the plan is up-to-date and is coherent.	All topics	Policy removed - N/A	N/A	No
134	MM51	Policies Map 1	Rotherham Urban Area	Swinden Technology Centre, Moorgate - currently employment use - allocate as residential .	In response to the Council's Housing Land Supply Position Statement (January 2017) this additional site allocation (Swinden Technology Centre) has come forward.	All topics	See MM2	Also see MM2. This represents an additional housing allocation and is effectively a windfall site as the current use has now ceased. As it is an existing built development within the main urban area the impact of this change is limited, albeit it still represents a change to the previous IIA in terms of housing and economy and employment.	Yes
135	MM52	Policies Map Sheet 1	Rotherham Urban Area	Remove LDF0838 (land between Bawtry Road and H35) from the Green Belt and include within H35.	To provide additional access thereby ensuring an effective policy.	All topics	This site scored red in the IIA Report 2015, revision 4 (March 2016) Volume 2: Assessment of Allocations and Alternatives:- significant highway access issues. The additional small parcel of land will help create a safer, more sustainable access to the proposed residential allocation. The reasons this site was selected were because it is a good-performing site under the IIA / SA, in proximity to Rotherham Urban Area, close to existing services and facilities, located in a popular residential area, and it met the settlements role established in the Spatial Strategy.	Yes - improves site accessibility but also requires land to be released from the Green Belt. Therefore potentially changes landscape, transport and housing topics.	Yes

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
136	MM53	Policies Map 1	Rotherham Urban Area	Northfield Retail Park, Parkgate - remove industrial and business use designation and replace with 'Retail Park' designation and notation: Amend explanatory text to Policy SP26 'Out-of-centre Retail Parks and other Out of Centre Developments'	The amendment reflects a retail park which has already been granted planning permission.	All topics	N/A	N/A	No
137	MM54	Policies Map 3	Dinnington, Anston and Laughton Common	Amend boundary of Allocation reference: H81 Land off Wentworth Way, Dinnington to exclude land at the north-west corner of the site. Allocate this excluded land as Green Space.	Changes to the site boundary to exclude an area currently used for informal recreation purpose. This will ensure that the allocation is effective and is consistent with national policy.	All topics	N/A	N/A	No
138	MM55	Policies Map 3 and relates to MM20	Dinnington, Anston and Laughton Common	Delete E16 Todwick North employment and special policy area notation and retain within the Green Belt.	The allocation was deleted due to numerous reasons; the allocation lies in Green Belt, has significant protected species issues and accessibility to public transport issues. Although the Council had considered (at the time of Submission of the Local Plan) that these issues were capable of mitigation or appropriate compensation in accordance with other policies of the Local Plan. Due to its isolated location, the site could not be developed into an urban extension. Thus the allocation was deemed to be not justified and not consistent with national policy.	All topics	The land was previously allocated for Special Policy Area. There is neutral change from the modification as the site will retain its current status as Green Belt i.e. there will be no construction nor operational effects from proposed development. Initially the Sustainability Appraisal concluded mitigation could overcome these issues but on further detailed examination, this was not the case. Therefore deletion is consistent with SA objectives as the methodology is clear sites with constraints should only move forward if mitigation can be provided.	No.	No
139				Add a new residential allocation at Land off Far Field Lane, Wath-upon-Dearne.	In response to the Council's Housing Land Supply Position Statement (January 2017), sites have come forward for development over the plan period. Changes specific to this Main Modification comprised of combining site LDF0298 and site LDF0297, facing on to Doncaster Road. The site has an estimated capacity of 242 dwellings. This will ensure that the plan is up-to-date, is coherent and that the housing supply figures broadly accord with the distribution of development set out in the Core Strategy.	Economy and Employment	Risk: Not relevant - residential use Opportunity: As above	N/A	No
140						Transport	Risk: Site 298 scored red whilst site 297 scored amber during the assessment of locations and site selections of the submitted Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) 2016 against highways/site accessibility i.e. potentially significant constraint and/or negative impact on the achievement of an SA objective. This was due to the fact that highways access may be required to the east from Farfield Lane to site 298. Both sites scored red for public transport Opportunity: Minimise reliance on the private car - improve public transport accessibility.	Policies SP29 and SP70 will ensure good and timely infrastructure provision, including public transport.	Yes
141						Education and Skills	Risk: Potential short-term pressures upon existing educational facilities in the period after new residents move into site and prior to any new education facility being built. Opportunity: Further provision of education facilities if required will prevent the overcrowding of classrooms and help improve pupil's learning experience.	Policies SP29 and SP70 ensures good, accessible and timely infrastructure provision such as junior and infant schools.	Yes
142						Health and Well-Being	Risk: Potential short-term pressures upon existing healthcare facilities in the period after the first phase of housing is complete. Opportunity: Provision of health facilities if required, will reduce health inequalities and well designed landscaped areas will improve access to green spaces. Overall this will result in a healthy and sustainable community.	Policies SP1, SP29, SP35, SP40, SP42, SP58 and SP66 -promote better access to recreational facilities and health services.	Yes
143						Biodiversity	Risk: Development has the potential to have impacts upon habitats and species in its vicinity. Key issues include habitat loss, recreational pressure, light and noise disturbance. Opportunity: A shift to sustainable transport would reduce air and noise emissions, reducing the adverse impacts on habitats and wildlife. An opportunity to prevent or reduce declines in habitat degradation or populations or protected and notable species.	Policies SP29, SP35, SP36, SP37 and SP38 aim to mitigate the noted risks by prioritising the protection of biodiversity and the wider environment. Through investment attracted into development and into Rotherham generally, these policies have the potential to contribute to improved habitat quality and management.	Yes
144						Pollution and Emissions	Risk: Nothing specific other than that generally associated with housing development. Opportunity: New homes offer the potential for improved efficiency in terms of energy consumption and heating.	Policies SP29, SP55 and SP60 will help ensure that the potential for rises in air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions are reduced, thus minimising impacts on human health.	No
145						Flood Risk	Risk: Development has the potential to have impacts on flood risk. Opportunity: Policy requirement that new development seeks to reduce the extent and impact of flooding through mitigation, such as SUDs and promotion of natural/semi natural flood storage.	Policies SP35 and SP50 aim to reduce flood risk through a number of measures including mitigation, siting of development etc, flood risk assessment etc.	Yes

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
146	MM56	Policies Map 1 and relates to MM2	Wath-upon-Deerne, Brampton Bierlow & West Melton			Natural Resources (other than Fossil Fuels)	Risk: The construction of new housing will lead to increased population growth with corresponding growth in demand on water resources. An increase in development can also lead to a greater chance of a pollution incident, which could have adverse impacts on the quality of water resources. Opportunity: More sustainable use of natural resources. Securing contributions from developers towards essential infrastructure provision through CIL where applicable, and S106 agreements and obligations e.g. increasing green infrastructure and habitat creation, more energy efficient buildings, improved habitat quality and management.	Policies SP50, SP55, SP58 and SP70 ensures that natural resources will be reused / recycled and incorporated into design principles. Policy SP 60 promotes renewable energy and sustainable construction, which can reduce reliance on fossil fuels.	Yes
147						Townscape	Risk: Loss of greenfield land / greenspace and development has the potential to affect the quality or character of settlements, areas or buildings. Opportunity: Policy promotes improvement to the public realm and community environment. Street scene enhancements can improve the public realm thus increasing quality of life in the area.	Policies SP58, SP 61, SP 62 and SP 63 protect against development that is inappropriate in scale and character.	Yes
148						Soil, Land Use and Geology	Risk: Low potential that undeveloped land is contaminated but appropriate information would be provided as part of a planning application. Opportunity: Appropriate management and handling of soils during the development process.	Policy SP39 aims to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land.	No
149						Housing	Risk: None. Opportunity: Enables new housing development including new affordable housing.	Policies SP1, SP12 and SP58 maximise proximity and accessibility for new housing to service and employment centres.	Yes
150						Landscape	Risk: Poorly designed development has the potential to despoil landscapes. Opportunity: Minimise the adverse landscape impacts of new development, and through mitigation, can lead to potential enhancement of landscapes.	Policies SP35, SP36, SP40, SP47 and SP58 promote the protection and enhancement of local character.	Yes
151						Historic Environment	Risk: Does not impact on historic environment; sites LDF0297 and LDF0298 have low risk of potential loss of historic environmental features. Opportunity: As above.	N/A	No
152						Accessibility / Community Facilities	Risk: That the new site is not well located to community facilities. Opportunity: The site is located in Wath-Upon-Deerne which has many local facilities. There is the potential for CIL payments and/or S106 contributions, as appropriate, to support new community facilities.	Policies SP35, SP40, SP41 and SP42 aim to protect and contribute towards securing a healthy environment. Policy SP66 aims to ensure that new development is located appropriately. This policy may assist in ensuring that new development can integrate with existing residential areas; Wath upon Deerne is identified as a principle settlement for growth and it is within the highest areas of deprivation in Rotherham.	Yes
153						Population and Equality	Risk: New housing should be designed so it is fit to meet the needs of people's complete life cycle. Opportunity: The mix of house sizes, types and tenures can improve the existing housing situation. New recreation, sports facilities and play facilities, promoting active and healthy lifestyles.	Policies SP29 and SP58 ensures that new development will be designed to comply with the Equalities Impact Assessment as identified in appendix 3; age, disability, gender reassignment, sexual orientation (sexuality), gender, maternity, pregnancy, marriage and civil partnership, race, ethnic origin, national origin, colour, nationality, religion and belief, gypsy / traveller communities and lone parents.	No
154									Add a new residential allocation at Land between Pontefract Road and Barnsley Road.
155	Transport	Risk: Site LDF0263 scored amber against public transport accessibility i.e. potentially significant constraint and/or negative impact on the achievement of an SA objective. Opportunity: Minimise reliance on the private car - improve public transport accessibility.	Policies SP29 and SP70 will ensure good and timely infrastructure provision, including public transport.	Yes					
156	Education and Skills	Risk: Potential for short-term pressures upon existing educational facilities in the period after new residents move into site and prior to the new education facility being built. Opportunity: Further provision of education facilities if required will prevent the overcrowding of classrooms and help improve pupil's learning experience.	Policies SP29 and SP70 ensures good, accessible and timely infrastructure provision such as junior and infant schools.	Yes					

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
157	MM57	Policies Map 1	Wath-upon-Dearne, Brampton Bierlow & West Melton			Health and Well-Being	Risk: Potential for short-term pressures upon existing healthcare facilities in the period after the first phase of housing is complete. Opportunity: Provision of health facilities if required will reduce health inequalities and well designed landscaped areas will improve access to green spaces. Overall this will result in a healthy and sustainable community.	Policies SP1, SP29, SP35, SP40, SP42, SP58 and SP66 promote better access to recreational facilities and health services.	Yes
158						Biodiversity	Risk: Development has the potential to have impacts upon habitats and species in its vicinity. Key issues include habitat loss, recreational pressure, light and noise disturbance. Opportunity: A shift to sustainable transport would reduce air and noise emissions, reducing the adverse impacts on habitats and wildlife. An opportunity to prevent or reduce declines in habitat degradation or populations of protected and notable species.	Policies SP29, SP35, SP36, SP37 and SP38 aim to mitigate the noted risks by prioritising the protection of biodiversity and the wider environment. Through investment attracted into development and into Rotherham generally, these policies have the potential to contribute to improved habitat quality and management.	Yes
159						Pollution and Emissions	Risk: Nothing specific other than that generally associated with housing development. Opportunity: New homes offer the potential for improved efficiency in terms of energy consumption and heating.	Policies SP29, SP55 and SP60 will help ensure that the potential for rises in air pollution and noise emissions are reduced, thus minimising impacts on human health.	No
160						Flood Risk	Risk: None as there is low flood risk on site. Opportunity: As above.	N/A	No
161						Natural Resources (other than Fossil Fuels)	Risk: The construction of new housing will lead to increased population growth with corresponding growth in demand on water resources. An increase in development can also lead to a greater chance of a pollution incident, which could have adverse impacts on the quality of water resources. Opportunity: More sustainable use of natural resources. Securing contributions from developers towards essential infrastructure provision through CIL where applicable and S106 agreements and obligations e.g. increasing green infrastructure and habitat creation, more energy efficient buildings, improved habitat quality and management.	Policies SP50, SP55, SP58 and SP70 ensures that natural resources will be reused / recycled and incorporated into design principles. Policy SP 60 promotes renewable energy and sustainable construction, which can reduce reliance on fossil fuels.	Yes
162						Townscape	Risk: Loss of greenfield land / greenspace and development has the potential to affect the quality or character of settlements, areas or buildings. Opportunity: Policy promotes improvement to the public realm and community environment. Street scene enhancements can improve the public realm thus increasing quality of life in the area.	Policies SP58, SP 61, SP 62 and SP 63 protect against development that is inappropriate in scale and character.	Yes
163						Soil, Landuse and Geology	Risk: Low potential that undeveloped land is contaminated but appropriate information would be provided as part of a planning application. Opportunity: Appropriate management and handling of soils during the development process.	Policy SP39 aims to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land.	No
164						Housing	Risk: None. Opportunity: Enables new housing development including new affordable housing.	Policies SP1, SP12 and SP58 maximise proximity and accessibility for new housing to service and employment centres.	Yes
165						Landscape	Risk: Poorly designed development has the potential to despoil landscapes. Opportunity: Minimise the adverse landscape impacts of new development, and through mitigation, can lead to potential enhancement of landscapes.	Policies SP35, SP36, SP40, SP47 and SP58 promote the protection and enhancement of local character.	Yes
166						Historic Environment	Risk: Does not impact on historic environment. Opportunity: As above.	N/A	No
167						Accessibility / Community Facilities	Risk: That the new site is not well located to community facilities. Opportunity: The site is located in Wath-Upon-Dearne which has many local facilities. There is the potential for CIL payments and/or S106 contributions, as appropriate, to support new community facilities.	Policies SP35, SP40, SP41 and SP42 aim to protect and contribute towards securing a healthy environment. Policy SP66 aims to ensure that new development is located appropriately. This policy may assist in ensuring that new development can integrate with existing residential areas; Wath upon Dearne is identified as a principle settlement for growth and is within the highest areas of deprivation in Rotherham.	Yes
168						Population and Equality	Risk: New housing should be designed so it is fit to meet the needs of people's complete life cycle. Opportunity: The mix of house sizes, types and tenures can improve the existing housing situation. New recreation, sports facilities and play facilities, promoting active and healthy lifestyles.	Policies SP29 and SP58 ensures that new development will be designed to comply with the Equalities Impact Assessment as identified in appendix 3; age, disability, gender reassignment, sexual orientation (sexuality), gender, maternity, pregnancy, marriage and civil partnership, race, ethnic origin, national origin, colour nationality, religion and belief, gypsy / traveller communities and lone parents.	No
169						MM58	Policies Map	Wath-upon-Dearne, Brampton Bierlow & West Melton	Re-allocate land adjacent to allocation H42 (north and east) from Green Space to residential use as part of the additional housing sites.

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
170	MM59	Policies Map 2	Waverley	Delete Special Policy Area hatching and 'AMP' notation from allocation E22. Replace with Industrial and Business Use and New Employment hatchings.	This will ensure that the plan is up-to-date and is effective in line with national policy.	All topics	N/A	N/A	No
171	MM60	Policies Map Sheet 2 and relates to MM15	Waverley	H54 Waverley Mixed Use Community. Delete policy and allocate as a Special Policy Area.	This will ensure that the plan is up-to-date and is effective in line with national policy.	All topics	N/A	N/A	No
172	MM61	Policies Map Sheet 3 and relates to MM2	Maltby and Hellaby	Remove part of LDF0839 from the Green Belt and include within H70 at Maltby.	This change to the boundary will ensure an access is provided into the site from Rotherham Road, thereby enhancing the attractiveness and deliverability of this site to the development sector. It will ensure that the plan is up-to-date and is effective in line with national policy.	All topics	There is potential for biodiversity impact from this change to the site boundary and it results in a small loss of Green Belt, however the Site Development Guidelines for this site (H70) provide further details of the mitigation likely to be required. All other topics are scoped out.	Policies SP35, SP36, SP37 and SP38 aim to mitigate the identified issues by prioritising the protection of biodiversity and the wider environment. Through investment attracted into development and into Rotherham generally, these policies have the potential to contribute to improved habitat quality and management.	Yes
173	MM62	Policies Map Sheet 3 and relates to MM2	Maltby and Hellaby	Delete employment site allocation designation at E25 at Maltby and replace with residential site allocation.	This main modification recognises that the site has already been granted planning permission for residential use and therefore is no longer relevant in the plan period from 2016 up to 2028.	All topics	N/A - Allocation now deleted.	N/A	No
174	MM63	Policies Map Sheet 3	Maltby and Hellaby	E23 Land at former Maltby Colliery. Remove LDF0842 from Green Belt and include within E23.	To reflect the Main Modification and amend the boundaries of site allocation E23 as set out in Policy SP20, Former Maltby Colliery.	All topics	There is ancient woodland onsite, whilst there is potential for both surface water flooding issues and protected species. All other topics are scoped out.	Policies SP35, SP36, SP37, SP38 and SP50 aim to mitigate the identified issues by prioritising the protection of biodiversity and the wider environment as well as flood risk on and off site is dealt with robustly, including the timely resourcing and implementation of any required flood risk management measures.	Yes
175	MM64	Policies Map Sheet 3	Maltby and Hellaby	Amend the northern boundary of employment allocation E24 (Cumwell Lane, Hellaby) to include a small area of Green Belt to ensure that it follows the field boundary.	The proposed change allows the site to follow the line of the road where Cumwell Lane meets Bawtry Road and to create a strong Green Belt boundary.	All topics	N/A	N/A	No
176	MM65	Policies Map Sheet 2 and relates to MM42	Aston, Aughton and Swallownest	H89 Aston Common, South of Mansfield Road, E27 Aston Common, West of Mansfield Road and E28 Aston Common, East of Mansfield Road Industrial Estate. Combine sites, delete housing and employment allocations and change to a mixed use allocation.	This policy combines site H89 allocated for residential use (indicative 150 dwellings), E28 allocated for business use and E27 allocated for industrial and business use so that it becomes a Mixed Use Area allocation. This will ensure that the policy is effective in ensuring the area is developed comprehensively and is consistent with national policy.	Refer to MM42's topics	No, there is no substantial alteration of the plan and thus not likely to give significant effects.	N/A	No
177	MM66	Policies Map Sheet 2	Aston, Aughton and Swallownest	SG16 Disused tip on Aston Bypass. Redraw the Green Space boundary to include SG16 within the Green Space and remove safeguarded land allocation.	The submission Sites and Policies Local Plan inappropriately allocated this site, identified as Urban Greenspace within the adopted Unitary Development Plan (1999), as safeguarded land. It is proposed to retain the site as Green Space in accordance with national policy guidance.	All topics	The land was previously proposed for safeguarding but it will now be retained as green space, therefore no further impacts occur as a result of this change.	N/A	No
178	MM67	Policies Map Sheet 2	Policies Map - Wales and Kiveton Park	LDF0461 – Unesco Steel, Manor Road, Kiveton Park. Delete business allocation and allocate for industrial and business use.	The allocation for business use is not justified and is not deliverable. The site is predominantly occupied by uses that fall outside the B1 Use class and is a valuable resource for such uses. Development management policies can be used to ensure that due regard is paid to the environmental and highway impacts of proposals.	All topics	Under IIA Report 2015, Vol. 4: Site Survey Summary Sheets (dated January 2016), the site was allocated for business use only; the adopted Unitary Development Plan identified this site for industrial and business uses, and the Council did not, in the oral Hearing session, subsequently provide sufficient justification or evidence to support the proposed change to the land use allocation.	N/A	No
179				E32 North of School Road, Waleswood. Remove LDF0483 from the Green Belt and identify as an extension to the E32 business and industry allocation, taking account of the route for HS2 announced by Government on 17 July 2017.	To define a clear Green Belt boundary, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent, and provide further employment opportunities in the area. However, the site has increased from its original boundaries from 7.08 hectares to 20.75 hectares. The northern half of the allocation has not yet been assessed by the IIA.	Economy and Employment	Risk: The proposed route of HS2 was issued on 17 July including the profile maps. For this site, Route Sheet 1 between Woodall to Conisbrough, the track appears to be mainly within a cutting through the site and there will 2 viaducts to be built (over Pigeon Bridge Brook and the A57). The target to meet the borough's employment land for the site is 5.99 hectares. Opportunity: The proposed industrial and business use allocations will expand the existing industrial area and create more employment opportunities.	Land in this area has been promoted to the Council for development and having regard to the need to provide sufficient land to meet the borough's employment land requirement it is proposed to allocate this land as a development site for business and industrial use.	Yes

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
180	MM68	Policies Map Sheet 2	Wales and Kiveton Park		Under IIA Report 2015, Vol. 2: Assessment of Allocations and Alternatives, and Site Selection (dated March 2016), the site was allocated for employment and overall was a good-performing site under the IIA / SA. It only scored red in the IIA assessment against socio-economic and greenbelt. The route of HS2 will take up land on either side of the proposed track, thus land take has increased to accommodate both employment uses as well as HS2. At the end of Stage 3 of the site selection methodology, the site prioritisation (part G) as described for LDF0483 in appendix 2-C of the IIA2 2015, Vol 2: Assessment of Allocations and Alternatives, and Site Selection (version 4 dated March 2016) did not include HS2's rail route. This site was given a green assessment, whilst other sites which fell within 200 metre buffer of HS2 were given a red assessment. The HS2 route was included as other known physical constraints. The alternative, now safeguarded, route for HS2, was announced on 15th November 2016, on the day of the Matter 24 Local Plan oral Hearing session for this settlement grouping: Wales/ Kiveton Park, and was discussed in that Hearing session.	Transport	Risk: This allocation scored red during the assessment of locations and site selections of the submitted Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) 2016 against highways access and access to public transport i.e. potentially significant constraint and/or significant negative impact on the achievement of an SA objective. Although access to the site may be problematic it is considered that this issue can be overcome. The council will not allow access from the south which would require additional land/demolition of properties on School Road and this option will not be supported. Opportunity: Minimise reliance on the private car - improve public transport accessibility.	Policies SP29 and SP70 will ensure good and timely infrastructure provision, including public transport. If employment units are developed on either side of the HS2 route, additional infrastructure maybe required to allow access under/over HS2 route.	Yes
181						Education and Skills	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
182						Health and Well-Being	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
183						Biodiversity	Risk: Development has the potential to have impacts upon habitats and species in its vicinity. Key issues include habitat loss, recreational pressure, light and noise disturbance. Opportunity: A shift to sustainable transport would reduce air and noise emissions, reducing the adverse impacts on habitats and wildlife. An opportunity to prevent or reduce declines in habitat degradation or populations or protected and notable species.	Policies SP29, SP35, SP36, SP37 and SP38 aim to mitigate the noted risks by prioritising the protection of biodiversity and the wider environment. Through investment attracted into development and into Rotherham generally, these policies have the potential to contribute to improved habitat quality and management.	No
184						Pollution and Emissions	Risk: All new development has the potential to increase air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Opportunity: Promoting walking and cycling as alternative forms of transport. Installation of integrated renewable and low carbon technologies into new development.	Policies SP29, SP55 and SP60 will help ensure that the potential for rises in air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions are reduced, thus minimising impacts on human health.	No
185						Flood Risk	Risk: None as there is low flood risk on site. Opportunity: As above.	N/A	No
186						Natural Resources (other than Fossil Fuels)	Risk: Low potential that undeveloped land would lead to a greater chance of a pollution incident, but appropriate information would have to be provided as part of a planning application. Opportunity: More sustainable use of natural resources. Securing contributions from developers towards essential infrastructure provision through CIL where applicable, and S106 agreements and obligations e.g. increasing green infrastructure and habitat creation, more energy efficient buildings, improved habitat quality and management.	Policies SP50, SP55, SP58 and SP70 ensures that natural resources will be reused / recycled and incorporated into design principles. Policy SP 60 promotes renewable energy and sustainable construction, which can reduce reliance on fossil fuels.	Yes
187						Townscape	This is a non urban area so is scoped out.	N/A	No
188						Soil, Landuse and Geology	Risk: Low potential that undeveloped land is contaminated but appropriate information would be provided as part of a planning application. Opportunity: Appropriate management and handling of soils during the development process.	Policy SP39 aims to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land.	No
189						Housing	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
190						Landscape	Risk: The removal of land from the Green Belt for built development reduces the attractiveness of the landscape. Opportunity: The safeguarded HS2 route provides an opportunity to create a new landscaped area and defensible boundary.	Removal of land from the Green Belt to extend the existing employment allocation.	Yes
191						Historic Environment	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
192						Accessibility / Community Facilities	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	
193						Population and Equality	This Main Modification does not affect this theme and is scoped out.	N/A	No
194	MM69	Policies Map 2	Catcliffe, Treeton and Orgreave	LDF0501 Bluemans Way, Catcliffe. Allocate for residential development.	This MM reflects that planning permission for housing has been granted since the submission draft.	N/A	NA-reflects a recent planning permission.	N/A	No
195	MM70	Policies Map Sheet 2	Thurcroft	LDF0433 South of Brampton Meadows. Delete as Green Space and include within the Green Belt.	To define a clear Green Belt boundary, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. It was noted from the IIA Report, Volume 4: Site Survey Summary Sheets (January 2016) that this site was already part of a larger field that is allocated Green Belt. Furthermore, the existing designation is not justified as this area of farmland does not perform a Green Space function.	All topics	To strengthen Green Belt boundaries and ensure longer term protection.	N/A	No

	A	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
1	Change ref	Section / Policy	Paragraph / Chapter	Description of change	Reason / Comment	IIA Topic	Potential Effects for IIA	Potential for Residual Effects	Further review of IIA required?
196	MM71	Policies Map Sheet 2	Todwick	H84 Land to the west of Kiveton Lane. Delete allocation and retain area in the Green Belt.	This site, together with other areas of land around Todwick, makes a significant contribution to preventing the neighbouring settlement groupings of Dinnington/Anston/Laughton Common and Wales/Kiveton Park from merging into one another. The site is poorly related to the existing built form of the village, would constitute encroachment into the countryside, and would cause significant harm to the attractive rural character of the local area. Further more the allocation has significant protected species issues. Consequently the allocation is not justified and would be contrary to national planning policy.	All topics	The site was previously allocated for residential development. There is neutral change from the modification as the site will retain its current status as Green Belt.	No	No

Appendix B.

Wath-Upon-Deerne, Brampton, Bierlow and West Melton consultation sites, dated 26th June 2017,

Rotherham
Metropolitan
Borough Council



JACOBS®

Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

**The Integrated Impact Assessment and Site Justification - Wath-upon-
Dearne, Brampton Bierlow and West Melton Consultation Sites**

Document No. | 2

26th June 2017

Document history and status

Revision	Date	Description	By	Review	Approved
0	19 th June, 2017	IIA Review and Site Justification – Wath-upon-Dearne Consultation Sites	Martin White/Helen Sleigh	Meryl Leung	Michael Robinson
1	22 nd June, 2017	Amendments following discussion with Helen Sleigh	Martin White	Meryl Leung	Michael Robinson
2	26 th June	Add NTS	Martin White	Meryl Leung	Michael Robinson

Distribution of copies

Revision	Issue approved	Date issued	Issued to	Comments

Rotherham Sites and Policies Local Plan

Project No: Project Number
Document Title: The Integrated Impact Assessment and Site Justification - Wath-upon-Dearne Consultation Sites
Document No.: Document No.
Revision: 2
Date: 26th June 2017
Client Name: Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Client No: Wath-upon-Dearne Consultation Sites
Project Manager: Michael Robinson
Author: Martin White
File Name: Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies, Wath-upon-Dearne Consultation Sites IIA Review

Jacobs U.K. Limited

1 City Walk
Leeds, West Yorkshire LS11 9DX
United Kingdom
T +44 (0)113 242 6771
F +44 (0)113 389 1389
www.jacobs.com

© Copyright 2017 Jacobs U.K. Limited. The concepts and information contained in this document are the property of Jacobs. Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of Jacobs constitutes an infringement of copyright.

Limitation: This document has been prepared on behalf of, and for the exclusive use of Jacobs' client, and is subject to, and issued in accordance with, the provisions of the contract between Jacobs and the client. Jacobs accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever for, or in respect of, any use of, or reliance upon, this document by any third party.

Contents

Non Technical Summary	1
1. Background	3
2. Proposed Consultation Sites	4
3. Assessment in the IIA	6
3.1 How the Consultation Sites were Chosen	6
3.2 The IIA Assessment	6
3.3 IIA Stage 2	6
3.4 Stage 3 of the IIA	7
3.5 IIA Site Analysis.....	8
3.5.1 LDF Site 0263.....	8
3.5.2 LDF0297	9
3.5.3 LDF0298	10
4. Further Justification for Allocation	12
4.1 Introduction	12
4.2 Land between Pontefract Road and Barnsley Road (LDF0263).....	12
4.3 Land off Far Field Lane (part of LDF0298, and LDF0297 subsumed within new site, reference: LDF0849).....	12
4.4 Alternative Sites Considered But Not Taken Forward.....	14
5. Conclusion	15
A. Appendix A: Extracts from IIA Submission: IIA Methodology	
B. Appendix B: IIA Stage 2 Assessments	
C. Appendix C: IIA Stage 3 Assessments (to show alternative sites considered)	

Non Technical Summary

The purpose of this short report is to validate the assessment of potential housing allocation sites completed in the Submitted Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) for the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies. Specifically it relates to the Sustainability Appraisal of proposed housing allocation sites in the Wath-upon-Deerne, Brampton, Bierlow and West Melton settlement grouping.

To meet an anticipated shortfall against planned provision set out in the Core Strategy, it is necessary for additional housing sites to be identified in the Wath-upon-Deerne, Brampton Bierlow and West Melton settlement grouping. RMBC is consulting on two sites, which together would yield enough capacity to provide at least 500 dwellings and meet this shortfall.

The Environmental Assessment Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004¹ set out at Regulation 12 the formal requirements of an 'environmental report', which should form an integral part of the sustainability appraisal report and is a core output of any strategic environmental assessment. Further guidance on Sustainability Appraisal is provided by the online² planning tool which states:

Regulation 12 of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 sets out the formal requirements of an 'environmental report', which should form an integral part of the sustainability appraisal report and is a core output of any strategic environmental assessment. An environmental report for the purpose of the regulations must identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the Local Plan policies and of the reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and geographical scope of the Local Plan. The sustainability appraisal report must clearly show how these requirements have been met as well as recording the wider assessment of social and economic effects.

The sustainability appraisal must include a non-technical summary of the information within the main report. The summary should be prepared with a range of readers in mind, and provide a clear, accessible overview of the process and findings.

Paragraph: 019 Reference ID: 11-019-20140306

Where modifications to a Local Plan are proposed, as is the case now, the guidance states:

The sustainability appraisal report will not necessarily have to be amended if the Local Plan is modified following responses to consultations. Modifications to the sustainability appraisal should be considered only where appropriate and proportionate to the level of change being made to the Local Plan. A change is likely to be significant if it substantially alters the Plan and/ or is likely to give to significant effects.

Further assessment may be required if the changes have not previously been assessed and are likely to give rise to significant effects. A further round of consultation on the sustainability appraisal may also be required in such circumstances but this should only be undertaken where necessary. Changes to the Local Plan that are not significant will not require further sustainability appraisal work.

Paragraph: 021 Reference ID: 11-021-20140306

It is up to the local planning authority to decide whether the sustainability appraisal report should be amended following proposed changes to an emerging plan. A local planning authority can ask the Inspector to recommend changes to the submission Local Plan to make it sound or they can propose their own changes.

If the local planning authority assesses that necessary changes are significant, and were not previously subject to sustainability appraisal, then further sustainability appraisal may be required and the sustainability appraisal report should be updated and amended accordingly.

Paragraph: 023 Reference ID: 11-023-20140306

¹ http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2004/1633/pdfs/ukxi_20041633_en.pdf – SI, 2004 No 1633

² <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainability-appraisal#Sustainability-appraisal-process>

The purpose of this report is to identify the previous assessments that were undertaken for each site in the IIA Sustainability Appraisal³ and outlines the conclusions it reached in terms of their suitability as a housing allocation. This includes the physical and environmental issues that were identified in the IIA. The report then sets out the reasons why it is now considered that this situation has changed and why these sites are now considered a 'priority for development' with respect to Stage 3 of the IIA process and appropriate for allocation when compared to alternatives.

This report is not intended to represent a replacement Sustainability Appraisal of the emerging Sites and Policies Local Plan but sets out the current position in the IIA and the reasons why this has now considered to have changed. It is first necessary to complete consultation on the proposed changes to housing allocations and the purpose of this report is to accompany this consultation process. In due course, the IIA will be updated to reflect any main modifications which are proposed, including any new housing allocations, so a Sustainability Appraisal of each main modification will be completed. This approach is in accordance with advice contained in the online planning tool referred to above.

³ Submission document references series SD008 A-E.

1. Background

The Council's Local Plan for Rotherham (2013 to 2028) sets out broadly how housing and employment development should be distributed throughout Rotherham's settlements.

The Council submitted its Local Plan Sites and Policies document to the Secretary of State on 24 March 2016 for independent examination (SD02). The examination is underway and the Council has received and published the Inspector's letter setting out the Proposed Main Modifications necessary to make the Sites and Policies document sound (ID024).

The Council's evidence submitted to the Examination identified sufficient sites with planning permission to meet the identified target of 1,300 homes for the Wath-upon-Deerne, Brampton Bierlow and West Melton settlement grouping. However, a number of these sites are fully developed and further monitoring has demonstrated that the number of residential units to be delivered on site is considerably lower than originally anticipated. Using the most up to-date figures available there is an identified shortfall of 527 dwellings against the Core Strategy requirement.

The Council are required to address the shortfall by identifying additional housing allocations in the Wath-upon-Deerne, Brampton Bierlow, West Melton area, to meet the target set out in the Core Strategy.

Reference to the consultation paper that this document accompanies provides further details of the sites proposed to be allocated for housing and thereafter in this report referred to as the "Consultation Sites".

2. Proposed Consultation Sites

The following Consultation Sites are proposed to meet the identified shortfall:

1. Land between Pontefract Road and Barnsley Road (LDF0263). It has an estimated capacity of 328 dwellings.
2. Land off Far Field Lane (LDF0849). This is comprised of the northern part of site LDF0298 plus the small site LDF0297 to the north, facing on to Doncaster Road, to enable a suitable access into the site to be created. The allotments to the west of the site are to be retained (allocated as Green Space). The site has an estimated capacity of 242 dwellings.

Figure 2.1: Consultation Site LDF0263

Map 2 Proposed additional housing site at Pontefract Road and Barnsley Road (LDF0263)



 Residential Development (11.73ha, estimated 328 dwellings)

Figure 2.2: Consultation Site LDF0849

Map 1 Proposed additional housing site at land off Far Field Lane (LDF0849)



Residential Development (9.55ha, estimated 242 dwellings)

Safeguarded Land (SG 5, 16.01ha)

The proposed additional housing sites have strong developer interest and are available. They were included in the full Submission Sustainability Appraisal process, as set out in the Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) 2016; SD08A-E), albeit not in the exact same format.

3. Assessment in the IIA

3.1 How the Consultation Sites were Chosen

The consultation sites have been selected by RMBC taking into account the following specific criteria:

1. The availability, suitability and deliverability of alternative housing site allocation options.
2. The conclusions of the IIA / Sustainability Appraisal regarding alternative housing site options.
3. Relevant supporting evidence documents.
4. The desire to, where possible, minimise loss of land from the Green Belt.

3.2 The IIA Assessment

With respect to point 2 above, the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the Council produce an accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. Guidance on these documents states that they should also meet the requirements of the Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) Regulations. The Submission Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) of the Sites and Policies document includes:

- Sustainability Appraisal, and meeting the requirements of SEA regulations.
- Health Impact Assessment.
- Equalities Impact Assessment.
- Habitats Regulation Assessment which aims to ensure that there will be no significant adverse effects on a European nature conservation site, except in exceptional circumstances.

The IIA includes details of the Council's site selection methodology, setting out why sites have been proposed as development allocations, or alternatively why sites have not been considered to be suitable.

The Consultation Sites are included with the IIA submitted for examination, albeit as three separate sites rather than the two consultation sites put forward:

- i. Although site LDF0849 is not a single site within the IIA, it effectively comprises two sites assessed by the IIA which are LDF0297 and part of LDF0298.
- ii. Site LDF0263 is covered by the IIA as put forward for consultation.

3.3 IIA Stage 2

The Consultation Sites were assessed at Stages 2 and 3 of the IIA. This means the IIA concluded that there were no over-riding policy or environmental constraints precluding them from further consideration in the plan making process, otherwise they would have been discounted at Stage 1. As such, this process established that they are in principal suitable for development.

The full methodology is set out in the Submission IIA document part 2 (SD008B), Appendix 2C. This is extracted as Appendix 1 of this report. Note: the methodology is also summarised in part 1 of the Submission IIA document (SD008A).

Stage 2 assessed all sites against a number of detailed site-specific sustainability factors and potential constraints to development and by doing this, to conduct the main assessment stage of the IIA, including SA / SEA. The factors and constraints relate to a variety of social, economic and environmental issues which

conform to the SA Framework agreed with statutory bodies and others at the scoping stage (as re-conducted most recently in 2013). The factors were:

- Access to Services.
- Greenspace.
- Other Leisure.
- Support for Sustaining Schools.
- National Cycle Network.
- Access to Employment.
- Infrastructure (non-transport).
- Highways / Site Accessibility.
- Transport / Accessibility.
- Biodiversity.
- Air Quality.
- Proximity to Water Body.
- Groundwater Sources.
- Soil Brownfield / Greenfield.
- Geodiversity.
- Flood risk (both EA flood model and RMBC surface water flood risk).
- Waste.
- Minerals.
- General Landscape.
- Designated Landscapes.
- Townscape.
- Historic and Built Environment.

A Red / Amber / Green assessment for most of these criteria was applied. The colour coding represented the following categories:

- **Red** = potentially significant constraint and/or significant negative impact on the achievement of an SA Objective.
- **Amber** = some potential constraint and/or negative impact on the achievement of an SA Objective.
- **Green** = no known constraint and/or little negative impact on the achievement of an SA Objective.

The purpose of this scoring technique was to enable site comparison, and also to report on their “likely significant effects” for IIA purposes and in accordance with the SEA Regulations. ‘Red’ scoring did not automatically exclude sites, as the potential for any major adverse effect had to be considered further within Stage 3 and whether the red could be managed through mitigation. Refer to Appendix A of this report for further information on this process.

3.4 Stage 3 of the IIA

The purpose of Stage 3 was to prioritise sites in terms of whether they should be allocated for development. This stage prioritised the 534 sites assessed at Stage 2 by consideration of both “SA” and “non-SA” planning and sustainability factors. The assessment was based on both the Stage 2 (SA) results and a further ‘in combination’ assessment, i.e. taking into account the potential effects with other potential allocations. The Stage 3 assessment used the following criteria:

- SA Score: Socio-Economic
- SA Score: Environmental
- Green Belt
- Urban Extensions

- Deliverability (Housing)
- Town, District & Local Centres
- Green Infrastructure Corridors
- HS2 Rail Route
- Other known constraints / issues
- SA Cumulative Effects

Each of the 545 sites was scored and this informed decision-making. The possible outcomes for each site were:

- I. Allocated – (Residential/ Employment/ Retail/ Gypsy and Traveller site).
- II. Safeguarded for future development if required- (Residential).
- III. None – (Not allocated).

Within Stage 3, the potential for mitigation to avoid a major adverse effect was taken into consideration. It should be noted that SA is not a decision-making tool, but rather SA informs decision-making. While the SA objectives must be taken into account, planning considerations will influence decisions.

3.5 IIA Site Analysis

3.5.1 LDF Site 0263

The Stage 2 assessment for each site is contained in Annex 2-E of Part 2 of the IIA (SD08B) and the relevant extract for the Wath-upon-Deerne settlement grouping is provided at Appendix B of this report.

This site had two red scores against, one against the IMD proxy indicator and a red because it isn't a brownfield site.

Detailed survey sheets contained in Part 4 of the IIA (SD09D1) provide the rationale for prioritisation at Stage 3:

This site is currently allocated as Urban Greenspace. During its appraisal, a number of sustainability factors and constraints have been evaluated to establish this site's potential to accommodate future development. Specifically, the application of the site selection methodology at stage 2 (the Sustainability Appraisal of individual sites) and stage 3 (the prioritisation of sites) summarises the site selection process, the results of which are included within the Integrated Impact Assessment.

The best performing sites when assessed against these criteria and based on current knowledge of constraints have been recommended for allocation for future development, subject to reaching the targets set out for each settlement grouping within the Core Strategy. As the housing target for Wath-upon-Deerne, Brampton Bierlow, West Melton Settlement Grouping has been met there is no need to allocate this site for residential development. As the site is currently allocated Urban Greenspace it is inappropriate to designate it as Safeguarded Land in accord with policy CS5. It is proposed therefore to retain the Urban Greenspace allocation.

The overall assessment at Stage 3 was amber (as red scores at stage 2 were weighted and a single red score doesn't automatically mean that at Stage 3, this also resulted in a red over-arching score)

Stage 1 Exclusion or taken to Sustainability Appraisal stage?	Taken to next stage	
Sustainability Appraisal Socio-Economic Score	Amber	Sustainability Appraisal Environment Score
		Amber

The full Stage 3 assessment for the site is provided as Appendix C of this report.

As referred to earlier the boundary of the consultation site is the same as the site assessed in the IIA as shown in figure 3.1.

Figure 3.1: IIA Site boundary 0263



The main sustainability issue in terms of any impact on the submitted IIA is therefore the loss of green space.

3.5.2 LDF0297

The Stage 2 assessment scored the site red on green space, red on public transport accessibility and red as it is not brownfield land. In terms of site prioritisation, the Stage 3 assessment concluded that:

This site is currently allocated as Green Belt and it is intended that this site be utilised to accommodate the demand for allotment gardens within the locality. Potential road access problems have been identified by Transportation but access may be required to the east (and possibly including a small portion of this site) from Farfield Lane to site LDF0298/ Safeguarded Land site SG5.

Stage 1 Exclusion or taken to Sustainability Appraisal stage?	Taken to next stage	
Sustainability Appraisal Socio-Economic Score	Amber	Sustainability Appraisal Environment Score
	Amber	Amber

The extent of site LDF0297 assessed in the IIA is shown in figure 3.2 below.

Figure 3.2: IIA Site Boundary LDF0297



The main issues with this site identified by the IIA are accessibility, its location in the Green Belt and that it may be required to meet local demand for allotments.

3.5.3 LDF0298

Stage 2 identified red scores for greenspace, water, sewerage capacity, highways access, public transport access, potential for protected species and that it is not brownfield land.

The Stage 3 assessment identified that:

Site LDF0298 is currently allocated as Green Belt. During its appraisal, a number of sustainability factors and constraints have been evaluated to establish its potential to accommodate future development. There is a possible overland flood route through this site. Development proposals should ensure that overland flows do not cause flooding. There are known flooding problems immediately downstream (north) consideration should be given to the location of a flood alleviation scheme in this locality. The application of the site selection methodology at stage 2 (the Sustainability Appraisal of individual sites) and stage 3 (the prioritisation of sites) summarises the site selection process, the results of which are included within the Integrated Impact Assessment.

The best performing sites when assessed against these criteria and based on current knowledge of constraints have been recommended for allocation for future development, subject to reaching the targets set out for each settlement grouping within the Core Strategy. As part of this process, consideration has also been given to designating Safeguarded Land. In accordance with Central Government advice and policy CS5 of the Core Strategy, Safeguarded Land is removed from the Green Belt and set aside to be considered for the next Local Plan. The purpose of Safeguarded Land is to ensure that having reviewed the Green Belt boundary as part of

this Local Plan we do not have to do so again before the end of the Plan period or immediately after. During this plan period (2013-2028) the land set aside as Safeguarded Land is not allocated for development nor will it be released.

The IIA therefore reached the following conclusion:

Stage 1 Exclusion or taken to Sustainability Appraisal stage?	Taken to next stage	
Sustainability Appraisal Socio-Economic Score	Red	Sustainability Appraisal Environment Score
	Red	Red

The site boundary assessed in the IIA is shown below:

Figure 3.3: IIA Site Boundary LDF0298



Factors to consider on this site are therefore potential surface water drainage, accessibility, sewerage capacity and its location in the Green Belt.

The Consultation Site only partially covers the boundary of the site covered in the IIA (less than 50%).

4. Further Justification for Allocation

4.1 Introduction

The justification set out below for each site updates the conclusions from the Integrated Impact Assessment 2016 and sets out the reasoning for now putting sites forward for allocation, taking into account the consideration of other alternatives.

4.2 Land between Pontefract Road and Barnsley Road (LDF0263)

This site is an agricultural field currently allocated as Urban Greenspace in the Unitary Development Plan. The Publication Sites and Policies document proposed that it remain as Green Space.

The IIA identified that the site was proposed to be retained as Green Space, as it meets a recognised need or serves an important amenity or townscape function (SD08B; section 4.6 Wath-upon-Deerne, Brampton Bierlow and West Melton, table 4.22). The Green Space Assessment (February 2017; RMBC062A-F) noted that it forms part of an attractive area of open space, a break, within the built form and functions as a green lung/ green wedge between Brampton and West Melton.

The site has been assessed for potential residential development; however at the time of Publication of the Sites and Policies document the Council considered that it had selected the best performing sites when assessed against the Sustainability Appraisal criteria and based on current knowledge of constraints, the housing target for Wath-upon-Deerne, Brampton Bierlow and West Melton had been met.

Notwithstanding this, the Council noted in its examination hearing statement (M22.01) that if further sites were required in the Borough to meet any deficit in supply, then it would support the allocation of this site for residential development. The Council considers that it is a good performing site as it is in close proximity to the built settlement; it is within a popular residential area and it not being Green Belt nor in recreational use. It is in Flood Zone 1.

In reconsidering the site, the Council recognises that it does not perform a typical recreational Green Space function but is farmed agricultural land. Whilst it forms an area of open land that separates the communities of West Melton and Brampton Bierlow and it has acted as a visual amenity for local communities, when assessed against alternative site options, including the release of further Green Belt sites, the Council does not consider that its current Green Space allocation should prevent development of the site. A substantial area of land to the south west of the site, which lies between Brampton and West Melton, would remain allocated as Green Space.

Given the shortfall in housing land for this area it is essential that the most sustainable sites are selected to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy and the Council considers that this site is an appropriate site to meet the needs of this community in the west of the area.

4.3 Land off Far Field Lane (part of LDF0298, and LDF0297 subsumed within new site, reference: LDF0849)

LDF0298 is currently allocated as Green Belt in the Unitary Development Plan. The Publication Sites and Policies document proposed its removal from the Green Belt and identification as Safeguarded Land which could be considered for possible allocation following any future review of the Local Plan. The site has therefore been previously assessed for potential residential development; however in the Sites and Policies Document the Council selected the best performing sites when assessed against the Sustainability Appraisal criteria and based on current knowledge of constraints. At the time of Publication of the Sites and Policies document in 2015, the Council considered that the housing target for Wath-upon-Deerne, Brampton Bierlow and West Melton had been met.

Notwithstanding this, the Council noted in its examination hearing statement (M22.01) that if further sites were required, then it would support the allocation of this site for residential development. The Council considers that

the site is a good performing site under the Integrated Impact Assessment / Sustainability Appraisal, given its proximity to the built settlement and existing services of Wath-upon-Deerne, and being located in a popular residential area. It is in Flood Zone 1. It is now proposed that the northern part of this site is allocated as a residential development site, with the exception of the allotment gardens which would be allocated as Green Space. The remainder of SG5 (LDF0298) to the south would remain as Safeguarded Land.

The Detailed Green Belt Review 2016 (EB49B) noted that the majority of the site's boundaries follow strong physical boundaries. The south eastern corner is the least well defined although hedgerows provide some definition. The site's boundaries could therefore form a reasonably strong new Green Belt boundary. In view of this the Council considers that the northern part of site SG5 should be allocated for residential development and that the site proposed follows sensible field boundaries, for the most part, to create a logical development site extension to existing development within the locality.

An area of allotment gardens to the west of LDF0849 is proposed to be allocated as Green Space. This recognises the important role allotments play in meeting health and well-being aspirations and reflects the approach adopted for such uses in other parts of the borough. Further evidence is provided in the Green Space Assessment (February 2017; RMBC062A-F).

The residential allocation would also include an area of land (LDF0297) to the north fronting on to Doncaster Road. This site is currently allocated as Green Belt. The Publication Sites and Policies document proposed that it remain as Green Belt due to the site's need as greenspace / recreation, acknowledging that the site is identified as allotment land (IIA submission part 2 (SD08B; section 4.6 Wath-upon-Deerne, Brampton and West Melton, table 4.22).

However, this land is not currently in use as allotments, and consists of unmaintained grass land and trees. The earlier assessment also recognised that access may be required from Doncaster Road to land to the south and could possibly include a small portion of this site, entering from Farfield Lane into site SG5. This reflects the transportation assessment of LDF0298 that there is currently no suitable means of vehicular access available.

The Council now considers that this allotment land to the north is required to ensure that appropriate access can be achieved to the proposed housing site and to promote an attractive entrance into the site ensuring delivery on site in the longer term. This is considered to outweigh the need to retain the site as Green Belt or for potential allotment use. In calculating the residential capacity of the proposed housing site the Council has excluded 0.9 hectares to allow for the potential replacement of allotment land elsewhere within the site and the continuing provision of allotment gardens within the locality.

It should be possible to resolve any water sewerage capacity and any drainage issues through working with Yorkshire Water and RMBC as the Lead Local Flood Risk Authority (LLFA).

In terms of biodiversity, a Phase 1 habitat survey would need to be conducted and submitted to the Council's ecologist as part of any future planning application. The new site development guidelines for this site note:

A Phase 1 habitat survey should be conducted and the presence of protected species (specifically foraging bats and badgers) should be checked.

If the Phase 1 habitat survey identified that protected species could be present, further detailed species specific surveys would be necessary to establish if a scheme of ecological mitigation is required.

Given the shortfall in housing land for this area it is essential that the most sustainable sites are selected to meet the requirements of the Core Strategy. The Council considers that the proposed housing site is appropriate to meet the needs of the community in the east of Wath-upon-Deerne, and mainly uses land already proposed to be removed from the Green Belt in the Sites and Policies Document. The Inspector in his letter regarding proposed Main Modifications (ID24) did not propose any changes to this Safeguarded Land site, and as such appears to consider its removal from the Green Belt as sound. Only a small proportion of this additional residential site was proposed to be retained as Green Belt in the Publication Sites and Policies document.

4.4 Alternative Sites Considered But Not Taken Forward

A number of alternative sites are not being actively promoted through the Sites and Policies document examination process. The Council has taken the view that this reflects a lack of landowner or developer interest in bringing the sites forward. No additional consideration of these sites has been undertaken, and the conclusions for these sites remain as set out in the Integrated Impact Assessment.

A number of sites have continued to be promoted by other parties as part of the examination (referred to as 'omission sites'). Reference to Table 4, in the Additional Housing Sites Consultation Document July 2017, that this justification accompanies, summarises why the alternative areas of Safeguarded Land and promoted sites have not been taken forward. The conclusions for these sites also remain as set out in the Sustainability Appraisal Statement.

The Council concludes that the alternative site options:

- Broadly have more site development constraints, or constraints which would require more extensive or complex mitigation, or constraints which may mean that development cannot be achieved, than the proposed additional site allocations and discussed above.
- Consist in many cases of smaller sites and that to utilise these sites would require a larger number of sites to be released from the Green Belt. The Council's Detailed Green Belt Review (2016) (EB49B) notes the difficulties of achieving appropriately strong boundaries in relation to a number of these smaller sites;

As such the Council considers that on balance the proposed additional housing site allocations are the most appropriate to meet the identified housing supply deficit in this settlement grouping.

5. Conclusion

Core Strategy Policy CS 3 Location of New Development sets out the criteria to be used when allocating sites for development. The Council considers that the proposed additional housing sites perform acceptably against these criteria and there is no indication that the sites should not be identified for development. As such the Council considers that on balance the proposed additional housing site allocations are the most appropriate to meet the identified housing supply deficit in this settlement grouping. They minimise the additional land which would be removed from the Green Belt, bring forward land which was previously proposed as Safeguarded Land, and include land originally proposed to be retained as Green Space. Re-assessment indicates that allocating these sites for residential use to meet the current housing supply deficit outweighs the need to retain them for their original proposed allocations.

Appendix A. Extracts from Submission IIA Methodology (Part2 - SA0008B)

Appendix 2-C : Site Selection Methodology

2-C.1 Overview

Stage 1 represents an initial sieving exercise. The objective is to filter out at an early stage all those sites that have a significant overriding constraint(s) to development or are already developed. It also enables the defining of the “reasonable alternatives” in order to meet a requirement of the SEA Regulations. Any constraints are so significant that development is highly unlikely to be appropriate. The constraints relate to whether or not the site broadly conforms to the Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy settlement hierarchy and a number of key environmental and heritage considerations.

Stage 2 considers the remaining sites and looks at more detailed site specific considerations and constraints. The aim of Stage 2 is to assess all sites that are deemed suitable under Stage 1 against a number of detailed site-specific sustainability factors and potential constraints to development, and by doing this, to comply with SA / SEA requirements. These relate to a variety of social, economic and environmental issues which conform to the statutorily agreed SA Framework¹⁷. A simple Red / Amber / Green assessment for each of the criteria will be used.

It should be noted that SA is not a decision-making tool, but rather SA *informs* decision-making. While the SA Objectives must be taken into account, planning considerations will influence decisions. Red / Amber / Green SA overall ‘scores’, one covering socio-economic considerations and one covering environmental considerations, will be given to each site and considered as part of the Stage 3 site prioritisation.

Stage 3 aims to prioritise all the sites that have progressed through from stage 1 and gone through the SA process. This will enable sites to be compared against each other and will prioritise those sites that are the most sustainable for development and best meet the priorities as per the Core Strategy. This stage will look at Green Belt / non Green Belt, type of urban extension to settlements, deliverability and other known physical constraints, including the proposed HS2 route. The SA cumulative effects of development will also be considered / scored here.

It should be noted firstly that some of the poorest-performing sites at Stage 2 show a number of potential adverse effects as a result of their large size – i.e. larger sites are likely to encompass more environmental constraints. Secondly, even some poorly performing sites may still need to be chosen to be allocated at the Stage 3 site prioritisation assessment if there are insufficient other sites available to meet the development needs for each settlement grouping identified within the Core Strategy. This process must be clearly and carefully recorded and an explanation given for the reason for allocation / non-allocation of each site.

2-C.4 Stage 2 – Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Detailed Site Considerations / Constraints

Stage 2 will be structured in accordance with our statutorily agreed Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Framework. This is made up of SA Topics and Objectives covering environmental, social and economic issues. We will frame our criteria under the SA Topics. The criteria mainly focus on constraints, which is a proportionate level of assessment at this stage.

A simple Red / Amber / Green assessment for most of these criteria will be used. The purpose of this scoring will be not only to compare sites, but also to report on their “likely significant effects” in order to comply with the SEA Regulations. A site with a high number of ‘red’ assessments (i.e. many risks of major negative effects) is unlikely to be suitable for allocation as a development site unless a shortage of more suitable sites results in insufficient allocations to reach the Core Strategy settlement target. The assessments may not capture all constraints, but any additional known constraints on particular sites can be included within the overall site assessment at Stage 3. Additional refinement and further investigations can also be carried out at the prioritisation stage if required.

Red = potentially significant constraint and/or significant negative impact on the achievement of an SA Objective

Amber = some potential constraint and/or negative impact on the achievement of an SA Objective

Green = no known constraint and/or little negative impact on the achievement of an SA Objective

SA Topic 1: Population and Equality	Combined consideration due to overlaps in available and usable data.
SA Topic 2: Health and Well-Being	
SA Topic 3: Accessibility / Community Facilities	
SA Topic 4: Education / Skills	

2-C.4.1 Results of Stage 2

All sites are carried forward to the Stage 3 prioritisation stage and they are given an overall SA rating – one for socio-economic constraints/concerns and one for environmental constraints / concerns. There may be sites which have just one particular constraint which cannot be overcome / mitigated against and therefore renders the site totally unsuitable for development. Similarly a site may have several constraints but they may be more minor in nature and more easily be addressed with mitigation measures. However, as a general rule, sites with a lower number of ‘Red’ assessment scores will be more likely to be given a more favourable overall assessment.

Note: SA / SEA requirements are met through the consideration of the various sustainability criteria and scoring applied, but it is not required that the “most sustainable” sites are inevitably selected. In particular, policy or other (e.g. community) considerations during Stage 3 can lead to the selection of sites which do not perform as well as others under the SA Topics / Framework. However, it is

required that the SA Report explains how environmental considerations were taken into account when making these decisions.

There are certain unknown scores at Stage 2. For example, information on protected species, highways access issues, and water / sewerage capacity was not available for every site. Proxy information from adjoining sites has been used where possible, but where not possible, no rating has been provided. At present, these gaps in information are not thought to be significant to decision-making. Consultation on the previous iterations of the Sites and Policies document and IIA has helped to determine whether these gaps are material.

2-C.5 Stage 3 –Site Prioritisation

A. SA Socio-economic:

- Overall sustainability assessment for socio-economic constraints / measures, including access to services, access to greenspace, school capacity deficit, access to employment, water / sewage infrastructure capacity, highways access and public transport accessibility. Any red constraint under highways access or water / sewage infrastructure at Stage 2 = Red. Any other constraint under the socio-economic factors from Stage 2 = Amber. Otherwise = Green.

Distance to leisure facilities has not been considered a material constraint at this stage.

B. SA Environmental:

- Overall sustainability assessment for environmental constraints / measures, including biodiversity, AQMAs, proximity to a water body, groundwater sources, Grade 2 agricultural land, geodiversity designations, flood risk, landscape and townscape and the historic environment. Any red constraint under these factors from Stage 2 = Amber. Otherwise = Green.

Coal mining referral area / mineral safeguarding areas and access to recycling centres have not been taken forward to Stage 3. This is because it is difficult to differentiate between sites, as the scores for these indicators are similar throughout the borough. Brownfield land has also not been taken forward, given that the Council is attempting to use all brownfield land in any event.

C. Green Belt:

- The Core Strategy has highlighted the shortage of suitable development sites available to meet the identified need and therefore some sites will be required to be allocated that are within the current Green Belt boundary. However, the number of sites to be taken out of the Green Belt are to be kept to a minimum. Green Belt Site = Red, Part Green Belt Site = Amber, Non-Green Belt Site = Green.

D. Urban Extensions:

- As per Stage 1 any sites not falling within or close to defined settlements will already have been discounted. Urban extensions will be assessed based on type – i.e. edge of settlement which would extend the built up area further into the countryside = Red, edge of settlement but contained within the existing confines = Amber, within the existing built up area = Green.

E. Deliverability:

- Any site proposed for development must be genuinely available and likely to be developed during the plan period and the NPPF requires that the council should maintain at least a five year supply of developable housing land. Sites are therefore more likely to be preferred if they are expected to be deliverable within a relatively short timescale. Sites which have some significant constraint(s) but which can potentially contribute before the end of the plan period (and in the following years) = Red, sites which may have some constraints in the shorter term but likely to be available within first 10 years = Amber, sites available immediately or within first 5 years of the plan period = Green.

F. Green Infrastructure Corridors

- Many of the Green Infrastructure assets that contribute to Rotherham's Green Infrastructure network will have been considered in Stage 2 when looking at detailed site constraints. However, to further consider the potential cumulative impact of development on Strategic and Local Green Infrastructure Corridors any sites falling within these will be given an Amber assessment.

G. HS2 Rail Route

- The recent announcement of the go ahead of the high speed rail link shows the proposed route and an associated 200m buffer. Although the final route remains subject to further consultation any site that falls within the 200m buffer is given a Red assessment.

H. SA Cumulative Effects

- The SA must consider the potential for cumulative effects (or combined effects) from different combinations of sites. These may lead to the need to consider different groupings of sites as alternatives, and this may include sites previously discarded. Red = SA identifies major adverse cumulative effect(s) in combination with other sites. Amber = SA identifies adverse cumulative effect(s) in combination with other sites which can be reduced or overcome with mitigation. Green = SA does not identify any change to the original SA of this site.

2-C.5.1 Final Results:

The best performing sites when measured against these criteria and based on current knowledge of constraints will be recommended for allocation for future development, subject to reaching the targets set out for each settlement grouping within the Core Strategy. The number of new housing allocations will depend upon the number of homes proposed for the settlement and the number of homes that already have an outstanding planning permission. Some otherwise suitable sites may therefore be discounted at this stage if a sufficient number of outstanding permissions already exist (with additional to allow for choice). However, consideration will also need to be given to allocation of some sites as safeguarded land to meet identified needs for 5 years beyond the end of the plan period (Policy CS5).

New or further evidence on constraints and possible mitigation could alter the scoring / outcome in the future.

For those sites that are being proposed to be taken out of the Green Belt a further consideration will be undertaken in respect of the four Green Belt purposes. A site which falls within a parcel of land that scored 'Red' against either (or both) purposes 1 and 3 or purposes 2 and 4 in the Strategic Green Belt Review will be subject to a detailed assessment of that site using the criteria used in the Strategic Green Belt Assessment. This can then be used as part of the overall site assessment and in comparing potential Green Belt sites, but should not override broader sustainability considerations.

STAGE 1

AUTOMATIC SITE EXCLUSION

Discount sites which are:

- A. Already fully developed or unavailable within Plan period
- B. Not in conformity with the Local Plan Core Strategy settlement hierarchy
- C. Falls within or very close to a biodiversity international or national designation; or

Falls within a functional floodplain;

Significantly impacts on a nationally important archaeology site; or

Given consideration of any unoccupied site within an existing Air Quality Management Area and the relevant air quality objectives.

Sites Removed From the Plan or Taken Forward for Consideration in Stage 2



STAGE 2

SA AND SITE CONSIDERATIONS / CONSTRAINTS

Red / Amber / Green assessment scores:

- A. Proximity to services
- B. Greenspace
- C. Other Leisure
- D. School Capacity
- E. Access to PRow Network
- F. National Cycle Network or
- G. Access to Employment
- H. Infrastructure (Non-Transport)
- I. Highways / Site Accessibility
- J. Transport / Accessibility:
- K. Biodiversity
- L. Air Quality
- M. Potential to Modify a Water Body
- N. Groundwater Sources
- O. Soil
- P. Geodiversity
- Q. Flood Risk
- R. Waste
- S. Minerals
- T. General Landscape
- U. Designated Landscapes
- V. Townscape
- W. Historic and Built Environment

All sites taken to Stage 3



STAGE 3

SITE PRIORITISATION

Red / Amber / Green assessment scores:

- A. SA overall socio-economic
- B. SA overall environmental
- C. Green Belt
- D. Urban Extensions
- E. Deliverability
- F. Green Infrastructure Corridors
- G. HS2 Rail Route
- H. SA Cumulative Effects

where everyone matters



Result

List of the sites the Council considers the most suitable to allocate for housing and employment land development, sufficient to meet Core Strategy targets for each settlement grouping

Appendix B. IIA Stage 2 Site Assessments – Wath-upon-Dearne, Brampton Bierlow, West Melton Sites

Appendix C. IIA Stage 3 Site Assessments, Wath-upon-Dearne, Brampton Bierlow, West Melton (to show all alternative sites considered)

2-E.3 Results of Stage 3 – Site Prioritisation

The table within this appendix presents the assessment scores for each site used in order to select the preferred allocations and safeguarded land. This formed Stage 3 of the Site Selection Methodology (see Section 2 and Appendix G for more information).

Stage 3 has resulted in the overall 'planning view' of the strengths and weaknesses of each site. A decision has then been made as to whether a site is:

- Allocated – Residential;
- Allocated – Employment;
- Allocated – Retail;
- Allocated – Gypsy & Traveller site;
- Safeguarded (Res) – “Res.” for Residential;
- Safeguarded (Emp) – “Emp.” for Employment;
- “No” – not allocated (current use retained); or
- “No” – designate as green space.

“No” means that a site is not a development site for this Sites and Policies document. This does not preclude a site from being considered as a windfall site in the future, except where a site is Green Belt or has, or is to have, a designation (e.g. green space). New proposed designations are noted in the tables that follow. Furthermore, this exercise does not preclude a site from more minor changes in usage, such as for mixed use sites, as these would be reviewed as part of future policy mechanisms.

A Red / Amber / Green assessment for most of these criteria was applied. The colour coding represented the following categories:

- Red = potentially significant constraint and/or significant negative impact on the achievement of an SA Objective;
- Amber = some potential constraint and/or negative impact on the achievement of an SA Objective; and
- Green = no known constraint and/or little negative impact on the achievement of an SA Objective.

Ref:	Site Name	A. SA Score: Socio-Economic	B. SA Score: Environmental	C. Green Belt	D. Urban Extensions	E. Deliverability (Housing)	F. Green Infrastructure Corridors	G. HS2 Rail Route	H. SA Cumulative Effects	Comment on Cum. Effect	Allocation
BRAMLEY, WICKERSLEY AND RAVENFIELD COMMON											
LDF0694	LAND EAST OF BRAMLEY GRANGE FARM,	Red	Red	Red	Red	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0696	LAND WEST OF SLACKS LANE, BRAMLEY	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0697	LAND BETWEEN SLACKS LANE AND M18, BRAMLEY	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0710	LAND AT WOODSIDE BUNGALOW, SECOND LANE, WICKERSLEY	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0716	MOORHEAD WAY (2)	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0737	LAND OFF FAIRWAYS	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Residential Development Site
LDF0738	LAND OFF SECOND LANE	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0740	LAND OFF SANDY FLAT LANE	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0774	LAND EAST OF MOOR LANE SOUTH	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Residential Development Site
LDF0784	LAND OFF MOOR LANE NORTH	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0798	LAND EAST OF MOOR LANE SOUTH, NORTH OF LIDGET LANE (2) - formerly part of LDF0452	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Safeguarded land for residential
LDF0809	RUBY COOK RECREATION GROUND	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	White	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0832	LAND ADJ KING HENRY PUBLIC HOUSE	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	White	Yellow	Green	N/A		Retail Development Site
WATH-UPON-DEARNE, BRAMPTON AND WEST MELTON											
LDF0258	LAND TO THE EAST OF CORTON WOOD BUSINESS PARK	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	N/A		Residential Development Site
LDF0259	ADJOINING 211 MELTON, HIGH STREET	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0260	LAND TO THE WEST OF PONTEFRACT ROAD	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0261	OFF FLATT'S LANE AND BROOME DRIVE	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0262	LAND TO THE EAST OF PONTEFRACT ROAD	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	White	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0263	LAND BETWEEN PONTEFRACT ROAD AND BARNSLEY ROAD	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0265	LAND TO THE NORTH WEST OF THE BRAMPTON CENTRE	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0267	LAND TO THE NORTH OF WESTFIELD ROAD	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Residential Development Site
LDF0268	OFF ORCHARD PLACE	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Residential Development Site
LDF0270	LAND TO THE EAST OF WESTFIELD ROAD	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Safeguarded land for residential
LDF0274	PONY PADDOCK TO THE EAST OF WESTFIELD ROAD	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0275	OFF WEST STREET/ BISCAY LANE	Red	Red	Green	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.

Ref:	Site Name	A. SA Score: Socio-Economic	B. SA Score: Environmental	C. Green Belt	D. Urban Extensions	E. Deliverability (Housing)	F. Green Infrastructure Corridors	G. HS2 Rail Route	H. SA Cumulative Effects	Comment on Cum. Effect	Allocation
WATH-UPON-DEARNE, BRAMPTON AND WEST MELTON											
LDF0279	EAST OF STATION ROAD	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0280	CADMAN STREET	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0282	FIRE STATION KNOLLBECK LANE	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0288	LAND TO THE NORTH OF ELSECAR ROAD	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Safeguarded land for residential
LDF0292	HIGHFIELD FARM	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Residential Development Site
LDF0297	DONCASTER ROAD/ FARFIELD LANE	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0298	LAND OFF FARFIELD LANE	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Safeguarded land for residential
LDF0299	R/O 35 - 133 OAK ROAD	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Red	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0307	QUARRY HILL ROAD/ GYPSEY GREEN LANE	Red	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0308	MANVERS WAY/ STATION ROAD	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	White	Yellow	Green	N/A		Employment Development Site
LDF0309	STATION ROAD	Red	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0321	LAND OFF KNOLL BECK LANE	Red	Red	Green	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0322	LAND ADJOINING "THE FIELDS" WESTFIELD ROAD	Red	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0324	BRAMPTON CENTRE	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Residential Development Site
LDF0325	LAND R/O 2 TO 30 FLATTS LANE	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0335	LAND OFF DENMAN ROAD	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Residential Development Site
LDF0336	LAND OFF MATTHEWS AVENUE/ BUSHFIELD ROAD	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	White	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0337	LAND OFF NEWHILL ROAD	Red	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0338	BISCAY LANE	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	Red	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0339	WEST STREET/ WHITWORTH WAY	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0342	STATION ROAD	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow	White	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0343	OFF STATION ROAD	Red	Red	Green	Green	White	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0344	MANVERS WAY/ BROOKFIELDS WAY	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	White	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0345	BROOKFIELD WAY	Yellow	Red	Green	Yellow	White	Yellow	Green	N/A		Employment Development Site
LDF0346	DONCASTER ROAD / EAST OF FARFIELD LANE	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0347	MANVERS WAY (EXPRESS PARKS)	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	N/A		Residential Development Site

Ref:	Site Name	A. SA Score: Socio-Economic	B. SA Score: Environmental	C. Green Belt	D. Urban Extensions	E. Deliverability (Housing)	F. Green Infrastructure Corridors	G. HS2 Rail Route	H. SA Cumulative Effects	Comment on Cum. Effect	Allocation
WATH-UPON-DEARNE, BRAMPTON AND WEST MELTON											
LDF0348	MANVERS WAY/ DEARNE LANE	Yellow	Green	Yellow	White	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Employment Development Site
LDF0351	MANVERS WAY	Yellow	Green	Yellow	White	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Employment Development Site
LDF0354	HIGH STREET	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	Red	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0431	SITE OFF BOLTON ROAD	Red	Green	Green	Yellow	White	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0555	LAND OFF DAWSON LANE	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0556	LAND OFF QUARRY HILL ROAD	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0604	WATH WEST INDUSTRIAL ESTATE OFF DERWENT WAY	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	White	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0605	BOLTON ROAD, MANVERS	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	White	Yellow	Green	N/A		Employment Development Site
LDF0606	CORTONWOOD BUSINESS PARK	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	White	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0711	BESSACARR SERVICE CENTRE, DERWENT WAY, BRAMPTON BIERLOW	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	White	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0732	LAND OFF BATTISON LANE (1)	Red	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0733	LAND TO THE SOUTH OF QUARRY HILL ROAD (OFF DAWSONS LANE)	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0734	LAND OFF WATH WOOD BOTTOM (1)	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0735	LAND OFF WATH WOOD BOTTOM (2)	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0736	LAND OFF GIPSY GREEN LANE	Red	Red	Red	Red	Red	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0744	FOORBALL GROUND, MANVERS FITZWILLIAM FIELDS	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	White	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0751	LAND OFF BARNSELY ROAD	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0771	LAND NORTH OF STUMP CROSS ROAD, WATH	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	N/A		Residential Development Site
LDF0810	SOUTH OF DONCASTER ROAD, WEST OF CALLFLEX	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	White	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0812	LAND TO NORTH OF ELSECAR ROAD	Yellow	Yellow	Red	Yellow	White	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.
LDF0819	LAND TO SOUTH OF DONCASTER ROAD	Yellow	Red	Red	Yellow	White	Green	Green	N/A		Not allocated.

Appendix C. HRA Screening Letter.

E:mail: helen.sleigh@rotherham.gov.uk
E-mail the Council for free from your local library

Our Ref. Your Ref. Please ask for:
Helen Sleigh

8 January 2018

Natural England Consultation Service
Hornbeam House, Electra Way
Crewe Business Park,
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

Dear Sir, Madam

Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Determination for the Main Modifications to the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies 2018

We have consulted with you previously (June 2013, October 2014 and September 2015) on the screening determination as to whether Appropriate Assessment is required as part of the Rotherham Local Plan Sites and Policies document. Following the ongoing examination of the Sites and Policies document by an independently appointed Planning Inspector, Main Modifications have been prepared to the submitted Sites and Policies Document (2015) to ensure the soundness of the Plan. The Main Modifications are to be consulted upon between 8 January and 19 February 2018.

In response to earlier statutory consultations, the information presented under cover of this letter is submitted to Natural England for a screening determination as to whether Appropriate Assessment is required of the Main Modifications to the submission Sites and Policies document.

The main amendments to the September 2015 (as dated) screening determination involve the removal and addition of some allocations from the assessment. The policies relevant to the HRA screening have not changed significantly since the September 2015 screening determination, and the Main Modifications are proposed to ensure the soundness of the Local Plan, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Rotherham's Sites and Policies document is one of several local development documents which make up the Local Plan. The Sites and Policies document sets out Rotherham's proposed residential and employment allocations and proposed safeguarded land over the next 15 years. It also sets out a number of detailed development management policies

which will supplement the strategic policies of the Core Strategy, guide the determination of individual planning applications and facilitate implementation of site allocations.

Evidence of the need, or otherwise, for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA, also sometimes referred to as ‘Appropriate Assessment’) is a requirement when submitting a local development document under Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. This must, as a minimum, include the ‘screening’ stage of HRA. This stage determines whether or not a plan or programme present the potential to significantly affect a ‘Natura 2000’ European nature conservation site, as previously required by Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended) and superseded by Regulation 63 of the 2017 (No.1012) ‘Wildlife Countryside | The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations’ on 30/11/2017.

At each earlier stage of Local Plan preparation, Natural England determined that the Sites and Policies Local Plan was ‘screened out’ of HRA.

European Nature Conservations Sites

The table below sets out the reasons for designation for the Natura 2000 sites (Special Protection Areas – SPAs – and Special Areas of Conservation - SACs) of potential relevance to the Local Plan, including Sites and Policies document. This includes all sites within 20 km of Rotherham Borough, as previously requested by Natural England. (Note: no Ramsar sites have been identified as being relevant.) During the screening exercise, it has not been considered necessary to expand this search area. Information for each site has been obtained from the Joint Nature Conservation Committee website.

Table 1: Natura 2000 Sites in HRA Study Area (20 km from RMBC boundary)

Type	Name	Site Centre Location	Site Area (ha)	Direction from Rotherham Boundary	Shortest Distance from Rotherham	Qualifying Features
SPA	Thorne and Hatfield Moors	53 38 16N 00 53 53 W	2,449.00	E	19.5 km	Annex 1 birds Article 4.1 • <i>Caprimulgus europaeus</i>
SPA	Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1)	54 39 24 N 02 14 49 W	147,246.4 0	NW/SW/W	12.5 km	Annex 1 birds Article 4.1 • <i>Circus cyaneus</i> • <i>Falco columbarius</i> - • <i>Falco peregrinus</i> • <i>Pluvialis apricaria</i> (North-Western Europe – breeding)

SAC	South Pennine Moors	53 27 37 N 01 46 59 W	64,983.00	NW/SW/W	12.5 km	Annex 1 habitats 4010: Northern Atlantic wet heaths with <i>Erica tetralix</i> 4030: European dry heaths of the best areas in the UK 7130: Blanket bogs 7140: Transition mires and quaking bogs presence. 91A0: Old sessile oak woods with <i>Ilex</i> and <i>Blechnum</i> in the British Isles
SAC	Denby Grange Colliery Ponds	53 38 01N 01 35 26 W	18.53	NW	18.6 km	Annex 2 species 1166: Great crested newt <i>Triturus cristatus</i>
SAC	Hatfield Moor	53 32 37 N 00 56 38 W	1,363.50	E	19.5 km	Annex 1 habitat 7120: Degraded raised bogs still capable of natural regeneration
SAC	Birklands and Bilhaugh	53 12 17 N 01 04 31 W	271.80	S/SW	13.5 km	Annex 1 habitat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9190: Old acidophilous oak woods with <i>Quercus robur</i> on sandy plains

Objectives of the Sites and Policies Document

The Rotherham Local Plan serves to guide the way in which built development occurs in the borough, with regard to its relationship with communities and the surrounding environment. As part of the Local Plan, the Sites and Policies document aims to achieve the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Core Strategy. These are set out below.

The objectives of the Sites and Policies Document are consistent with the vision and objectives for the Local Plan, as set out in the Core Strategy.

LOCAL PLAN VISION

Rotherham will be prosperous with a vibrant, diverse, innovative and enterprising economy. It will fulfil its role as a key partner in the delivery of the Sheffield City Region recognising the close economic, commercial and housing markets links with Sheffield and our other neighbouring authorities.

Rotherham will provide a high quality of life and aspire to minimise inequalities through the creation of strong, cohesive and sustainable communities. Rotherham will be successful in mitigating and adapting to future changes in climate. It will have a sense of place with the best in architecture, sustainable design and public spaces. Natural and historic assets will be conserved and enhanced. Rotherham will promote biodiversity and a high quality environment where neighbourhoods are safe, clean, green and well maintained, with good quality homes and accessible local facilities, making best use of existing infrastructure, services and facilities. A network of green infrastructure will link

Rotherham's urban areas with the wider countryside, providing access to green spaces and acting as habitat links for wildlife.

The largest proportion of growth will be focused in the Rotherham Urban Area including major new development at Bassingthorpe Farm which is key to delivering growth in the heart of Rotherham. Regeneration of Rotherham town centre will enable it to fulfil its role as the borough's primary retail, leisure and service centre. Considerable development will take place on the edge of the urban area at Waverley, with the development of a new community and consolidation of the Advanced Manufacturing Park. Significant development will also take place in Principal Settlements for Growth: in the north around Wath, Brampton and West Melton, on the fringe of Rotherham Urban Area at Wickersley, Bramley and Ravenfield Common, and in the south-east at Dinnington, Anston and Laughton Common. New development will also take place in the borough's principal settlements and local service centres. Throughout Rotherham development will aim to create self-contained communities which support a network of retail and service centres, where the need to travel is reduced and communities enjoy good access to green spaces and the wider open countryside.

LOCAL PLAN OBJECTIVES

Delivering development in sustainable locations

Objective 1: Scale of future growth

By the end of the plan period, sufficient new homes and employment opportunities and a choice of development sites will have been provided to meet objectively assessed development needs.

Objective 2: Green Belt

In implementing the plan's spatial strategy over the plan period, the wider aims of national Green Belt policy will have been safeguarded while a borough-wide review will have informed the release of Green Belt land in the most sustainable locations for growth to meet future needs.

Objective 3: Sustainable locations

By the end of the plan period, the majority of new development will have been located in or on the edge of sustainable urban locations, close to transport interchanges and within transport corridors. Wherever viable and sustainable, previously developed land will have been used first. Car dependency and the need to travel will have been reduced by the promotion of higher housing densities and mixed use developments in appropriate locations, travel planning and public transport improvements.

Creating mixed and attractive places to live

Objective 4: Provision for housing

By the end of the plan period, implementation of the plan's policies will have helped improve quality and amount of housing available in all areas of Rotherham. Development of new housing will have improved choice of type, tenure and affordability, including provision for gypsies and travellers. Any established need for affordable housing in specific rural communities will have been met.

Supporting a dynamic economy

Objective 5: Retail and service centres

By the end of the plan period, the plan's "town centre first" approach to development decisions will have improved the economic viability and vibrancy of Rotherham Town Centre as the borough's principal location for business, commerce, culture, leisure, town centre uses and civic activities. The plan will have supported the aim of providing a community stadium as close to Rotherham town centre as possible. The implementation of a retail and settlement hierarchy will have steered new development to appropriate centres to sustain and, where appropriate, extend retail, leisure, employment and community services. Smaller local centres will have been sustained to continue provision for local daily needs.

Objective 6: Provision for employment

By the end of the plan period, the borough's economy will be more modern, diverse and enterprising and will have moved closer to a low-carbon economy. Implementation of the plan's policies will have helped provide a wide range of accessible job opportunities in the borough. The regeneration and improvement of existing employment sites will have been complemented by the creation of local and rural employment opportunities.

Movement and accessibility

Objective 7: Local transport connections

By the end of the plan period, the proportion of trips made by walking and cycling will have increased. Public transport interchanges and bus services between local communities will have been improved. Implementation of the plan's policies will have helped to secure improved information technology networks to enable increased "teleworking", along with the development of live/work housing and mixed use schemes in appropriate locations.

Managing the natural and historic environment

Objective 8: Landscape, historic environment and settlement identity

Implementation of the plan's policies over the plan period will have helped promote the continuing management, protection and enhancement of the borough's distinctive historical features and landscape character. While allowing for growth of certain settlements to implement the plan's spatial strategy, wherever possible, the identity and setting of individual settlements will have been maintained and enhanced.

Objective 9: Greenspaces, sport and recreation

By the end of the plan period, the borough's network of green infrastructure will have been identified, conserved and enhanced. Implementation of the plan's policies will have protected and enhanced the borough's network of accessible sport and recreation facilities and helped improve the health of Rotherham's population.

Objective 10: Biodiversity / geodiversity

By the end of the plan period, the borough's significant biodiversity and geodiversity sites will have been identified, designated, conserved, managed and enhanced. Opportunities for expanding, linking and creating significant sites will have been identified and delivered. The geodiversity, habitats, and greenspace eco-systems of the wider

environment will have been conserved, enhanced and managed by implementation of the plan's policies. The borough's best and most versatile agricultural land will have been protected, wherever possible, to promote local food production.

Objective 11: Minerals

By the end of the plan period, the borough's mineral reserves will have been identified and managed to provide for the needs of the construction industry and to meet Rotherham's contribution towards the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs. In tandem with this, the use of recycled and secondary sources, sustainable site waste management practice and the use of sustainable building materials will have been increased by implementation of the plan's policies. Sources of local building materials will have been safeguarded for conservation of the borough's built heritage.

Objective 12: Managing the water environment

By the end of the plan period, implementation of the plan's policies to regulate development will have conserved, managed and enhanced the borough's water environment and contributed to the wider integrated management of water catchments. The risks of pollution of rivers and water resources, depletion of water supplies, flooding and harm to biodiversity and leisure interests will have been minimised by implementation of the plan's policies.

Objective 13: Carbon reduction and renewable energy

By the end of the plan period, the borough's carbon footprint will have been reduced from current levels. Implementation of the Plan's policies will have secured an increased proportion of energy generation via renewable and low carbon means and will have promoted energy efficiency, energy conservation and the use of sustainable construction techniques.

Creating safe and sustainable communities

Objective 14: Design

By the end of the plan period, new development built to sustainable design standards will have contributed to the creation of safe, accessible, and well managed places, buildings and public spaces. The design of new development will have contributed to and enhanced the distinctive townscape and character of heritage features within communities.

Objective 15: Community well-being

By the end of the plan period, implementation of the plan's policies will have helped to reduce crime levels and minimise the potential results of terrorist activity by improving the design of new development. The potential risk to nearby populations from hazardous installations will have been minimised by the designation and enforcement of appropriate stand-off zones. Decisions on the location and type of development will have helped to reduce pollution levels in the borough's air, land and water and will have taken account of the borough's legacy of former coal mining activity.

Objective 16: Waste management

By the end of the plan period, a strategic waste management facility will have been provided to deal with the borough's forecast needs. Implementation of the plan's policies,

or those of joint plans covering the borough, will have promoted a reduction in waste levels by utilising waste as a raw material for industry and energy production and by encouraging increased recycling rates.

Infrastructure

Objective 17: Infrastructure delivery

By the end of the Plan period, the necessary utility infrastructure to support new development will have been provided in appropriate locations. Local community services will have been provided or existing services enhanced in keeping with the scale of planned new development in each community.

Screening Assessment

Given the distances involved between Rotherham and Natura 2000 sites, the only significant issues relevant to HRA screening are regarding potential cumulative and secondary impacts. Therefore, we have not conducted a policy-by-policy screening exercise of the Main Modifications, but rather considered the Local Plan as a whole (all policies as proposed to be amended, acting together, including the Core Strategy).

The HRA screening of the Core Strategy identified three key aspects of the Local Plan which could potentially lead to effects on Natura 2000 Sites. This assessment is equally relevant to the Sites and Policies document. These aspects have been reviewed and translated for the Sites and Policies document, and are:

1. Proposed Site Allocations / Safeguarded Land: the development of sites can lead to land take / habitat loss, and thus impacts on bird species populations which are functionally linked to the European sites' designated bird populations. Birds in Rotherham may be either over-wintering from European sites, or have population cross-over / inter-breeding with populations within the European sites;
2. Policies SP1(as proposed to be amended by MM2, MM3); SP11 to be deleted by MM12, SP12 (as proposed to be amended by MM13), SP13 (as proposed to be amended by MM14) and SP14 and combined with Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS2 and CS6: growth of housing regionally combined with overall regional population growth can lead to different types of recreational pressure, including dog-walking (which can cause various types of impacts, including bird mortality and nest destruction), off-road cycling and vehicles (which can damage habitats), and other issues;
3. Policies SP1 (as proposed to be amended by MM2, MM3); SP11 to be deleted by MM12; SP12 (as proposed to be amended by MM13); SP13(as proposed to be amended by MM14); SP14, SP15, SP16 ((as proposed to be amended by MM16); and SP17 (as proposed to be amended by MM17) and combined with Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS2, CS6 and CS9: growth of housing and employment land uses leading to increased water abstraction or increased runoff and thereby increased downstream flood risk.

Regarding Issue 1 above, it was considered that the potential for indirect effects on Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC via any potential impact on great crested newt (*Triturus cristatus*) populations within the borough was negligible and thus insignificant,

given the distances involved. In addition, both legislative and policy protections at the project level are considered adequate to avoid a significant effect on great crested newt populations within the borough.

Issues 1, 2 and 3 above have been considered to be adequately mitigated by the policies in both the Sites and Policies document and the Core Strategy. The analysis for the Sites and Policies document which supports this conclusion is set out below.

The potential for significant adverse effects to the integrity or nature conservation objectives of the 'Natura 2000' sites from Policies SP1, SP12, SP13, SP14, SP15, SP16 and SP17 as proposed to be amended through Main Modifications (combined with Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS2 and CS6) is considered to be offset by a number of other Local Plan policies including Core Strategy policies: CS20 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity), CS19 (Green Infrastructure), CS22 (Green Space) and CS24 (Conserving and Enhancing the Water Environment).

In addition policies in the Sites and Policies Local Plan include: SP35/MM25 (Green Infrastructure and Landscape); SP36/MM26 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment); SP37/MM27 (Sites Protected for Nature Conservation); SP38/MM28 (Protected and Priority Species); SP40/MM29 (New and Improvements to Existing Green Space); SP50 (Understanding and Managing Flood Risk and Drainage).

Issue 1: Land Take / Habitat Loss and Impacts on Bird Populations

Table 2 below shows the Natura 2000 sites potentially affected by any indirect impact on relevant bird populations within Rotherham Borough.

Table 2: Sites and Policies document HRA issue No.1 & Natura 2000 site conditions

Natura 2000 Sites	Relevant Condition Needed to Support Site Integrity
Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA	Protection of bird populations. Species with relevant sightings in Rotherham: <i>Caprimulgus europaeus</i> (nightjar) <i>Circus cyaneus</i> (hen harrier) <i>Falco columbarius</i> (merlin) <i>Pluvialis apricaria</i> (golden plover)

Information on bird sighting locations from Rotherham's Biological Records Centre was mapped alongside the proposed residential and employment allocations (August 2014), and proposed safeguarded land. Records date as far back as 1844 and vary in level of detail, and therefore only those which are a relatively reliable representation of the current situation can be used (recognising that the result is still indicative, and subject to annual and seasonal variation). This has been achieved by:

- A. filtering out data older than the past 13 years, while concentrating on data from the past 5 years;
- B. filtering out data with a grid reference of less than 1 km accuracy (i.e. data with 10 km grid square references was not used);
- C. checking references to locations against the grid references; and
- D. filtering out data with no bird count information.

Figure 2-A.12 in Volume 2 of the submitted Integrated Impact Assessment (2015 as dated), presents the mapped data as described above.

While data from the year 2000 onwards was applied, proposed allocations and safeguarded land were checked against pre-2000 data to identify any additional areas of potential interest.

Figure 2-A.12 (Volume 2 of IIA) highlights proposed allocations and safeguarded land which overlap with significant bird sightings. This information has been used to 'audit' the site-by-site assessment conducted as part of the Sustainability Appraisal / Integrated Impact Assessment for HRA considerations. This audit is part of the HRA Screening analysis.

As a result of this analysis, the following species have been found to have no significant links with proposals under the Sites and Policies document (other than the potential for habitat enhancement) due to the insignificant presence of the species in or near allocations:

- *Caprimulgus europaeus* (nightjar);
- *Circus cyaneus* (hen harrier);
- *Falco peregrinus* (peregrine); and
- *Falco columbarius* (merlin).

The earlier analysis showed that there were a number of records of wintering golden plover in or near allocations. The loss of wintering / migrating sites for golden plover could conceivably cause adverse effects on the Peak District Moors SPA (where they are an Annex 1 feature as a breeding population) if there was a functional link between the SPA breeding population and the wintering population in Rotherham. However, as these birds records are some distance from the SPA and separated by extensive urban areas, it is considered that there is no functional link between the allocations used by wintering/migrating golden plovers and the SPA.

Species data received after the last update (August 2014) was screened against a list of those sites affected by Main Modifications and an assessment made of any potential effects on the suite of species concerned, as follows:

Hen Harrier

This species remains an irregular winter visitor to Rotherham area with just two Rotherham records on single dates only in October 2014 & November 2016, both well away from affected allocation sites. Modifications considered to have no impact.

Merlin

An uncommon passage & winter visitor to Rotherham with 13 records from widely spread sites since 2013 and all but three of these in 2014. Modifications considered to have no impact.

Peregrine Falcon

Since the last update at least two pairs of Peregrine have been proven to breed regularly in Rotherham and may have done so for several years. This has consequently led to an increase in records of the species, with these largely concentrated around the vicinity of the breeding sites. In winter, birds range more widely and will frequent an area regularly where prey availability is good and the open farmland in the Anston area has proved attractive in recent years. Modifications considered to have no impact.

Golden Plover

During October - the peak period for locating of wintering flocks of this species - numbers in the Anston area did not exceed 200 and none at all were reported from Cumwell Lane, Todwick or Brampton Commons in any of the winter periods from 2013 onwards. This apparently drastic decline in local wintering flocks may be a consequence of birds being attracted out of the Borough to the wetland complexes of the Dearne valley, where large concentrations have been recorded in recent winters; however, it is also reflected nationally, and evidence suggests that there may have been a shift away from use of inland fields to estuaries. It is also possible that flocks may have moved to tracts of farmland where they can't be seen and reports of sizable flocks over Kiveton Park may indicate the presence of hitherto undetected flocks on farmland further south and west, in the Harthill/Woodall area. Modifications considered to have no impact.

European Nightjar

No additional records have been received since the original assessment was carried out and thus the species continues to be an extremely rare visitor to Rotherham borough. Modifications considered to have no impact.

It is concluded therefore that there is no functional link between the allocations used by wintering/migrating by all the species mentioned above and the SPAs.

Issue 2: Regional Recreational Pressure

Table 3 below shows the Natura 2000 sites potentially affected by any indirect impact on habitats via recreational pressure generated by growth of housing in Rotherham Borough.

Table 3: Sites and Policies document HRA issue No.2 & Natura 2000 site conditions

Natura 2000 Sites	Relevant Condition Needed to Support Site Integrity
Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA Peak District Moors (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) SPA South Pennine Moors SAC Denby Grange Colliery Ponds SAC Hatfield Moor SAC Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC	Maintenance of habitats, minimal and well managed recreational pressure

The potential for significant adverse effects to the integrity or nature conservation objectives of the Natura 2000 sites above from Policies SP1, SP12, SP13, SP14, sP15, SP16 and SP17 as proposed to be amended through Main Modifications (combined with Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS2 and CS6) is considered to be offset by a number of other Local Plan policies. The recreational demand generated will be directed towards provision of green infrastructure and green space within the borough. Towards this aim, the Council requires:

- SP35: Green Infrastructure and Landscape as proposed to be amended by MM25

“The Council will require proposals for all new development to support the protection, enhancement, creation and management of multi-functional green infrastructure assets and networks including landscape, proportionate to the scale and impact of the development and to meeting needs of future occupants and users.

SP40: New and Improvements to Existing Green Space as proposed to be amended by MM29

- *“Residential development schemes of 36 dwellings or more shall provide 55 square metres per dwelling on site to ensure that all new homes are:*

(i) within 280m of a Green Space;

(ii) ideally within 840 metres of a Neighbourhood Green Space (as defined in the Rotherham Green Space Strategy 2010); and

(iii) within 400 metres of an equipped play area...

“In all cases where new Green Space does not have to be provided on site, then developer contributions will be sought to enhance existing Green Space based on an assessment of need within the local area at the time of any planning application and proportionate to the scale and nature of the planned development.”...“New Green Space and equipped play areas will be accompanied by either (i) provision for maintenance by a landscape management company or similar, to standards agreed with the Local Authority for the lifetime of the development, or (ii) a financial contribution by way of a commuted sum equivalent to the cost of maintaining new Green Space or enhancements to existing Green Space for a period of thirty years.”

There are also links with Policy SP36 as proposed to be amended by MM27 ‘Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment’ and with policies of both the Core Strategy and Sites and Policies document which aim to create an accessible borough by walking, cycling and public transport.

The policies should therefore provide adequate recreational space for the new developments and should not lead to any significant increase in disturbance to any European sites directly. As the Rotherham populations of designated species (e.g. wintering golden plover) are not functionally linked with the SPA populations, any localised increase in disturbance to sites within Rotherham should not adversely affect the SPAs indirectly.

Given these considerations, the Sites and Policies document (and Local Plan as a whole) is not likely to lead to a significant effect on the nature conservation objectives of the identified Natura 2000 sites.

Issue 3: Water Environment Pathways

Table 4 below shows the Natura 2000 sites potentially affected by any indirect impact on habitats or wildlife via water environment impacts generated by growth of housing and employment development in Rotherham Borough.

Table 4: Sites and Policies document HRA issue No.3 & Natura 2000 site conditions

Natura 2000 Sites	Relevant Condition Needed to Support Site Integrity
Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA Hatfield Moor SAC	Sites require sustainable water resource management

The likelihood of significant effects on the nature conservation objectives of the Natura 2000 sites above from Policies SP1 (as proposed to be amended by MM2, MM3); SP11 to be deleted by MM12; SP12 (as proposed to be amended by MM13); SP13 (as proposed to be amended by MM14); SP14, SP15, SP16 (as proposed to be amended by MM16); and SP17 (as proposed to be amended by MM17) and combined with Core Strategy Policies CS1, CS2, CS6 and CS9, is considered to be offset by a number of other Local Plan policies.

The mitigating policies of the Core Strategy will apply equally to the Sites and Policies document. This includes Policy CS24, which says:

The Council will adopt a pro-active approach to managing the water environment which seeks to ensure that new development is not subject to unacceptable levels of flood risk, does not result in increased flood risk elsewhere and, where possible, achieves reductions in flood risk overall.

The Council will seek to ensure that any proposal:

... Improves water efficiency through incorporating appropriate water conservation techniques including rainwater harvesting and grey-water recycling...

The extent and impact of flooding will be reduced by:

- Requiring that all developments significantly limit surface water run off*
- Requiring the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems or sustainable drainage techniques on all sites where practical and feasible*

Also Policy SP50 Understanding and Managing Flood Risk and Drainage which says:

The Council will expect proposals to:

a. demonstrate an understanding of the flood route of surface water flows through the proposed development in an extreme event where the design flows for the drainage systems may be exceeded, and incorporate appropriate mitigation measures;

b. Control surface water run-off as near to its source as possible through a sustainable drainage approach to surface water management (SuDS). The Council will expect applicants to consider the use of natural flood storage / prevention solutions (such as tree planting) in appropriate locations, and the use of other flood mitigation measures such as raised finished floor levels and compensatory storage; and...

Abstraction may not be essential for projects to be developed. Also, there is water available for abstraction in the Lower Rother and Middle Don CAMS areas which would be subject to appropriate licensing. The Yorkshire Water and Severn Trent Water Resource Management Plans (WRMPs) account for such important attributes as climate change, population growth, increases in housing and the demand from industry. In the Yorkshire Water region, all three water resource zones show a surplus throughout the 25-year planning horizon. The East Midlands water resource zone of the Severn Trent WRMP is forecasted to have a water supply deficit without intervention, and new schemes and further leakage reduction is planned in order to meet this long-term deficit. As a result, no significant effect on Natura 2000 sites is expected.

For the above reasons, we consider that there are no likely significant effects on Natura 2000 sites and therefore an Appropriate Assessment is not required of the Main Modifications proposed to the Sites and Policies document before adoption.

If you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me on direct dial, 01709 823831 in the first instance.

Yours sincerely

Helen Sleigh
Senior Planning Officer, Planning Policy
Planning Regeneration and Transport
Regeneration and Environment
Services

