

# Rotherham local plan

## Rotherham Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document

### Consultation Statement

July 2016

## **Contents**

Introduction .....	2
Background.....	3
Preparation of the draft Supplementary Planning Document.....	3
Consultation arrangements.....	4
Consultation response .....	5
Adoption.....	6
Further information.....	6
Appendix 1: Workshop note.....	7
Appendix 2: Summary of representations received, the Council’s response and proposed changes to the Supplementary Planning Document .....	11
Appendix 3: Adoption Statement .....	35

## Introduction

1. This Statement accompanies the adopted Rotherham Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document (SPD.)
2. The Rotherham Town Centre SPD has been prepared to support the following Local Plan policies:

*Table 1: Relevant Local Plan policies*

<b>Rotherham Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted September 2014)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy CS 11: Tourism and the Visitor Economy</li> <li>• Policy CS 12: Managing Change in Rotherham's Retail and Service Centres</li> <li>• Policy CS 13: Transforming Rotherham Town Centre</li> </ul>
<b>Rotherham Local Plan Publication Sites and Policies (September 2015)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy SP22 Development Within Town, District and Local Centres</li> <li>• Policy SP23 Primary Shopping Frontages</li> <li>• Policy SP24 Secondary Shopping Frontages</li> <li>• Policy SP25 Hot Food Takeaways</li> <li>• Policy SP26 Out-of-Centre Retail Parks and Other Out of Centre Developments</li> <li>• Policy SP27 Rotherham Town Centre Regeneration</li> <li>• Policy SP28 Rotherham Town Centre Evening Economy</li> </ul> <p><i>Note: these policies may be subject to further amendment following submission, examination and subsequent adoption of the Sites and Policies document.</i></p>

3. Before adopting a SPD local authorities are required<sup>1</sup> to prepare a Consultation Statement setting out who was consulted in connection with the preparation of the SPD, the main issues raised in response to the consultation, and how those issues were addressed in finalising the SPD.
4. This Statement sets out how stakeholders have been involved in the preparation of the SPD and provides detail of the consultation arrangements. It also includes the adoption statement as required by relevant Regulations<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Regulation 12 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

<sup>2</sup> Regulation 14 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

## **Background**

5. In 2005 Rotherham signed up as one of Yorkshire Forwards Renaissance towns as part of the Urban Renaissance programme. The first stage in the programme was the establishment of the Town Team and the development of the Renaissance Charter. The Charter set out a series of goals against which future development proposals would be tested. This was followed by the production of a Masterplan for Rotherham town centre. The objective was to make Rotherham an individual and unique place but linked to and working with its neighbours. This Masterplan articulated the aims and goals of the Charter and set out a comprehensive 25 year vision for the town and a series of development projects and initiatives that would individually and collectively lead to transformational change to Rotherham`s urban centre. A vibrant, repopulated and reborn town centre was at the heart of this vision.
6. The economic landscape, especially regarding the town centre has changed significantly since the original Renaissance Masterplan was written. Consequently Arup were appointed in September 2015 to provide an update. This allows the Council to examine progress made in the development of Rotherham town centre, and prepare a new SPD which will underpin the future vision for the town centre, identifying new threats and opportunities, strengths and weaknesses.

## **Preparation of the draft Supplementary Planning Document**

7. In preparing the draft SPD Arup engaged with a range of stakeholders from the public and private sector. A stakeholder workshop was held on 20 November 2015, a note of which is attached at appendix 1.
8. A presentation to and subsequent discussion with the Council`s Town Centre business sub-group also took place in November 2015

## Consultation arrangements

9. In accordance with relevant Regulations<sup>3</sup>, the Council consulted on the draft SPD from 18 April to 5pm on 16 May 2016.
10. In June 2015 the Council adopted a revised Statement of Community Involvement, which sets out how and when people can influence new planning documents. Consultation on the draft SPD was undertaken in accordance with the guidance in this document. The table below sets out more detail regarding the consultation.

*Table 2: Consultation Plan*

<b>Where can I see the draft SPD?</b>	Website	The draft SPD was available to view on the Council's consultation website: <a href="http://rotherham.limehouse.co.uk/portal">http://rotherham.limehouse.co.uk/portal</a>
	Printed copies	Printed copies of the draft SPD were available to view at the Council's main offices at Riverside House, and the central Library at Riverside House.
<b>How will I know about the draft SPD?</b>	Emails and letters	The Council's Planning Policy team maintain a database of almost 12,000 people and organisations interested in preparation of the Local Plan and other planning documents (general and specific consultees). They were notified of the consultation by email or letter.  Letters and emails were also sent to key town centre stakeholders whose details are not held on the consultation database, including over 500 town centre businesses.
	Press notice	Notices publicising the consultation were placed in the following local newspapers during the week beginning 4 April 2016: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rotherham Advertiser</li> <li>• Dinnington Guardian</li> <li>• South Yorkshire Times</li> </ul>
<b>How can I comment on the draft SPD?</b>	Website, email and post	Comments were accepted through our consultation website, by email or by post.

<sup>3</sup> Regulation 12 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

## Consultation response

11. The Council received comments from twenty individuals or organisations during the consultation period. Appendix 2 provides a summary of the comments received, the Council's response to these, and the proposed changes to the SPD as a result.
12. The main issues raised in the consultation responses were:
  - Broad support for the overall aspiration for the town centre – in particular the importance of the redevelopment of Forge Island.
  - The creation of a prime walking route from the station to the civic area along Bridge Street and Bridge Gate.
  - One respondent commented in detail regarding cycle routes, infrastructure and maintenance.
  - Concerns over the level of detail provided in the SPD, particularly at a site specific level. Historic England and the Rotherham District Civic Society raised concerns around a number of detailed aspects of the document. Natural England suggested a number of areas where further detail could be provided.
  - The document is a missed opportunity and that it is not daring enough.
  - The feasibility and viability of the proposals raised concerns and whether funding would be available to maintain areas (of public realm for example) once completed.
  - Broad support from the Canal and River Trust for opening up the riverside and promoting development in waterfront locations.
  - The South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE) and Highways England broadly supported development in the town centre as a sustainable location, although Highways England raised some concerns around the cumulative impact of development on the strategic road network.
  - The Environment Agency noted that a number of sites fall within Flood Zones 2 or 3 and that proposals on these sites would need to satisfy relevant policy. Detailed comments were provided on Forge Island. It was suggested that further information regarding flood risk should be provided.
  - Errors and corrections were identified and alternative proposed wording suggested
  - A number of comments suggested actions beyond the remit of the SPD, or beyond the powers of the Local Planning Authority.
13. The consultation responses were welcomed and made a number of suggestions which help to improve the accuracy and clarity of the document. There are however a number of comments and suggestions which are not accepted. In particular it is the intention of the SPD to provide a broad guide to the vision and aspiration for the town centre, building on the Local Plan policies; as such it is not the intention of the document to provide detailed site specific guidance across the full range of planning issues.
14. Appendix 2 sets out the changes which have been made in preparing the final SPD. In summary these are:

- Insert a foreword
- Include of a summary of the Planning Use Classes Order
- Make minor amendments to the vision to make reference to well-maintained historic buildings
- Amend Goals 3, 5 and 8 to reference improved access to Clifton Park and to make reference to conserving historic assets
- Add references to the historic environment and heritage (including the location of Listed Buildings)
- Include reference to cycle routes
- Extension of the proposed Bridge Street pedestrian priority route to Frederick Street and Effingham Square and onwards towards Eastwood
- Include additional references to flood risk
- Address corrections

### **Adoption**

15. The Council resolved to adopt the Supplementary Planning Document, incorporating the changes set out at appendix 2, at its Cabinet and Commissioner's Decision Making Meeting of 11 July 2016. Following adoption the SPD can be taken into account as a material consideration in determining planning applications.
16. An Adoption Statement, as required by Regulation 14 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, is provided at appendix 3.

The adopted Rotherham Town Centre SPD is available from the Council's website at

[http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/download/113/additional\\_planning\\_guidance](http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/download/113/additional_planning_guidance)

### **Further information**

17. Further information can be obtained from the Planning Policy team:

Email: [planning.policy@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@rotherham.gov.uk)

Telephone: 01709 823869

Post to: Planning Policy,  
Planning, Regeneration and Transport,  
Regeneration and Environment Services,  
Rotherham MBC,  
Riverside House,  
Main Street,  
Rotherham,  
S60 1AE.

## Appendix 1: Workshop note

Subject	Rotherham Town Centre Masterplan Workshop		
Date	8 January 2016	Job No/Ref	245732-00

## 1 Rotherham Town Centre Masterplan Update – Workshop Note

### 1.1 Overview

On the 20<sup>th</sup> November 2015 Arup facilitated a workshop to discuss the baselining and emerging options work undertaken as part of Arup’s ongoing review and update of the 2005 Masterplan. The meeting was attended by the following:

Commissioner Kenny (RMBC)	Nick Ward (RMBC)	Paul Burgess (Burgess Commercial)
Paul Woodcock (RMBC)	Peter Sorby (RMBC)	Tim O’Connell (RMBC)
Tom Finnegan Smith (RMBC)	Ann Hardy (Rotherham College)	Amy McAbendroth (Arup)
Paul Smith (RMBC)	Sandra Pilson (Scarlett’s Deli)	Nick Smithson (Arup)
Cllr. Lelliot (RMBC)	Ryan Shepherd (RMBC)	Paul Lancaster (Commercial Property Consultant)
Mike Shires (RMBC)	Phil White (Arup)	Simeon Leach (RMBC)
Dave Stimpson (RMBC)		

Arup gave a presentation covering the baseline interpretation and the emerging concept for the masterplan update. Further detail can be ascertained through reference to the “baseline” and “emerging options” reports. Attendees then split into individual groups and discussed the following questions:

- Should the updated masterplan focus on a small number of concentrated interventions, or a greater number of dispersed interventions across the Town Centre?
- What are the issues facing movement, landscape and wider connectivity?
- Are the connections to the river still considered important?
- What are the challenges and opportunities for development?

### 1.2 Findings

#### 1.2.1 10 Masterplan Goals

It was agreed that all 2005 goals were still considered fit for purpose with the exception of Goal 5 which relates to significant highways remodelling. The goals should also reflect the town centre’s proximity to the proposed Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District (‘AMID’) at the east with the scope to extend this concept to the town centre itself. Additionally the goals should also refer to culture, leisure, and sport. There was a view amongst some participants that the 2005 goals are ‘too vague’ and could be more focussed.



### **1.2.2 Q1: Should the updated masterplan focus on a small number of concentrated interventions, or a greater number of dispersed interventions across the Town Centre?**

Several participants felt that Forge Island should be the focus for a singular concentrated intervention. A number of different uses were discussed for the peninsula, however the majority of attendees agreed that a 'leisure-hub' would be the best use. In terms of defining Forge Island's extent, it was suggested that any proposed intervention should extend from Rotherham Central at the west, and also include land to the west of Corporation Street.

In terms of potential uses for Forge Island, participants felt that a mixed use development would be most appropriate and this would lead to greater vibrancy. Achieving a critical mass of development on Forge Island was considered crucial to the success of any future scheme. Permeability was flagged as a potential constraint that would need to be overcome. Solutions should focus upon providing opportunities for pedestrian movement between Rotherham Central and the retail core. This would help ensure that Forge Island does not become a standalone development and will therefore benefit the town as a whole, having a catalytic effect that allows satellite development to come forward around it.

Forge Island was viewed as the key lynchpin and development opportunity that could have a catalytic effect around which further schemes could come forward. The possible release of land from the relocation of the existing police station and law courts would strengthen the case for this approach. The quarters approach was also supported as it would give areas of the town a district 'theme' and 'identity'.

#### **Summary**

Forge Island should be the focus for a singular concentrated intervention. There was consensus that this intervention would be best utilised for leisure type uses.

### **1.2.3 Q2: What are the issues facing movement, landscape and wider connectivity?**

There are a number of permeability issues across Rotherham Town Centre, most notably across Forge Island to the west and Centenary Way to the north. Centenary Way segregates the area of the town centre to the north and was considered to provide a barrier to pedestrian movement. Several participants commented that the Masterplan should consider the improvements to gateway routes in to the town (including the bus station) which are mostly of poor quality currently.

The session discussed a number of facilities and 'attractions' that are on the edge of the town centre and attract high footfall in their own right, but which are not well linked to the town centre by attractive walking and cycling routes. These included:

- New York Stadium;
- Riverside House (including main Central Library and Customer Service Centre);
- Central leisure centre at St Ann's;

- Clifton Park and Museum.

It was felt that the currently poor linkages represent a missed opportunity, and that there is opportunity to strengthen the connections between these ‘jewels,’ contributing to a greater overall sense of quality, place and identity. This could be achieved through improvements to the streetscape, along with more readily deliverable measures such as wider pedestrian wayfinding and legibility, heritage trails etc.

#### **Summary**

- Centenary Way and Forge Island both create severance and permeability issues within the town centre.
- Better connectivity would stitch together many of Rotherham’s assets which could contribute to the overall sense of place and identity.

#### **1.2.4 Q3: Are the connections to the river still considered important?**

The majority of participants felt that connections to the river remain important and should be protected. Quality developments should be sought along the river corridor. It was mentioned that AMID lies within close proximity to the town centre and connections to the river could be utilised to better link the two.

It was noted that there are land ownership constraints, including third party ownerships, which may preclude connections to the river in some instances, with sites that would host non-residential uses presenting a particular challenge.

Flood risk poses a barrier to development, with flood defences stopping upstream of the town centre. Whilst some town centre buildings are protected from flooding on an individual basis (e.g. the RMBC offices), there is not an integrated set of defences in place for the town centre itself. This might mean that connections between development sites and the river need to be designed and implemented in a smart way, i.e. in focused in key locations and designed to maximise key views.

Whilst the river can be viewed as an asset for Forge Island, it also creates severance that would need to be addressed as part of future redevelopment.

#### **Summary**

It was considered that the river corridor remains important and also creates an opportunity to better connect into the AMID which lies within close proximity to the town centre

#### **1.2.5 Q4: What are the challenges and opportunities for development?**

Participants suggested that footfall had been severely impacted on Corporation Street following the relocation of Tesco. Paul Lancaster commented that this may be true for local traders but Wilkinsons have only seen a 20% reduction, and this level of trade had not been affected by the opening of their Parkgate store in July. Participants considered this point and concluded anecdotally that it appears there are two distinct shopping trips; Parkgate and the Town Centre.

Paul Lancaster noted that based upon his discussions with leisure operators there may well be an opportunity to create a leisure hub, however for this to be viable it would require a number of complementary uses on the same site, e.g. cinema, family dining, hotel and gym. Demand from a hotel operator may exist, however this would only be on the basis of being part of a wider scheme with other uses that would provide the necessary critical mass.

One participant suggested that presently the town centre's lack of amenity facilities was a significant deterrent to Town Centre living. A wider discussion around town centre living noted that an increase in residents would improve perceptions of safety and make the Town Centre feel more secure on an evening due to an increased presence.

The Town Centre is currently bordered by three of the poorest wards in the country. It was observed that there is a real opportunity to create a residential district related to creative industries along the river south of Main Street (Westgate) which would benefit from great connections and affordability.

It was suggested that Wellgate has experienced a serious decline in occupancy. Participants noted that the street used to provide good quality independent retailing, however the street is now dominated by voids and poor quality occupiers. This discussion linked back to the footfall mapping exercise undertaken by Arup and it was observed that the retail core of the town has shrunk. It was therefore and that priority should be given to protecting those retailers that remain. Participants felt that Rotherham cannot afford to have any more high profile retailers leaving the town, especially not from key anchors like Primark or Wilkinsons.

From discussions, one of the main challenges to development was seen as land ownership, especially on the Interchange site which is owned by Norseman with a long lease to SYPTE.

It was highlighted that there are opportunities to take advantage of the higher education campus that will accommodate up to 1,000 degree students, offering opportunities for broader development including student residential accommodation, as well as increased footfall in the town centre. Linked to this, retention and adaptation of the markets complex could offer both retail and educational / CDI opportunities.

It was highlighted that there are a number of emerging demographic trends, particularly around the younger and older populations. The town centre may provide an opportunity for town centre living, however this also presents a challenge to the delivery of residential units owing to viability constraints; a critical mass of supporting development would also need to be delivered in tandem. Delivery of a leisure hub development will help overcome this.

## **Summary**

- Focus on retaining existing retailers, rather than attempting to expand the retail core.
- Bring forward a focused leisure hub with a critical mass that ensures its success.
- Look to link in with the AMID concept and bring working / making activity in to the town centre.
- Take advantage of the projected increase in student numbers (footfall / retail / resi / leisure).
- Seek to attract younger and older people to live in the town centre.

## Appendix 2: Summary of representations received, the Council's response and proposed changes to the Supplementary Planning Document

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

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

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

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

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

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Changes to SPD
			beyond the remit of this SPD; however there are considered to be sufficient existing opportunities to park close to the town centre.	
SPD04	Dr Edwin and Beatrice Jackson	<p>The council must be congratulated in restoring the City Centre. There is one street, where PRIMARK is located. If this is the promise of how the City Centre will look like, please definitely continue with the good work.</p> <p>It is desirable that the City Cleanliness is supported by all people, signs for no spitting, please pick up rubbish and rubbish bins available when possible.</p>	<p>Your comments of support are noted.</p> <p>Whilst it is beyond the remit of this document, the Council will continue to meet its maintenance and cleanliness responsibilities within the town centre.</p>	None
SPD05	Natural England	<p>We do not wish to provide specific comments, but advise you to consider the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consider making provision for Green Infrastructure (GI) within development. This should be in line with any GI strategy covering your area.</li> <li>• consider issues relating to the protection of natural resources, including air quality, ground and surface water and soils within urban design plans</li> <li>• consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development</li> <li>• The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community</li> <li>• The NPPF includes a number of design principles which could be considered, including the impacts of lighting on landscape and biodiversity</li> </ul>	<p>Green Infrastructure plays a key role in the SPD, from its potential role as part of pedestrian route and gateway enhancements, to opening up the riverside and contributing to a green network, particularly along the river corridor.</p> <p>The Local Plan adopted Core Strategy and emerging Sites and Policies document contains policies relating to amongst other things Green Infrastructure, air and water quality, and design. As such these will be taken into account in any planning applications and it is not considered necessary to repeat them in the SPD.</p>	None
SPD06	Mr. Ishaq Khan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the references made within the SPD are very similar to existing planning policy and</li> </ul>	Your comments of support are noted. Your wording suggestions and corrections on	Amend 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph on page 43: ‘...following the

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

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Changes to SPD
		<p>areas of the town centre have been allocated for housing, when in the long-term they can be appropriate for employment uses. Adjust policy with an aim to secure greater employment uses on prime sites near the civic and cultural area of the town centre.</p>	<p>linking the town centre to communities to the north east.</p> <p>With regard to housing and employment uses, your concerns are noted. The SPD has been produced in conformity with the Local Plan adopted Core strategy and emerging Sites and Policies document. These policies seek to meet the borough's employment and housing needs. It is recognised that the town centre is well connected to existing employment locations, and that the SPD and Local Plan does accommodate appropriate employment uses in the town centre (in particular offices). As the borough's main public transport hub the town centre also provides good accessibility to employment opportunities in other locations. However it is also recognised that one of the key priorities is to increase the population within the town centre, which will help bolster and improve the vitality and viability of the centre. It is therefore considered that the document makes appropriate provision for housing and that a greater emphasis on employment uses is not necessary.</p>	
SPD7	Mr Andrew Burton	<p>A very interesting and exciting vision for the future that must surely be supported by all for the benefits it will bring to the town and borough.</p> <p>A number of comments/observations as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The forward appears to be in Latin?</li> <li>2) Should there be a consideration for a main gateway into the town centre along Westgate?</li> <li>3) Why does the draft document include an</li> </ol>	<p>Your comments of support are noted.</p> <p>The latin text in the forward is used for illustrative purposes. A foreword will be included in the final version of the document.</p> <p>Westgate is a main gateway and is</p>	<p>Insert foreword</p> <p>Include Westgate on the key gateway plan on page 76 and the accompanying stand-alone map.</p> <p>Page 22 – progress - 2011 –</p>



Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Changes to SPD
		<p>outdated aerial photo of the town centre with no title or reference date.</p> <p>4) An early page in the document (not numbered) refers to the 10 goals but these aren't described until later (page 17).</p> <p>5) Much of what is proposed will required a high level of maintenance that currently cannot be afforded. Will revenue be secured to ensure the proposals can be sustainable (eg. recently completed hardworks at the Central Railway Station have become weedy and unclean).</p> <p>6) On p.22 under '3.1 Progress' a list of projects refers to All Saints Square under the 2011 heading. This work was completed much earlier.</p> <p>7) On p.35 Clifton Park (no.5) isn't shown on the key.</p> <p>8) On p.62 (item 7.2) the text talks about improving connectivity and provision of new opportunities for town centre users to engage in different parts of the town centre. I believe the Landscape and public Realm should also concentrate on the existing fabric of the town centre generally (ie. improved paving, seating, signage, planting etc.). It also talks about the most important assets of the town centre...surely these are the actual retail outlets?</p> <p>9) Effingham Square appears to be identified as an area to be improved and indicated as a site for short term intervention. Long term inervention is shown for the entrance to Clifton Park (off Doncaster Road and Clifton Lane). We (Landscape Design Team) have recently been invloved with Highways to improve the area around the Clifton Park Entrance and the Effingham Square area was 'improved' as part of the Tesco development.</p> <p>10) On p.61 of the report (and the masterplan generally) comments relating to the ten goals</p>	<p>highlighted as an area for improvement on page 76. The figure on page 49 and the accompanying stand-alone map will be amended to better reflect this.</p> <p>The document has drawn upon a range of images; however it should be noted that Council resources do not stretch to commissioning new aerial photography of the centre. No more up to date aerial photographs have been identified for use.</p> <p>It is considered that the document is clear regarding the 10 goals; notwithstanding early references to these.</p> <p>The Council will continue to meet its maintenance and cleanliness responsibilities within the town centre. It is beyond the remit of the SPD to introduce new policy regarding maintenance of public spaces; whilst the planning system may offer some opportunities to consider longer term maintenance (through the negotiation of developer contributions or the use of Community Infrastructure Levy receipts) this issue will require consideration within the Council as a whole.</p> <p>Your comments regarding public realm improvements at All Saints Square are welcomed. This actually refers to the improvements adjacent to the Minster and not All Saints Square itself, or Minster Gardens. The reference will be clarified.</p>	<p>amend title 'All Saints Square <u>Minster</u>'</p> <p>Add reference on page 62 to examples of public realm improvements such as improved paving, seating, signage, public art and planting.</p>

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

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

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

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

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Changes to SPD
		and is not going to elicit responses from those who use the town centre.  pg 22- 2011. Riverside does not include an Arts Centre.	and art gallery.	
SPD12	Peter Hawkridge, Rotherham District Civic Society	The Society would wish to make the following points in relation to consultations of this nature:- (i) It would have been helpful if a monochrome copy of the report, supplemented by the coloured maps, had been available on the RMBC website. The Society does not have unlimited funds for printing costs. (ii) The inclusion of a schedule of Use Classes as an Appendix would have been appreciated. (iii) A one page summary describing the Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District concept and its geographic extent would have been of assistance. In the Society's view there is only one purpose in employing an external consultant and that is to bring to the table expertise, knowledge and innovative thinking not already available within RMBC's Planning Service. This report however reads almost like a series of standard planning clichés, green corridors/riverside/town centre living etc containing warm words that the client likes to hear and skating over the significant difficulties the town centre faces. There is an old saying about consultants – “give them your watch and they'll tell you the time” This appears to be what has happened in this case with the report simply reflecting the views provided at the consultation event on the 8th January 2016. If this is the case it is to be hoped that the consultancy fee has been minimal. There is no	The document has been produced having due regard for the financial pressures under which Council operates. Whilst noting that the plan is provided in colour most printers allow printing in black and white. Furthermore the Council provided hard copies of the document for inspection at Riverside Library.  Whilst a number of comments have been provided regarding the proposed uses in particular parts of the centre it should be noted that the SPD has been prepared to ensure that it is in conformity with and does not conflict with the emerging Local Plan, which identifies appropriate uses in specific locations including the town centre and in particular mixed use areas on the periphery of the town centre.  The Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District is an emerging concept and not sufficiently advanced to warrant more detailed reference within the SPD.  The intention of the SPD is to provide a broad guide to the vision and aspiration for the town centre building on the Local Plan policies; as such it is not the intention of the document to provide detailed site specific guidance across the full range of	Goal 5 - ...sporting assets such as <del>Rotherham Theatre on Bridgegate</del> , the Civic Theatre...  Page 22 – progress section: 2007 – change 'College Road' to 'College Street' 2012 NY Stadium – include references to meeting goals 5 and 8 2015 – High Street – include reference to meeting goal 10 2016-2026 – 'Implementation of the <del>Six</del> <b>Eight</b> Key Moves'  Consideration will be given to the consistency of wording of Sections 7.1, 7.3 and 7.5 to aid clarity  Visualisation of forge island – amend text to refer to view looking Eastward, not westward  Include Westgate on the key gateway plan on page 76 and the stand-alone map  Page 80 – second paragraph

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Changes to SPD
		<p>point in employing consultants simply to mediate stakeholders' views.</p> <p>The Society was involved in responding to the very professional and detailed May 2008 Draft Interim Planning Statement prepared by RMBC Planning Service and is surprised that this has not been used as a reference point for the current "refresh"</p> <p>A number of detailed comments are provided.</p>	<p>planning issues.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the identification of a number of corrections and amendments. Whilst it agrees with a number of these and various proposed changes are identified as a result, there are a number of suggestions or comments which the Council does not agree with.</p> <p>For example, reference is made to a number of policies which are already adopted as part of the Local Plan Core Strategy. With regard to Drummond Street car park this site is identified as a development site in the current adopted UDP and is proposed to continue to be identified as such in the emerging local plan.</p> <p>A number of comments have been made regarding the visualisation of Forge Island. This image is included to give a broad indication of how this area could look and feel following redevelopment as a new part of the town centre. It is not intended to provide a detailed picture of the exact type, range or design of development.</p> <p>The town centre is currently well served in terms of short and long stay parking provision. It is noted that some of this provision is on sites which could be redeveloped for other uses. As such the Council is considering the long term implications of development on parking;</p>	<p>– amend as follows: ‘However, the current size of the <b>outdoor part of the</b> market provides some scope for remodelling in order to rationalise the existing occupiers into a smaller and better quality space.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to determining whether additional funding options related to the LEP or regional growth funds could be referenced</p> <p>Insert a summary of the Use Classes Order</p>

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



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

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

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

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

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

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Changes to SPD
		<p>The Rotherham Bus Partnership has resulted in improvements meaning passengers can travel around the town more easily. SYPTE noted and agrees there is potential for improvements to the quality of the environment at the interchange</p> <p>In general SYPTE welcome the proposals to improve the Town centre. Rotherham Town Centre is relatively well connected by bus and as such it makes sense to focus development in an area of high public transport accessibility. RMBC note the importance of connectivity in encouraging investment. SYPTE wholeheartedly agrees with this and notes the opportunities of connecting the town centre up with the existing AMID as well as providing opportunities for its growth.</p> <p>Key Move 7: Transport Interchange SYPTE welcome the opportunity to redevelop this site in partnership with RMBC and this SPD document for reinforcing the need of the interchange to maintain its use as a transport hub and that any additional uses, such as retail, be ancillary to its main use.</p> <p>Work is currently ongoing on various possibilities for the future of the Interchange and SYPTE welcomes the importance this document places on getting this redevelopment right. The interchange is key component to a successful town centre and in many cases the first place people travelling into the town will see.</p> <p>SYPTE understand there are a number of complexities when developing this site, including the current structural issues in the car park.</p>		

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Changes to SPD
		<p>It is important to consider what will happen to existing bus services as the interchanges is redeveloped. Rotherham Town Centre has limited street space available for centrally located bus stops and as such is important to consider the phasing of development. There needs to be an allowance for the location of temporary stops as the redevelopment of the interchange goes ahead.</p> <p>Delivery</p> <p>It is important to insure the delivery is complimentary.</p> <p>In summary SYPTE welcome this forward thinking document and the importance it places on connectivity as well as acknowledging the opportunities for co-operation it presents.</p>		
SPD19	Richard Bellamy	<p>The purpose of these comments is to try and encourage the Local Authority to be a little bit more accommodating to people who travel to, from and across the Rotherham town centre using cycles of various forms.</p> <p>Cyclists are known to make short journeys and spend money in their local areas, thus helping the local economy. Very often, their presence is particularly beneficial to cafés, restaurants and to other food shops.</p> <p>Rotherham should look to places such as Bath, Bristol, Cambridge and York as being cities which cater best for cycling.</p>	<p>Your comments are welcomed and concerns related to cycling are noted.</p> <p>It is noted that draft Local Plan policies promote sustainable and inclusive access to proposed development by public transport, walking and cycling, including the provision of secure cycle parking.</p> <p>Rotherham has recently been successful in securing funding from Sheffield City Region to improve pedestrian and cycle links to and from areas on the fringe of the town centre to and across the town centre. We will continue to develop attractive and obvious cycle routes into the town centre</p>	<p>Extend the cycle route notation along Westgate on fig 5.4.1, the Masterplan extracts in section 7.1 and the main map accompanying the document.</p> <p>In section 5.4 insert additional text under the 'cycling routes' section referring to longer term aspirations for strategic cycling routes linking the town centre with outlying areas via Wellgate and Westgate.</p>

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Changes to SPD
		<p>The cycling routes into and out of the Rotherham town centre are not especially inviting.</p> <p>Street cleanliness is important, too. Many shared pedestrian and cycling paths are strewn with broken glass and other debris (eg: the pathways beneath Centenary Way near to the Lidl store and the railway station). Most of the cycle storage shelters in the town centre are not routinely cleaned, nor maintained adequately.</p> <p>To try and be more accommodating to cyclists, when reviewing its planning policies and documents, the Local Authority ought to be more receptive of the modern standards of highway design and cycling facilities.</p> <p>In the assessment of town centre cycling facilities and highway design, there should be a willingness for the Local Authority to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. learn from the experiences of the cities listed above;</li> <li>2. adopt the modern design guides such as 'Space for Cycling' (Cyclenation), the CPRE Transport Toolkit, the London Cycle Campaign and the Welsh Assembly (the latter for the design of road junctions); borrow a few ideas from the Netherlands as well;</li> <li>3. engage positively in discussions with national cycling groups (eg: Cycling UK and Sustrans), as well as local cycling clubs and groups, when proposing new facilities for cycling;</li> <li>4. improve the provision of secure cycle parking in the town centre;</li> <li>5. repair road surfaces as necessary (eg: Bridge</li> </ol>	<p>and to provide convenient and safe locations for cyclists to park their bikes once in the town centre as we acknowledge the benefits derived from a coherent cycle network.</p> <p>Many of the detailed comments provided are beyond the remit of the SPD, however the Council will continue to meet its maintenance and cleanliness responsibilities within the town centre.</p> <p>The intention of the SPD is to provide a broad guide to the vision and aspiration for the town centre building on the Local Plan policies; as such it is not the intention of the document to provide detailed site specific guidance across the full range of planning issues. However the SPD recognises that there will be a need for further cycle infrastructure as the population increases. There may be opportunities to improve cycle infrastructure through the 8 key moves identified in the SPD and in the development of other sites within the town centre.</p> <p>The information will be useful for the further detailed work which the Council intends to undertake which will include more site-specific guidance for parts of the town centre.</p>	



Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Changes to SPD
		<p>Street, Chantry Bridge, Greasbrough Road, Sheffield Road);</p> <p>6. quash the byelaw prohibiting cycling in Clifton Park;</p> <p>7. ultimately decide whether cycling either is, or isn't to be permitted on High Street;</p> <p>8. permit cycling in the bus lane at Corporation Street (or at least explain properly the reasons why cycling isn't permitted there).</p> <p>From time-to-time, the Local Authority has used funding wisely for cyclists (eg: the provision of a few cycle shelters; the A630 signalled crossing near to the Transport Interchange and the improvements at the St. Ann's roundabout). The 20mph vehicle speed limit in the town is welcome. There is scope for more and the Government has quite recently made a (much-criticised) pledge about the future funding of cycling facilities. Having thankfully abandoned the ridiculously inaccurate "listening Council" tag, is the Local Authority now beginning to accept and act upon the views of others ?</p>		
SPD20	Environment Agency	<p>Areas of Rotherham town centre are at risk from flooding, with a number of the project sites identified in the SPD located in Flood Zone 2 and 3 (medium/high risk). The SPD provides an opportunity to highlight flood risk issues and set out a proposed approach to reducing and managing flood risk in the town centre.</p> <p>The development projects and initiatives identified in the SPD should be informed by the sequential, risk-based approach to the location of sites to avoid where possible flood risk to people and property</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. It is noted that a number of sites are within flood risk zones 2 and 3 and as such will be required to comply with national and local planning policy. This includes Core Strategy policy relating to water quality and meeting the Water Framework Directive. It is also noted that the SPD has been produced in compliance with existing and emerging planning policy in the Local Plan, which has been subject to sequential and exception testing. It is acknowledged that</p>	<p>Section 4.1 – include additional wording to highlight relevant flood risk policy and the flood alleviation scheme.</p> <p>In section 7.1 and on the stand-alone map, add the following wording to the text relating Forge Island, Law courts and Police Station, Land south of Main Street</p>

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Changes to SPD
		<p>and manage any residual risk.</p> <p>All new developments will need to be in conformity with local and national planning policy and the Rotherham Flood Risk Toolkit.</p> <p>Any plans for the town centre should take into consideration the Rotherham Renaissance Flood Alleviation Scheme Phase 2 proposal and associated timescales to ensure that opportunities for partnership working and benefits are maximised wherever possible.</p> <p>The EA are currently revisiting the hydraulic modelling for the Middle and Lower Don and this includes the reach of the River Don through Rotherham. Outputs from this study may potentially result in changes to current flows, water levels and associated flood risk maps in this area. Initial outputs from the study are anticipated in late 2016 (although this could be subject to change). It is recommended that any plans for the area should take account of the new modelled data wherever possible, to ensure the most up to date data is utilised in decision-making for any possible schemes and developments.</p> <p>The SPD provides an opportunity to focus on the Water Framework Directive (WFD), and specific measures and actions referred to in the Humber River Basin Management Plan (HRBMP).</p> <p>The SPD presents an opportunity, through the provision of green infrastructure, to enhance the setting of the town centre and we are pleased to see this is reflected in the plan. River corridors</p>	<p>reference in section 7.1 overview and the accompanying stand-alone map should make reference to those sites within flood risk zones.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to provide additional wording in the planning policy section to highlight relevant flood risk policy and the flood alleviation scheme.</p> <p>It is noted that flood risk modelling work may update the situation regarding flood risk. The Council will naturally expect development proposals to utilise the most recent data available.</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan contains policies relating to amongst other things Green Infrastructure, air and water quality, and design. As such it these will be taken into account in any planning applications and it is not considered necessary to repeat them in the SPD.</p> <p>Whilst the detailed comments regarding Forge Island are welcomed, the intention of the SPD is to provide a broad guide to the vision and aspiration for the town centre building on the Local Plan policies; as such it is not the intention of the document to provide detailed site specific guidance across the full range of planning issues. The information will however be useful for the further detailed masterplanning work which the Council intends to undertake. This will include</p>	<p>and Land to the west of Westgate:</p> <p>'The site includes land within Flood Zones 2 and / or 3. Development will need to satisfy relevant planning policy regarding flood risk and regard must be had to the Council's Flood Risk Toolkit.'</p>

Ref	Name	Summary of comments	Council Response	Changes to SPD
		<p>(also known as blue infrastructure) are also an important feature of green infrastructure and this should be reflected in the SPD.</p> <p>Further detailed comments were provided regarding Forge Island and how it provides an opportunity to join up several initiatives and create an attractive environment and a step change in Rotherham's relationship with the River Don.</p>	<p>more site specific detail.</p>	

## **Appendix 3: Adoption Statement**

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

In accordance with Regulation 14 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, notice is hereby given that the Rotherham Town Centre Supplementary Planning Document was formally adopted on 11 July 2016 by the Council.

This Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out a vision for transforming Rotherham town centre and provides guidance for proposed development within and on the edge of the town centre. It is accompanied with a consultation statement summarising the main issues raised during public consultation on the draft SPD, and how those issues have been addressed in the adopted SPD.

The adopted SPD, along with the consultation statement and this adoption statement, can be viewed on the Council's website:

[http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/download/113/additional\\_planning\\_guidance](http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/download/113/additional_planning_guidance)

The documents are also available for inspection from 11 July to 31 October 2016 In Riverside Library, Riverside House, Main Street, Rotherham, S60 1AE.

Any person with sufficient interest in the decision to adopt the Supplementary Planning Document listed above may apply to the High Court for permission to apply for judicial review of the Council's decision to adopt it. Any such application must be made promptly and in any event not later than 3 months after the date on which this Supplementary Planning Document was adopted (11 July 2016).

If you or someone you know needs help to understand or read this document, please contact us:

Telephone: 01709 823869 Email: [planning.policy@rotherham.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@rotherham.gov.uk)

**Ak vy alebo niekto koho poznáte potrebuje pomoc pri pochopení alebo čítaní tohto dokumentu, prosím kontaktujte nás na vyššie uvedenom čísle alebo nám pošlite e-mail.**

نهگهر تو یان که سینک که تو دیناسی پیویستی بهیارمستی هه بیت بو نه وهی لهم به لگه نامه یه تینگات یان بیخوینیته وه، تکایه په یوه ندیمان پیوه بکه له سهر نهو ژماره یه ی سهر وه دایان بهو نیمه یله.

إذا كنت انت أو اي شخص تعرفه بحاجة إلى مساعدة لفهم أو قراءة هذه الوثيقة، الرجاء الاتصال على الرقم اعلاه، أو مراسلتنا عبر البريد الإلكتروني

اگر آپ یا آپ کے جاننے والے کسی شخص کو اس دستاویز کو سمجھنے یا پڑھنے کیلئے مدد کی ضرورت ہے تو برائے مہربانی مندرجہ بالا نمبر پر ہم سے رابطہ کریں یا ہمیں ای میل کریں۔

اگر جناب عالی یا شخص دیگری که شما اورا می شناسید برای خواندن یا فهمیدن این مدارک نیاز به کمک دارد لطفاً با ما بوسیله شماره بالا یا ایمیل تماس حاصل فرمایید۔