

**Minutes of the Meeting of the Save Our Greenbelt Dinnington Sub-group and RMBC held on 26 July 2012 at 1300 Riverside, Rotherham**

- 1 Those present:
  - MP: Rt Hon Kevin Barron MP
  - Ward Councillors: Judy Dalton, Clive Jepson, Simon Tweed
  - Officers: Karl Battersby, Andy Duncan
  - Group: Victor Betts, Graham Capper, Trevor Hill.
- 2 Apologies for absence: Jacquie Falvey, Jane Havenhand.
- 3 Core Strategy 2012.
  - 3.1 The Group raised concerns that there appears to be no difference in the current Core Strategy to that of 2011 (eg 700 homes on Dinnington East). The Group didn't expect any changes resulting directly from the "what goes where" meetings, because of the time scales. No reason was forthcoming. However, the map showing preferred sites will look different in the next consultation.
  - 3.2 KB informed the meeting of a developer's control in Dinnington West, which raised much discussion including primary schooling arrangements.
  - 3.3 The meeting was informed that problems relating to access (level crossing) in developing the Unbreko site near Kiveton Park station had made the site unattractive to the potential developer.
- 4 To more closely represent the geography of the area and to be consistent with "Maltby rather than West Maltby and East Maltby" it was agreed to remove "Dinnington East" from the Core Strategy and replace it with "Dinnington Area".
- 5 Concerns were raised with the consultation feedback document. Although most of the issues raised in more than 1700 objection letters were stated (included the threat of flooding to Worksop), two important issues were omitted, those of local flooding off Lakeland Drive and the efficacy of the emergency services. **AD to action.**

Post meeting feedback from Andy Duncan

The issues of "efficacy of the emergency services" and "flooding off Lakeland Drive" have been previously covered in our response to your 28 questions. They were not specifically referenced in the consultation feedback report as this report gave a flavour of the main issues raised and our response. Its purpose was not to give a point by point assessment of each comment received. However, you can see that emergency services provision and flooding have been explicitly assessed in our Infrastructure Delivery Study carried out to support and inform the Local Plan. Link below, please see pages 85 to 90 for emergency services and pages 119 to 123 for flooding.

[http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/6668/rotherham\\_infrastructure\\_study\\_report\\_may\\_2012](http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/6668/rotherham_infrastructure_study_report_may_2012)

On this basis I don't propose to republish the consultation feedback report.

- 6 There was much concern offered by the group that two of the 'Group invoked' letters had been attributed to Vic Betts. VB pointed out that his name had been associated with letters to which whose content he may well not subscribe.
- 7 Minutes of the cabinet meeting of Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2012. In the section of 'Risks and Uncertainties' were also presented as a concern:

*“Failure to comply with the Regulations  
Consultation and responses to consultation  
Aspirations of the community  
Changing Government policy and funding regimes. “*

The group can understand the inclusion of items 1 and 4, but found items 2 and 3 a concern in that:

- a) Consultation is of the community about the community's environment – how can this be a risk? KB pointed out that this was an issue of time scales, which was acceptable.
- b) The notion that the community should not have aspirations, which raised fears made last year that much of the community had feelings of being held in contempt by the council. KB gave an example of what was covered here, 'not all of the population of Rotherham will be please with any of the possible outcomes'. The Group made it clear that there was no criticism of the terms used in the report to the cabinet meeting. It was agreed that the cabinet members should have, perhaps, reworded the statement in the interest of clarity.

8 The Group gave the meeting an insight on upcoming issues:

8.1 Reducing the need for building on Greenbelt land by possibly communicating with landowners, developers, local councils, Westminster and perhaps Brussels. Kevin Barron gave some caveats and much welcomed guidance on some issues.

8.2 Localism Bill – Group members have been on training courses. The Group fully intends to be involved in the structures in the Dinnington area regarding Greenbelt issues.

9 Kevin Barron has been asked by the Group to request, of Gerald Smith, the changes made to the Dinnington area as a result of consultation in. Kevin Barron informed the meeting that he had written to Gerald Smith and is awaiting a reply.

10 The Group raised its disappointment that the Core Strategy didn't reflect the agreement made with the Leader of the Council and the CEO in November, which was further compounded by the Jacobs report stating that Brownfield land had been de-prioritised by RMBC as a result of government policy. Government policy is to remove the **target** of Brownfield usage, not to de-prioritise it; the policy is to 'prohibit development of Greenbelt except in exceptional circumstances. KB demonstrated the text in CS1 (or is it CS3) that this was not the case. However, agreement could not be reached because of the wording in the Jacobs document 'Detailed Assessment 4.1 Policies Cs2, CS3 and CS5 – Changes Pursuant to the NPPF'. **This issue needs to be resolved!**

Post meeting suggestion from the Group:

The Group's feeling is that the Jacobs quote is incorrect and needs changing.

Reply from Andy Duncan:

Re the greenfield/brownfield issue, to re-iterate our explanation at the meeting, government planning policy has now changed. However, our plan is quite clear that development of brownfield land remains a priority as evidenced by policies CS 3 and CS 9. The Jacobs sustainability appraisal report states that brownfield priority has been reduced of necessity to reflect national planning policy. But does then goes on to say that this change is not significant and will not prevent brownfield land coming forward. I really think we're arguing from the same side here - we're still clear that using brownfield first is the priority.

- 11 KB confirmed that Core Strategy can be amended prior to submission to the Secretary of State, and that the submission will not impair the consideration/inclusion of sites specified the 'what goes where' document.
- 12 Release of Greenbelt – if a parcel of land of Greenbelt is identified on the final document and planning permission is granted; the whole of the parcel of land will be released even if only part of it is to be initially developed.
- 13 Given that Dinnington East is an EU Objective 2 area, the Group asked for information on 'how does EU funding work'. It was felt that any funding was for developing businesses and would have to be applied for. KB informed the meeting that UK funding is available for development.  
**Kevin Barron volunteered to investigate the EU funding aspect.**
- 14 AD informed the meeting that 'the next round of consultation will call for all properties directly affected by any proposed development areas would be informed in the same way as for any normal planning application, and asked for the Group's assistance to help keep local residents informed.
- 15 Owing to time constraints, the seven reservations, which the Group have on the Core Strategy, were not presented. It was agreed that they would be discussed and possibly raised by email.