

---

# **Report to Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council**

**by Robin Brooks BA(Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Date 24 May 2011**

---

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

SECTION 20

## **REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION INTO THE BARNSELEY CORE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT**

Document submitted for examination on 29 September 2010

Examination hearings held between 15 and 22 March 2011

File Ref: PINS/R4408/429/6

## **Abbreviations used in this Report**

AHVA	Affordable Housing Viability Assessment
CS	Core Strategy
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government
DPD	Development Plan Document
dph	Dwellings per hectare
LDS	Local Development Scheme
PAN	Planning Advice Note
PPS	Planning Policy Statement
RS	Regional Strategy
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
SCS	Sustainable Community Strategy
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SHMA	Strategic Housing Market Assessment
UDP	Unitary Development Plan

## **Non-Technical Summary**

This report concludes that the Barnsley Core Strategy Development Plan Document provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the Borough up to 2026. The Council have sufficient evidence to support the strategy and can show that it has a reasonable chance of being delivered.

A limited number of changes are needed to meet legal and statutory requirements. These can be summarised as follows:

- Clarifying the extent and strategic role of Urban Barnsley;
- Setting out in more detail the implications of the Core Strategy policies for the Borough's various centres and how those centres will develop over the plan period;
- Explaining the derivation of the requirement for new housing;
- Clarifying the strategy for the allocation of employment land;
- Clarifying the scope and purpose of localized review of the Green Belt;
- Including targets for the provision of affordable housing in line with national guidance;
- Amending the approach to the historic environment to better reflect national guidance;
- Setting out in more detail the intended policy approach to the Borough's town centres;
- Including a schedule of infrastructure funding together with agencies responsible and intended timing; and
- Making limited amendments to certain policies in the interests of flexibility and reasonableness, consistent with national guidance.

Most of the changes recommended in this report are based on proposals put forward by the Council in response to points raised and suggestions discussed during the public examination. The changes do not alter the thrust of the Council's overall strategy.

## Introduction

*References to documents are provided in footnotes, quoting the reference in the Examination library.*

- i. This report contains my assessment of the Barnsley Core Strategy (CS) Development Plan Document (DPD) in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. It considers whether it is compliant in legal terms and whether it is sound. Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 12, Creating strong safe and prosperous communities through Local Spatial Planning (paragraphs 4.51-4.52), makes clear that to be sound, a DPD should be justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
- ii. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the Council have submitted what they consider to be a sound plan. The basis for my examination is the submitted CS (September 2010) which is the same as the document published for consultation in February 2009 except for a table of minor editorial changes and a report, including further changes, that addressed the Government's intention to abolish Regional Strategies (RS); both of these accompanied the submission document<sup>1</sup>.
- iii. In January 2011, after submission of the CS, the Council published a schedule of further proposed changes in response to a number of concerns I had expressed about the soundness of the plan. Additional changes were suggested during the course of the hearings and all the changes have been brought together and consolidated in Appendices A, B and C<sup>2</sup> to this report. They have been publicised on the Council's web-site and those suggested at the hearings were notified to participants. I have taken account of responses to these changes made in writing or at the hearing sessions.
- iv. My report focuses on those changes that are needed to make the CS sound. These are primarily those suggested by the Council in Appendices A, B and C but also include a small number that I recommend, listed in Appendix E. All such changes are indicated in bold. Those proposed by the Council carry the prefix C (e.g. **Change C1**). Those I recommend carry the prefix I (e.g. **Change I3**). None of these changes materially alter the substance of the plan and its policies, or undermine the sustainability appraisal and participatory processes undertaken.
- v. The Council also published minor editorial changes to the CS in January and March 2011. As they do not directly relate to soundness, they are not generally referred to in this report, but they improve the clarity and coherence of the CS and I accordingly endorse them. These changes are listed in Appendix D. I am also content for the Council to make any additional minor changes to page, figure, paragraph numbering etc and to correct any spelling errors prior to adoption.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sub 2 and Sub 3. See also para. 1, below.

<sup>2</sup> Appendices B and C are schedules of monitoring and indicators, and infrastructure funding, respectively, bound separately for convenience.

## Assessment of Soundness

### Preamble

1. The Examination took place against a background of continuing legal action over the Government's decision in July 2010 to abolish Regional Strategies. The submitted CS was accompanied by a report prepared in the light of that decision that amplified the justification for the principal elements of the CS and proposed deletion from the plan of detailed references to the RS for Yorkshire and Humberside<sup>3</sup>. As at the time of writing the RS remains part of the development plan, pending enactment of the Localism Bill, I asked the Council to seek to clarify, as far as possible, the relationship between the RS and the CS. In response, the Council suggest including a statement that the CS has been prepared in conformity with the RS, that its approach has not been changed and that that approach is considered to remain valid. This appears to me to be a reasonable summary of the Council's position and I endorse **Change C1** accordingly. Inclusion of this change explains the situation adequately, without needing to restore previously deleted detailed references to the RS.
2. After the hearings I asked the Council to draw attention on their website to the statement on Planning for Growth made by the Minister of State for Decentralisation on 23 March 2011 and to invite representations on implications for the CS. I have taken account of both the statement, and the representations upon it, in my consideration of the CS.

### Main Issues

3. Taking account of all the representations, written evidence and the discussions that took place at the Examination hearings I have identified 10 main issues upon which the soundness of the plan depends.

### *Climate change and renewables*

**Issue 1 - Whether the CS as a whole, and the relevant specific policies, adequately address the impact of climate change; and whether the specific policies are soundly based, likely to be effective, reasonable and consistent with national and regional planning policy.**

4. Policy CSP 1 sets out an overall approach to addressing climate change and mitigating its impact; and the following three policies amplify that approach in terms of securing more sustainable means of construction and drainage, and reducing flood risk. Policies CSP 5 and CSP 6 deal with the related issues of renewable energy generation in new developments and developments that produce renewable energy.
5. The CS describes promoting sustainable development and reducing the Borough's impact on climate change as overarching principles<sup>4</sup>; and it includes a clear and detailed set of objectives for reducing carbon emissions<sup>5</sup>. The principles are reflected in policy approaches such as concentrating new

---

<sup>3</sup> Sub 3

<sup>4</sup> Para. 4.12

<sup>5</sup> Para. 4.15

development in Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns, and encouraging higher housing densities and reducing the need to travel. On all the evidence I consider that the CS as a whole adequately addresses the challenge of climate change.

6. Policy CSP 2 "expects" development to achieve specified ratings under the Code for Sustainable Homes. This is an acceptable approach and one that is clearly welcome in principle as helping to achieve more sustainable forms of construction. However, the statement of a "requirement" to rise over the plan period is not acceptable; the Code is currently voluntary for private dwellings and to require compliance with it is inflexible and therefore unsound. I put forward **Change I1** to substitute the word "target".
7. There is no apparent cogent evidence to support the area and percentage thresholds in Policy CSP 4 relating respectively to making "a positive contribution to reducing or managing flood risk" and surface water run off. Accordingly, and however desirable the objective, to "require" compliance with those thresholds is excessive and unsound. The word "expecting" should be substituted, as in **Change I2**.
8. PPS22, Renewable Energy, states that policy proposals for decentralised energy supply should be evidence-based and viable. There is no obvious evidential justification for the expectation in Policy CSP 5 for housing proposals to contain such supply sufficient to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by at least 15%, increasing to 20% after 2015; the target in Policy ENV5 of the RS is at least 10%. However, given the strengthening emphasis on energy conservation it would not be unreasonable to retain these higher figures as expectations, provided that it was made clear that they were not being imposed regardless of practicality and viability. I put forward **Change I3** to include such a reference in the Policy rather than solely in the supporting text. Also, requiring decentralised energy alone to secure the reductions in carbon emissions is arguably excessive, and potentially prejudicial to viability, given that other design measures could also contribute to energy conservation. The change covers this point also.
9. PPS22 states that the RS should include a regional target for renewable energy generation against which progress can be assessed and that, where appropriate, such targets may be disaggregated. In the ultimate absence of the RS the CS as it stands would give neither a target to indicate direction of travel nor any indication of how far along the journey the Borough had gone. **Change C15** would incorporate both the Borough target from the RSS, and a summary of progress, which would render the plan sound pending any further work on targets at regional or sub-regional levels.
10. I conclude that the CS as a whole adequately addresses the challenge of climate change and that, with the inclusion of the changes referred to, the specific policies on the subject are soundly based, likely to be effective, reasonable and consistent with national and regional planning policy.

### ***Spatial strategy***

**Issue 2 – Whether the strategy for directing growth is soundly based, appropriate to the Borough, likely to be effective, consistent with national**

**and regional planning policy, and provides a sound basis for the more detailed policies of the CS.**

11. The strategic framework for development is essentially set out in Policies CSP 7 - CSP 12. The Council seek to maximize the benefits of Barnsley's location in relation to the Sheffield, Leeds and Manchester City Regions (CSP 7) and priority is to be given to development in Urban Barnsley and 6 Principal Towns (CSP 8). Policy CSP 10 distributes the quantum of housing required under Policy CSP 9 between the various settlements with just under half (46%) allocated to Urban Barnsley. Policies CSP 11 and CSP 12 do likewise with employment land, the greatest single allocation of which (37-44%) is proposed in Urban Barnsley.

*Barnsley's regional role*

12. Despite the current economic uncertainties, the CS adopts a robust approach towards the prospects for future growth. Given the Borough's good historic record in delivering new housing, its location relative to Leeds, Sheffield and Manchester, and the policy support provided by the RS (which refers to Barnsley as one of several "engines for growth" in South Yorkshire<sup>6</sup>) this confidence appears to me to be well placed. The Council have evidently undertaken extensive joint working on a range of planning matters with other agencies within the Leeds and Sheffield City Regions, an approach which should stand them in good stead with the duty to cooperate proposed in the Localism Bill, to follow the intended abolition of RS.
13. However, the approach needs to be realistic and based primarily on what is right for the Borough, albeit taking proper account of its regional and sub-regional context. I deal in more detail below with the number of homes to be built but it is also a matter that was discussed at the hearings in terms of its strategic implications in relation to Barnsley's regional and sub regional roles. The CS approach reflects the housing projections in the RS, albeit with enhancements for growth. Those projections have been examined in detail as part of the preparation of the RS and are the basis on which the Council have developed other aspects of the CS which underpin housing provision such as infrastructure. I see no clear justification for employing instead the Department for Communities and local Government (DCLG) 2008-based household projections, and then to apply uplifts of around 25% or more to those figures in pursuance of a growth agenda, or to seek to capitalize on projected housing shortfalls in Leeds and Sheffield as some have urged. Not only would this directly undermine the coherence of the CS as a whole but it could lead to sustainability problems if it resulted in significantly increased commuting into the cities. Although the DCLG figures are more recent, their implications need to be considered in a wider planning context than Barnsley alone.

*Definition of Urban Barnsley*

14. Following consultation on alternatives at Revised Preferred Options stage, the CS defines Urban Barnsley as including Darton and Dodworth. Despite intervening Green Belt and, in the case of Dodworth, the M1 Motorway, there

---

<sup>6</sup> REG1, para. 4.4

are clear functional links between the three communities, including good public transport connections. Linking them within one definition in planning terms is supported by the evidence base, notably the 2007 Barnsley Settlement Assessment<sup>7</sup>, would take advantage of the development opportunities in the two outliers and would enhance the potential of the wider area for growth and regeneration. **Change C5** makes clear that it is the whole of Urban Barnsley that would be a focus for development, confirming that all locations within it would be regarded as in principle equally acceptable for development. **Change C3** probably goes as far as a strategic document reasonably can to define the geographical extent of Urban Barnsley as including both Darton and Dodworth. I endorse both changes accordingly.

### *Settlement hierarchy*

15. The distinction between Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns in the CS directly reflects the classification of settlements in the RS as Sub Regional Cities and Towns, and Principal Towns. The high number of the latter, compared with other districts in the Region, is explained largely by the history of the former coalfield where a series of extensive urban settlements developed, relatively small in terms of population but with their own individual character and recognisable as individual towns. The RS distinguishes between Sub Regional Cities and Towns as "the **prime** focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities" and Principal Towns as the **main** focus for those activities and facilities (my emphasis).
16. The proportional distribution of housing between the settlements therefore appears reasonable, with the number of the Principal Towns accounting at least in part for what appears initially to be a relatively low allocation to Urban Barnsley; nevertheless, that town accounts for easily the greatest quantum of development of all the borough's settlements, equivalent to some 46% of the total. It retains the primacy accorded to it in the RS. **Change C17**, making clear that it will accommodate "significantly more growth than any individual Principal Town", confirms this; and **Change C18** similarly clarifies that individual Principal Towns will be foci for development, avoiding any implication that in combination they might be more important than Urban Barnsley. I endorse both changes accordingly.
17. The proportions of total housing growth allocated to the settlements listed in Policy CSP 10 appear broadly appropriate. The relative priority of the settlements has been the subject of consultation at Preferred Options (2005) and Revised Preferred Options (2009) stages, and of sustainability appraisal, and on the evidence that work has been done thoroughly. The allocation for Goldthorpe, essentially shorthand for the Dearne Towns, is justified by the importance of maintaining the momentum of regeneration there; and reflects advice in the Barnsley Settlement Assessment (2007) that those towns should receive the highest proportion of growth outside Urban Barnsley. The other settlements intended for the highest levels of growth, Wombwell, Cudworth and Hoyland, were identified in the Assessment as appropriate centres for growth.

---

<sup>7</sup> BMBC 4



18. The Assessment's recommendation that growth in Penistone should be at a "maintenance" rather than "significant growth" level is reflected in the more modest allocation to the town under Policy CSP10, an allocation that is all the more modest for the fact that about half of it is accounted for by existing commitments. The strategy of limiting development to that necessary to maintain Penistone as a market town is sound given its relatively remote location, attractive character, limited local employment, and absence of obvious significant planning problems. According it further significant growth could risk significantly increasing commuting in an essentially unsustainable way. The allocation to Other Settlements, though criticized by some representors as excessive, does not appear so when judged against the considerable number of villages in the Borough, some of them of significant size; 1,000 dwellings divided between them would produce only relatively small numbers for individual villages, appropriate to reflect opportunities for small-scale infill development and redevelopment likely to arise over the plan period.
19. The allocations to different settlements must necessarily be informed by knowledge of land availability for housing. There appears to be only limited headroom of supply in Goldthorpe and Hoyland (and likewise in Royston; see below) over the full plan period<sup>8</sup>. I deal more fully with the issue of housing land supply later in this report but suffice to say here that there appear to be no undue constraints on supply during the first ten years. Nor does the assessment take any account of windfalls which have historically made a significant contribution to the supply of housing in the Borough. On all the evidence I am satisfied that in terms of land supply the distribution of new housing to the various communities under Policy CSP 10 is essentially sound.
20. There was discussion at the hearings as to whether the allocations of housing numbers should be expressed as numbers (preferred by the Council as giving greater certainty, including to the public and infrastructure providers) or percentages (advocated by others for greater flexibility and to emphasize that the allocations were "floors" rather than "ceilings"). Whilst I understand the Council's misgivings about problems of rounding percentages, I consider that there is considerable merit in employing them alongside the housing numbers as they show more clearly the proportions in which growth would be shared between the various settlements. This would make the approach more effective and render it sound. I accordingly recommend the change in **Change I7** which represents one of the revised tabulations prepared by the Council.

### *Vision*

21. In response to my initial concerns that the CS gave insufficient guidance on how the Borough's towns should develop over the plan period, the Council produced additional text for the Spatial Portrait and this was amplified in the light of discussion at the hearings. This falls short of explaining matters such as intended future urban form and directions of growth, unfortunately in my opinion as these would give clearer strategic guidance and could significantly reduce the work that will be required on the Development Sites and Places DPD. However, it is sufficient to make the CS sound and I recommend

---

<sup>8</sup> Background Paper 3, Housing, table 2, p.7

inclusion of **Changes C6 - C9 and C11 - C14**, inclusive<sup>9</sup>.

*Royston as a Principal Town*

22. Royston is not currently a Principal Town under the RS but the Council argue that it is too important a settlement not to be given that designation. The RS defines such towns as fulfilling a regionally significant role as service, employment and transport hubs for their surrounding areas and advises caution in adding to the existing number of such towns so as not to undermine the core approach. However, it accepts that additional designations may be necessary in some South Yorkshire districts where there are numerous medium size towns, relatively close to Sub Regional Towns, that do not perform the same role as service centres in more rural parts of the region. This seems to me to fairly describe Royston's position in the local settlement pattern.
23. RS Policy YH5 sets out criteria for judging whether further settlements should become Principal Towns, namely (in summary) that they should support delivery of the core approach, notably in terms of regeneration; provide employment, services and facilities for the local population; have good accessibility by public transport; have capacity to accommodate development; and have potential to support the wider settlement network. Royston broadly satisfies these criteria apart from that on accessibility which is more limited than that of other existing Principal Towns. The Smaller Centres Study of November 2010<sup>10</sup> assessed it as being the only District Centre studied with potential to expand. The town has a fair range of facilities and, although relatively small in terms of both area and population, is recognisably urban in character. All these matters weigh in favour of designation as a Principal Town. It is perhaps arguable whether they pass the "compelling evidence" test in RS Policy YH5 but I consider it to be a legitimate area for the Council's judgement.
24. Various options for Royston have been canvassed through the CS preparation process but I agree with the Council that its proper designation is as a free-standing community. The quantum of housing proposed should help to attract investment that would assist in improving facilities in the town and further its regeneration; and additional population could help support necessary improvements to the retail area. I have seen no cogent evidence that designation as a Principal Town would mean growth potential being spread too thinly or that the amount of proposed housing would be insufficient to help achieve real improvements in the town.

*Birdwell*

25. In response to representations, and in the light of discussion at the hearings, the Council have suggested that Birdwell be included within the Principal Town of Hoyland rather than be regarded as a village. The two are geographically close and well connected by bus services; and Birdwell has a reasonable range of services, employment land and ready access to the M1, all of which would enhance the role of the larger community and make it more sustainable. I endorse **Changes C4 and C10** accordingly as making the CS sound.

---

<sup>9</sup> These include C12 covering Royston, the status of which is dealt with below.

<sup>10</sup> BMBC 41

26. With the inclusion of the changes referred to, I consider that the strategy for directing growth is soundly based, likely to be effective, consistent with national and regional planning policy and provides a sound basis for the more detailed policies of the CS.

### **Housing**

#### **Issue 3 - Whether the CS housing policies are appropriate to the Borough, founded on robust evidence, properly justified, likely to be effective, and consistent with national and regional planning policy.**

##### *Housing target and trajectory*

27. The CS takes as its basis for future housing numbers the RS figure for annual net additions to the dwelling stock of 1,015, giving a total of 18,270 dwellings for the plan period as a whole. To this is added 1,704, representing an uplift of 21% on the supply target over the years 2008-2016 to reflect the award of Growth Point status in 2008, giving a figure of 19,974. Following the ending of Growth Point funding in March this year the uplift is effectively spread over the whole plan period. With the further addition of a flexibility allowance of 1,526 to sustain growth<sup>11</sup>, the total for the plan period is 21,500.
28. **Change C16** explains this arithmetic and updates the text on the demise of Growth Point funding. It also states that the proposed housing requirement is consistent with the latest, 2008-based, household projection of an additional 1,000 households per year during the plan period. Some representors dispute this, arguing that the latest projections should be used as a basis and then updated for growth by some 20-25% (broadly comparable with the 27% enhancement applied to 2004 household projections during preparation of the RS) to relieve pressure on the Leeds and Sheffield housing markets and the Green Belt around the two cities. As noted above (para. 13), I see no justification for this. A significant element of growth, over and above the RS figures, has already been built into the housing requirement and it would not be prudent to increase this further on the basis of projections that have not yet been assessed for their regional implications. Also, although PPS3, Housing, advises local planning authorities, in assessing their housing requirements, to "...take into account...the Government's latest published household projections..."<sup>12</sup>, it does not require such projections to be used immediately after publication, automatically and irrespective of the point reached in the plan preparation process. Albeit that the growth assumptions in the CS are largely matters of judgement, they do build upon foundations properly tested through the strategic planning process.
29. Meeting the housing requirement will be challenging but evidence on historic completions indicates that it is achievable. For eight of the twelve years to April 2011 the Borough's performance exceeded RS targets<sup>13</sup> and although this

---

<sup>11</sup> The figure of 1,526 represents an additional 100 dwellings per year from 2011 to 2026 to enhance the Borough's attractiveness to housing growth within the Sheffield and Leeds City Regions (100 x 15 = 1,500). This is added to the 19,974 and the sum rounded up to 21,500.

<sup>12</sup> Para. 33

<sup>13</sup> Table 10 of Background Paper 3, Housing, and Table 2 of Housing response to Issues and Questions Paper.

may be attributable in part to buoyant economic conditions during that time, it would not be prudent to plan to 2026 on the basis of the poorer performance over the last 2-3 years. The Council reasonably envisage a return to better economic conditions over the longer term.

30. The housing trajectory appears to be a sound assessment of likely future performance, acknowledging initial poor market conditions but showing a gradual recovery from 2014 onwards and an essentially steady housing supply, year on year, for the last decade of the plan period, though it will clearly need to be periodically updated following monitoring. I see little benefit in expressing the housing requirement as an annual figure, as some have suggested. Although this might in principle assist with monitoring, it would not in itself be particularly significant and could imply that the rate of delivery would be unrealistically constant. I endorse **Change C16**, as set out above, as clarifying and making sound the derivation of the housing requirement.

#### *Availability of housing land*

31. The 2009 update of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA)<sup>14</sup> identifies a supply of some 22,440 dwellings over the plan period<sup>15</sup>, compared with a requirement of 21,500, giving a notional surplus of around 940 dwellings, equivalent to around 4% of the requirement figure. On the face of it this gives only limited headroom and the assessment was widely challenged at the hearings on a number of grounds, including over-optimistic assumptions on development density, inaccurate assessments of individual sites, lack of transparency and inadequate consultation with the development industry. However, the density applied, 40 dwellings per hectare (dph), is at the lower end of the range given in Policy CSP 14 and, as noted below, densities significantly higher than this have been secured in recent years. It does not seem an unreasonable figure to assume for the full length of the plan period; and the fact that some developers are currently building to much lower densities should not carry great weight in the overall assessment.
32. In an exercise of this scale and complexity, heavily reliant on judgement on individual sites, some inconsistencies and inaccuracies would appear to be almost inevitable but I have not seen any clear evidence that they are on such a scale as to invalidate the exercise; and the 2009 update indicates that the development industry have been closely involved at all key stages. Nor does the fact that the Council and developers disagree over the deliverability of, or constraints upon, individual sites in itself invalidate the assessment method.
33. PPS3 does not require delivery of housing sites to be guaranteed in detail but rather that Local Development Documents should identify "broad locations and specific sites" to deliver housing for at least 15 years; and that for years 11-15 specific sites should be identified "where possible"<sup>16</sup>. On all the evidence I am satisfied that the SHLAA bears the weight that needs to be placed upon it and that the evidence base is sufficiently robust to justify the CS approach. Importantly too, the SHLAA (rightly) includes no allowance for windfall sites

---

<sup>14</sup> BMBC 60

<sup>15</sup> The sum of 1,673 dwellings completed since 2008 or under construction; 5,208 with planning permission; and sites identified for 15,559 (all figures net).

<sup>16</sup> Paras. 53 and 55

which historically have contributed significantly to housing supply (accounting for 42% of completions in 2002/03 rising to 84.5% in 2008/09). Even if this contribution reduces in future, as allocations are made under the Development Sites and Places DPD, it seems likely to remain an important source of dwellings and a valuable buffer between the housing requirement and the assessed supply.

34. Policy CSP 9 states, in accordance with advice in PPS3, that a minimum five year supply of deliverable housing sites will be maintained. The Council's latest assessment, for 2010-2015, shows a total 5 year deliverable supply of 7,066 dwellings compared with a housing requirement over the same period of 4,950 units<sup>17</sup>, an excess of some 2,116 or something over 40% of the requirement. Similar criticisms have been made of this assessment to those of the SHLAA including that it is unrealistic in including long standing Unitary Development Plan (UDP) allocations unlikely to come forward as well as other sites that for various reasons will not deliver; and that it is unrealistically dependent on smaller sites. However, dwellings with full planning permission, which should have a good chance of coming forward within 5 years, account for about half of the supply figure and the supply from small sites has historically been good. In addition, the assumed density is lower than that used in the SHLAA (35 dph as opposed to 40 dph) which should make the assessment more robust. Bearing in mind these points, and the size of the margin of supply over demand, I consider that the statement in Policy CSP 9 is supported by a sound evidence base.

#### *Form and location of development*

35. The range of densities proposed in Policy CSP 14 pays adequate regard to the relevant guidance in PPS3. It accords with the spatial vision for the Borough, which would see the bulk of new housing concentrated in Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns which have the infrastructure to support the densities proposed. At 40-55 dph it is higher than the density of 35 dph currently sought under the Council's supplementary planning guidance though that it is not unrealistic is evident from the fact that in recent years densities well in excess of the proposed levels have been achieved without, apparently, undue dependence on flats. The proposed densities should help to make best use of land in sustainable locations, and the higher rate sought in good public transport corridors reflects the thrust of PPS3 guidance. That developments of flats may be losing favour, and developers seeking to build at lower densities, does not detract from this. **Change C25** properly reflects the importance of the character of the surrounding area as a determinant of what is an appropriate density.
36. In similar terms, the target of 55-60% of housing to be built on previously developed land is ambitious but on the evidence appears achievable, particularly given that annual rates are now well in excess of those achieved a decade ago and latterly have been around 87%. Seeking maximum practicable use of such land is a legitimate objective, in line with PPS3 guidance, and does not in itself amount to an unreasonable barrier to green field sites coming forward, as some representors argue has been the practical effect of the Council's Planning Advice Note (PAN) 30. **Change C24** clarifies

---

<sup>17</sup> BMBC 58, Tables 3a and 3b

the manner in which allocated housing land will be released under Policy CSP 13 and in relation to Policy CSP 17 on Housing Regeneration Areas. In cross referencing the Policies it makes them effective and thus sound.

### *Affordable housing*

37. Policy CSP 15 does not contain an overall target for the amount of affordable housing to be provided, as advised in PPS3. The Council do not favour including such a target on the grounds that it could rapidly become out of date; their preference is for information on areas and types of need to be included in an SPD where it could be more readily updated.
38. This approach risks not only running counter to national guidance, without convincing justification, but also failure to give strategic direction in the form of an overall yardstick against which progress can be measured from the date the CS is adopted. Change C26, as proposed in response to my early expressions of concern on soundness, states a need for 597 units of affordable housing per year, derived from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) update of May 2008<sup>18</sup>. Later, in response to discussion at the hearings, the Council supplied, as an alternative under this change, a target for delivery figure of 18% of the housing stock over the plan period, equivalent to some 2,780 dwellings, based on applying the percentages of housing sought under Policy CSP 15 to sites in the SHLAA.
39. Both figures are of limited value. The need figure derives from work undertaken in 2008 and only extends to 2011/12; projecting requirements beyond that date is described by the SHMA as "more difficult". The delivery figure depends heavily on work on site viability rather than assessment of housing need. The Council also point out that Policy H4 of the RS, in stating that LDFs should set targets for provision of affordable housing, advises that proportions of up to 30% may be needed in South Yorkshire. However, such figures are described as "interim, indicative estimates" and there is no evidence that they are based on any detailed assessment of need. In my view they cannot reasonably be regarded as proper targets in PPS3 terms.
40. This situation is far from satisfactory but I consider that there is an urgent need to make progress from the current policy context on affordable housing provided by the UDP (adopted some 11 years ago) and PAN 34, intended to provide interim guidance on the assumption that the LDF would come into force in 2008. I therefore put forward **Change I6** which combines the Council's need and delivery figures under Change C26 and stresses the need for regular review.
41. The proposed development size threshold for seeking affordable housing is the national indicative minimum of 15 dwellings. In the light of a high level of need, the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (AHVA)<sup>19</sup> argues for lower thresholds of 5 dwellings in Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns and zero in villages but the Council are concerned that in the current economic situation such figures might stifle development. There is clearly a price to be paid for

---

<sup>18</sup> BMBC 25, Table 6.8. The SHMA stresses that this figure, judged equivalent to 50% of the then net new stock additions, need to be treated with caution because of the assumptions about household behaviour on which it is based.

<sup>19</sup> BMBC 17

the higher figure in terms of affordable housing foregone as the AHVA estimates that it might exclude overall about a quarter of new dwellings granted planning permission. Setting an appropriate level does however involve a significant element of judgement and I believe that in the present fragile economic situation the lower AHVA figures could prevent a good number of smaller sites, including windfalls, from being brought forward. The consequent adverse effects of this on the housing supply generally might well outweigh potential benefits of providing affordable housing. The proposed threshold figure is also significantly lower than the 25 dwellings that currently prevails in areas of established need under PAN 34<sup>20</sup> and it would be prudent to review the effects of the new regime in practice before considering a lower figure.

42. The AHVA considered two main options for the percentage targets in Policy CSP 15, a dual target broadly splitting the Borough east/west, reflecting a significant difference in residual values; and a finer grain approach with 4 different targets more closely aligned to the relative strength of the various housing sub-markets. The Council chose the former, primarily for its straightforwardness and ease of implementation. This seems to me to be a sound stance, albeit at the risk of failing to secure all the affordable housing in the west of the Borough that the market could bear. Given that many more houses overall will be built in the east of the Borough than in the west, the dual percentage target should in practice deliver more housing where the need is greatest. As with thresholds (above), the effects can be tested and the approach amended if necessary.
43. The AHVA seems to me to be based on reasonable assumptions for an exercise of this type and detailed criticisms on matters such as densities used do not undermine its essential robustness. The Policy itself also contains the important flexibility for a developer to demonstrate that applying its percentage figures to a specific site would render development unviable, enabling alternative approaches to be considered and negotiated.
44. **Change C27** makes clear that the settlements listed under Policy CSP 16 are within the Green Belt. This brings it into line with PPS3 advice on rural exception site policies, namely that they may be used to permit affordable housing on small sites in small communities where policies of constraint (in this case Green Belt) would normally preclude development. Subject to this, and to the other changes referred to above, I consider the housing policies to be appropriate and justified, soundly based, likely to be effective and consistent with regional and national policy.

### ***Employment***

#### **Issue 4 - Whether the CS economic policies are appropriate to the Borough, founded on robust evidence, properly justified, likely to be effective, and consistent with national and regional planning policy.**

45. Policy CSP 11 states an intention to allocate 350 ha of employment land over the plan period, a figure that is distributed between Urban Barnsley, the Principal Towns and other settlements under Policy CSP 12. Policy CSP 19 sets

---

<sup>20</sup> BMBC 36

out criteria for assessing proposals for redevelopment of employment land and premises for non-employment purposes.

### *Evidence base*

46. The 350 ha figure is significantly lower than the total of 470 ha which the Employment Land Review<sup>21</sup> estimates is the amount of employment land required for the plan period. The higher figure includes a number of components, namely land required to meet job growth in industry and storage predicted in the RS, and allowances for other employment uses<sup>22</sup>, replacement of employment land lost to other uses and maintenance of a portfolio of market-ready sites. In addition it is postulated that some 175 ha would remain at the end of the plan period, including the portfolio of market ready sites. Inclusion of this last figure appears to me to be prudent given the importance of maintaining a good range of readily available sites at all times and ensuring that there is a sound land supply at the start of the next plan period. The latter has apparently been a significant problem in the preparation of the CS in that although 150 ha remain from the UDP (of which it is intended to carry forward some 128 ha) most of this is subject to greater or lesser constraints on development.
47. Areas of search for new employment sites have been assessed as part of work on the emerging Development Sites and Places DPD, with discounting to take account of constraints. Although this has not extended to the level of individual sites, it has been sufficient to establish that it should be possible to accommodate the overall quantum of land, subject to localized review of the Green Belt. The evidence base for the total requirement is therefore sound.

### *Land requirement*

48. The 350 ha figure in Policy CSP 11 is transitional figure en route to the full requirement of 470 ha; it has been referred to in evidence as "a cautious instalment". It derives from calculations done for the Revised Preferred Options 2009 which assumed a higher jobs per hectare density than is now considered appropriate (giving a smaller overall area), and made no allowance for land to remain at the end of the plan period. It is not intended to allocate the entire quantum initially largely because of uncertainties over the economic situation and employment pattern in the longer term; release of further land will be triggered by early review of this part of the plan. This does not seem unreasonable and the managed approach is further justified by the fact that some substantial and long-allocated sites remain to be developed; and by the risk that with a large reserve, allocated in its entirety at the outset, it would be more difficult to safeguard employment land from being lost to other uses. As Policy CSP 11 makes clear that a five year supply of market ready sites will be maintained, I do not see this approach as at odds with the emphasis on a positive attitude to economic development in the recent Government statement on Planning for Growth. It should also accommodate developers' concerns about lead in times necessary to implement larger-scale development.

---

<sup>21</sup> BMBC 27

<sup>22</sup> The RS adopts a narrow definition of employment and its figures for job creation and land requirement are accordingly conservative.



49. **Changes C20-23** inclusive confirm that the 350 ha is not intended to be a final figure and I endorse them accordingly. However, these changes to supporting text, and reference there to early review of the plan to accommodate a higher figure, only go so far. To achieve soundness the matter should be covered in Policy CSP 11 itself and I recommend **Change I4** accordingly.
50. A significant proportion of the 350 ha of land allocated, let alone any further land identified in future, will need to be found from local review of the Green Belt. **Changes C2 and C19** clarify the circumstances in which this would be done. The possibility of mixed uses on employment sites, that might bring benefits of sustainability, is covered in **Changes C11 and C12**, relating to Hoyland and Royston respectively where the Council consider there is some potential for them. In my view it would not be appropriate to introduce this as a general principle for employment sites, given the number of such sites that are likely to have to come from the Green Belt, and the stringent policy constraints that must necessarily apply in that situation.

#### *Distribution of sites*

51. The distribution of employment land between the various communities is inevitably something of a compromise between what is strategically desirable and the availability of suitable, relatively unconstrained locations, but the proportionate distribution in Policy CSP 12 broadly reflects the settlement hierarchy, at least in terms of the pre-eminence of Barnsley, the balance between the western and eastern parts of the Borough, and the emphasis on the Principal Towns at the expense of "other" settlements. The distribution of land between the Principal Towns, in some cases in relatively small allocations, is justified by the historic pattern of coalfield towns and by the importance of maximising sustainability by minimizing travel distances to work. A smaller number of large strategic sites might in some respects be more attractive commercially, but would be more inflexible and less sustainable.
52. **Changes C6 - C9 and C11 - C14** give some spatial guidance on the likely form and location of new employment sites in the various communities, along the same lines as for housing (above), sufficient to render the plan sound.

#### *Existing employment land*

53. **Change C28** would delete a criterion that has no real relevance to the central purpose of Policy CSP 19, which is to conserve stocks of existing employment land which is often in intrinsically sustainable locations. It also clarifies that the Policy bears upon proposals for redevelopment of such land for purposes other than employment. Taking account of this, and of the other changes referred to, I consider that the CS economic policies are appropriate to the Borough, soundly based, likely to be effective and in accordance with regional and national policy.

### ***Transport***

**Issue 5 - Whether the CS transport strategy is soundly based, likely to be effective, and consistent with national and regional planning policy. Whether it provides a sufficient basis for the CS as a whole and adequate guidance for the**

**Development Sites and Places DPD; and whether there is sufficient commitment by other agencies.**

54. Policy CSP 23 sets out six broad priorities for improving accessibility which will provide a focus for investment. Incorporating the Borough's transport strategy into the CS has not been without problems and much of it appears to consist of aspirations, general statements of intent and intentions to undertake further work. The nub of the strategy is in Points (A) to (D) of Policy CSP 23, the combined effect of which is to concentrate investment in transport in and around Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns, east of the M1 motorway.
55. The Council consider the Accessibility Improvement Zone (A) to be a useful policy tool to align their transport priorities with those of the Leeds and Sheffield City Regions and to enhance opportunities for project funding; and it will clearly provide an umbrella for a wide range of individual policy approaches under (C) and (D), including working with the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive and public transport operators to improve cross links between the Principal Towns. It is consistent with the designation of Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns as foci for growth.
56. The Council have clarified that the Northern Barnsley Connectivity Study (B) is a process, rather than a study likely to lead to a specific project, in that it models local transport networks, enabling solutions to problems to be tested and evidence assembled to justify project expenditure. **Change C29** addresses this point, clarifying that the relevant priority is implementation of accessibility improvements informed by the Study, rather than of the Study itself, and thus makes the approach sound. Although opinions of representors differ about the merits of the "northern access route" referred to under the heading of the Connectivity Study in the supporting text (and referred to elsewhere as the Northern Orbital Route), I have seen no evidence that it is more than the "possibility" the CS describes it to be. No work has apparently been done to advance the case for its construction, there is no real prospect of funding in the present financial climate and it appears unlikely that the road would be built during the plan period. The Council say that the spatial strategy does not depend upon completion of such a route, which appears to have addressed concerns of the Highways Agency, as confirmed by a statement of common ground. For all these reasons no changes are necessary for soundness reasons to what the CS says about the proposal.
57. Network Rail support the Council's approach in Policy CSP 24 to safeguarding the routes of former railway lines for possible reopening, with particular reference to lines between Barnsley and Doncaster and to Cudworth. Although not necessary to implement the CS, such safeguarding is clearly prudent in view of the lengthy timescale that would be needed for any reinstatement. There are no other rail-related proposals sufficiently far advanced to justify making the policy wider or more proactive in scope.
58. Other policies dealing with the transport implications of new development, parking and reducing the impact of road travel suffer to a greater or lesser extent from the problems identified in para. 54, above, but in my view they do not go to the heart of the soundness of the CS. I conclude that, subject to the change referred to above, the transport policies are sound, adequate to inform the rest of the CS and the Development Sites and Places DPD; and that there

is sufficient commitment by other agencies to their implementation.

**Issue 6 - Whether the CS is founded upon reliable evidence on infrastructure; whether there are any significant infrastructure problems that would prejudice its implementation; and whether there is sufficient commitment to the spatial strategy from infrastructure providers.**

59. Preparation of the CS was not informed by an infrastructure study and the only substantive policy reference to the subject is in Policy CSP 42 which takes a general, and essentially reactive, approach to funding of infrastructure by developers. However, a detailed infrastructure study commissioned by the Council has now been published, albeit in draft<sup>23</sup>, and concludes that there are no critical issues relating to delivery of infrastructure required to support the growth proposed over the next five years. Over this period development will be able to go ahead using existing infrastructure, in some cases by improving its efficiency and maximising outputs from investment already made. Also, although the CS was not underpinned by an infrastructure study, the Council point to the fact that they were able to take advantage during preparatory work of significant amounts of data on the subject collected in support of funding bids for major capital projects developed by themselves and partners.
60. In the longer term the study identifies a number of concerns, including problems of access to services for people in the eastern part of the Borough, and local imbalances and inadequacies in education, recreation and health provision. Limited accessibility is part and parcel of more general social and economic problems and should be capable of being addressed through both improvements in the Accessibility Improvement Zone and the better services provided through facilities such as the Advanced Learning Centres. I have seen no evidence to suggest that the other concerns identified are pressing, incapable of solution at reasonable cost or so serious as to be likely to prejudice successful implementation of the CS.
61. The Council consulted infrastructure providers during preparation of the CS, as did the authors of the infrastructure study. No representations have been received suggesting that any of these foresee major problems or are at odds with the CS. The Council also propose to explore potential new sources of funding such as prudential borrowing, the Community Infrastructure Levy and Tax Increment Financing in order to address reduced funding for infrastructure from other sources.
62. To assert the soundness of the infrastructure base **Change C41** would insert into the CS the table of infrastructure funding commitments and proposals from the infrastructure study, as set out in **Appendix C** to this report. This is inevitably something of a snapshot view that will need to be updated as implementation of the CS proceeds but it is a step in the right direction and I endorse the Change accordingly. Subject to this I conclude that the CS is founded on reliable evidence on infrastructure, that there are no major foreseeable problems in this area likely to prejudice its implementation and that there is sufficient commitment to it from infrastructure providers.

---

<sup>23</sup> BMBC 38 and BMBC 63. Part 1 was published in June 2010 and Part 2 in March 2011.

## ***Green Belt***

### **Issue 7 - Whether the Core Strategy Green Belt policy is soundly based, properly justified, likely to be effective and consistent with national and regional planning policy.**

63. As noted above, fulfilling the identified requirement for employment land will require identification of sites within the Green Belt. There is a dearth of previously developed land available for the purpose and much safeguarded land is too close to housing or otherwise too constrained to be suitable. Whereas PPG2 advises that the general extent of a Green Belt, once approved, should be altered only in exceptional circumstances, RS Policy YH9 countenances localized review of boundaries where "...necessary...to deliver the Core Approach..." and "meet identifiable development needs for which locations in Regional and Sub Regional Cities and Towns are not available and for which alternative sites would be significantly less sustainable". This covers what the Council have in mind and I see nothing in national guidance that would preclude localized review intended to accommodate a specific land use or uses. The Council apparently intend to undertake the localized review, settlement by settlement, through the Development Sites and Places DPD.
64. As I conclude above (para. 33) that sufficient housing land has been identified to support the CS housing strategy I agree with the Council that there is no justification for a review of Green Belt boundaries to identify further such land. Nor am I convinced on the available evidence that to undertake such a review would produce an intrinsically more sustainable pattern of development. The appraisal of Green Belt and safeguarded land through the SHLAA is less than clear, as became evident through detailed discussion at the hearings, but this does not fundamentally affect my conclusion on the essential soundness of that document. How safeguarded land may or may not be brought forward for development is a matter for the Development Sites and Places DPD. **Changes C2, C35 and C36** clarify the scope and purpose of the limited Green Belt review proposed (which will also cover inaccuracies and anomalies in boundaries as well as identification of employment sites). I endorse them as rendering the plan sound. Subject to that I consider the Green Belt policy to be sound, justified, likely to be effective and in line with national and regional planning policy.

## ***Town centres***

### **Issue 8 - Whether the Core Strategy policies for town centres are soundly based, likely to be effective and consistent with national and regional planning policy.**

65. Policy CSP 31 seeks to maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the Borough's centres at town, district and local levels and sets out the relative importance of those levels. It is not particularly detailed, and does not add substantively to national advice but it is not intrinsically unsound in its approach.
66. The supporting text to Policy CSP 31 supplies brief information on the proposed Barnsley Markets redevelopment, a key project for the future of the town centre, and an even briefer indication of the roles of the lower order

centres. **Changes C31-C33** together provide substantially more information that provides a clearer and more detailed strategic direction and I endorse them in the interests of soundness.

67. The supporting text also states that, on the basis of the Retail Analysis and Health Check of Barnsley Town Centre 2007<sup>24</sup>, after the Markets project is complete there will be some limited capacity for new convenience floorspace but little for new comparison space. This has been criticized as an inappropriate conclusion based on outdated evidence and it has also been stated that there is no realistic prospect of the Markets project being started in the near future. The Council say that an update of the analysis is under way and that, although the project has been delayed, it is intended to commence in 2012 with completion in 2015. Although in the current economic climate there must inevitably be considerable uncertainty over major schemes like this, I have seen no compelling evidence that the Markets project has ceased to be a commitment; and at some stage a plan must be published on the basis of the best information currently available. Taken to excess, to delay in order to take account of the very latest information would result in nothing ever being produced. From all that I have seen I believe that the retail policies are founded on adequately robust evidence, are likely to be effective and are consistent with national and regional advice.

### ***The environment***

#### **Issue 9 - Whether the CS environment policies are soundly based, appropriate to the Borough, likely to be effective, and consistent with national and regional planning policy<sup>25</sup>.**

68. Policy CSP 29 reflects the importance of good design, well related to its context, as promulgated in national advice and highlights particular features and areas of the Borough that are particularly deserving of careful design treatment. Reference to assessing design of housing against Building for Life criteria remains valid as the scheme has survived the demise of the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment and in view of the way in which Barnsley and other South Yorkshire local authorities are evidently applying its principles in design guidance. As this aspect of the policy is couched in terms that development "should...achieve" a certain rating, it is not dogmatic; and the proviso "or equivalent" takes account of the possibility that this particular scheme might be superseded by another.
69. The criticism of the approach to the historic environment (Policy CSP 30) by English Heritage and others on the grounds that it is insufficiently positive and proactive (in the words of PPS5, Planning for the Historic Environment) has essentially been addressed by **Change C30** which amplifies the supporting text. This both gives more detail on the Borough's particular historic legacy and expresses the Council's intention to work with others to realise the contribution that that legacy can make to regeneration. I endorse the change accordingly.

---

<sup>24</sup> BMBC 9

<sup>25</sup> I interpret "environment" widely here, to include policies in the Local Character, Green Infrastructure, Minerals and Contaminated Land and Pollution sections of the CS but not Green Belt which is addressed separately, above.

70. The approach to safeguarding green infrastructure (Policy CSP 33) is clear, focussed and locally distinctive but the approach to green space under Policy CSP 35 is less satisfactory in that it effectively defines such space as "**any** (my emphasis) land within or close to towns and villages that is or could be used...for recreation or by wildlife." This definition is too open and, although the supporting text gives examples of types of green space, these cannot be exhaustive. Misapplied, the policy as it stands could unreasonably restrict supply of otherwise acceptable windfall sites for housing and in my view renders the approach unsound. **Change I5** introduces a test of demonstrable value to make the Policy both justified and effective.
71. Para. 9.9.9 of the supporting text refers to green corridors as one particular aspect of green infrastructure and states that through the Development Sites and Places DPD the Council will consider the role that the Barnsley Canal and Dearne and Dove Canals might play in this context. However, what is said stops short of referring to their restoration as functioning canals, perhaps understandably in view of the scale and likely costs of the work involved. This is unfortunate as such restoration projects invariably take a considerable time to come to fruition, during which it is particularly important to ensure that actions are not taken that would preclude restoration altogether. The present approach is arguably unsound in terms of not effectively dovetailing with the more proactive planning approach to the Barnsley Canal taken in adjoining Wakefield. I therefore endorse as justified and effective **Change C34**, which adds a reference to the Development Sites and Places DPD considering the possibility of restoration of the canals and safeguarding of routes, where proven deliverable.
72. The Council accept that the CS approach to minerals does not comply with national guidance in that Policy CSP 38 states that the Development Sites and Places DPD will identify existing mineral extraction sites and areas of search but that there is no intention to identify Mineral Safeguarding Areas. The principal source of national advice is Minerals Policy Statement 1, Planning and Minerals, which advises that minerals should be safeguarded **as far as possible** (my emphasis) and that plans should define Mineral Safeguarding Areas to ensure that proven resources are not needlessly sterilised by development. I understand the Council's stance that this leaves some scope for judgement, which in their case is that to designate such safeguarding areas for coal and fireclay and brick clay would cover virtually the whole Borough and could be seen as imposing an undue burden on all applicants for planning permission in terms of addressing the possible case for extraction.
73. That said, the national guidance clearly seeks clarity and certainty in safeguarding minerals, an issue given added importance by the strategic significance of coal as an energy source. Nor does safeguarding resources mean that they would necessarily be exploited in all cases; simply that there should be an opportunity to consider exploitation, and it would be open to the Council to devise appropriate "sieve" policies in the forthcoming DPD to define those cases to which such consideration should be given. The important point is that there should be some mechanism to ensure that potentially valuable resources of coal and clay are not unnecessarily sterilised. **Changes C37 and C38** make a commitment to do this through the Development Sites and Places DPD and I endorse them accordingly in the interests of clarity and effectiveness. **Change C39** clarifies the application of national advice to

sandstone, which could be locally useful for repair and restoration of older buildings, and corrects a factual inaccuracy in the existing text, thus rendering it sound.

74. **Change C40** adds to Policy CSP 39 on Contaminated Land references to stability issues and contamination of water, in response to representations from the Coal Authority and Environment Agency respectively. I endorse these as making the Policy sound. Subject to the various changes I conclude that the environment policies are soundly based, appropriate, likely to be effective and consistent with national and regional policy.

### **Monitoring**

#### **Issue 10 - Whether the Core Strategy contains realistic, achievable targets, and appropriate indicators to monitor the performance and delivery of the strategy and policies; delivery mechanisms and timescales for implementation and an indication of agencies responsible.**

75. In its present form the Monitoring and Indicators section of the CS is palpably unsound. There are mismatches between policies and targets with some very general policies having unrealistically precise targets. A good number of policies, including some crucial to the essential direction of the strategy, have no targets at all. Some targets are couched in unhelpfully general terms; and others are no more than statements of intent to undertake further work.
76. The Council have comprehensively revised this section and targets, indicators and implementation mechanisms for policies are now helpfully grouped under policy themes with cross references to strategic objectives and the ambitions of the Sustainable Community Strategy. Targets and indicators are now clearly and directly related to policies and are set out in realistic and measurable terms. Implementation mechanisms and key partners are set out in some detail.
77. The revision is not the last word on the subject. The Council accept that some indicators are new and will require additional work on collection and analysis of data. There is also some uncertainty over the ultimate shape of some of the indicators in the light of the Government's decision to no longer require local authorities to report against National Indicators, and the related consultations on alternatives. However, I have no doubt that the Council will monitor and review the performance of the monitoring section itself. Meanwhile, subject to Section 10 of the CS being replaced by **Appendix B** to this report in accordance with **Change C42**, I am satisfied that the mechanisms for monitoring and implementing the strategy are realistic, well founded and appropriate, and therefore sound.

### **Legal Requirements**

78. My examination of the compliance of the CS with the legal requirements is summarised in the table below. I conclude that the CS meets them all. The limited aspects in which it does not comply fully with the requirements of the Local Development Scheme and Statement of Community Involvement do not detract from that assessment.

<b>LEGAL REQUIREMENTS</b>	
Local Development Scheme (LDS)	The CS is identified within the approved LDS 2007-2011. Its content is compliant with the LDS except that the originally proposed strategic approach to waste management is now being pursued through a joint waste plan with adjoining local planning authorities rather than as part of the CS. The LDS gives a submission date for the CS of February 2009 whereas it was in fact submitted in September 2010. The Council say that on the advice of the then Government Office the programme in the LDS was not revised.
Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and relevant regulations	The SCI was adopted in 2006 and consultation has been compliant with its requirements except that presentations of Revised Preferred Options were not made to Area Forum Meetings in 2009 as those Forums had been disbanded and their replacements, Area Partnerships, had not then been established.
Sustainability Appraisal (SA)	SA has been carried out and is adequate.
Appropriate Assessment (AA)	The Appropriate Assessment Screening report (February 2010) sets out why AA is not necessary.
National Policy	The CS complies with national policy except where indicated and changes are recommended.
Regional Strategy (RS)	The CS is in general conformity with the RS.
Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)	Satisfactory regard has been paid to the SCS.
2004 Act and Regulations (as amended)	The CS complies with the Act and the Regulations.

## Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

**79. I conclude that with the changes proposed by the Council, set out in Appendices A, B and C, and the changes that I recommend, set out in Appendix E, the Barnsley Core Strategy DPD satisfies the requirements of S20(5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria for soundness in PPS12. Therefore I recommend that the plan be changed accordingly. And for the avoidance of doubt, I endorse the Council's proposed minor changes, set out in Appendix D.**

*Robin Brooks*

### INSPECTOR

This report is accompanied by:

Appendices A, B and C (separate documents); Council changes that go to soundness

Appendix D (separate document); Council's minor changes



Appendix E (attached); Changes that the Inspector considers necessary to make the plan sound

**APPENDIX E****CHANGES THAT THE INSPECTOR CONSIDERS NECESSARY TO MAKE THE PLAN SOUND**

<b>Policy/Para.</b>	<b>Change required</b>	<b>Change Ref.</b>
CSP 2 Sustainable Construction	In the second sentence replace "requirement" with "target".	I1
CSP4 Flood Risk	Under the fourth and fifth bullet points replace "requiring" with "expecting".	I2
CSP 5 Including Renewable Energy in Developments	In the first sentence insert "and other appropriate design measures" after "low carbon energy sources".  Add at the end of the sentence: "subject to such measures being practicable and not unacceptably prejudicing the viability of the development".	I3
CSP 11 Providing Strategic Employment Locations	Insert after the final sentence:  "Additional land may be allocated in response to reduction in supply or increase in demand during the plan period, identified through review of this Policy".	I4
CSP 35 Green Space	In the second sentence replace "is or could be used by people for recreation or by wildlife" with "has or could have demonstrable value for recreation or wildlife".	I5
Para. 9.4.11	Insert new paragraph after paragraph 9.4.11:  "The current Strategic Housing Market Assessment estimates that there is a need for some 597 affordable homes per year. A provisional target is that 18% of the total housing requirement during the plan period, or some 2,780 dwellings, should be affordable homes. These figures will change over time. They will be regularly monitored and reviewed and any changes will be set out in a Supplementary Planning Document. Additional affordable housing may be delivered by other partners." <sup>26</sup>	I6

<sup>26</sup> This change replaces the Council's Change C26.

Policy CSP10 The Distribution of New Homes	Replace the Policy as set out below:	I7
--	--------------------------------------	----

"We will seek to distribute new homes for the period 2008 to 2026 as follows:

Location	Settlement hierarchy status	Number of homes	% figure representation of Submitted CS total of 21500 new homes
Urban Barnsley	Urban Barnsley	9800	46
Cudworth	Principal town	1800	8
Goldthorpe	Principal town	3000	14
Hoyland	Principal town	1800	8
Penistone	Principal town	1100	5
Royston	Principal town	1000	5
Wombwell	Principal town	2000	9
Other Settlements	Large and small villages	1000	5
Total		21500	100

The above figures are indicative and rounded."

**APPENDIX A**

**Further proposed changes to Submission Version of the Core Strategy  
Consolidated Schedule April 2011**

*This document has been produced to support the Submission version of the Core Strategy. It sets out the proposed changes to be made to the policies and supporting text of the Submission version of the Core Strategy. These changes are proposed as a response to a number of initial soundness concerns which were raised by the Planning Inspector (set out in the Further Proposed Changes Table of January 2011) and the requested changes which arose through the Examination Hearings (Requested Changes for Sessions 1-6)*

*The schedule below lists all the changes which are proposed in the order they appear in the document.*

<b>Core Strategy Policy/Paragraph</b>	<b>Change required</b>	<b>Change Ref</b>
3. Relationship with Other Plans and Strategies		
Paragraph 3.15	<p><b>Delete existing paragraph 3.15 (retain bulleted list) and insert new paragraph:</b></p> <p>Following the Publication of the Core Strategy the Yorkshire and Humber Plan: Regional Spatial Strategy to 2026 was revoked. At the time of Submission the legal challenge on the revocation had not been made and in line with the government guidance at that time, the RSS was no longer considered to form part of the development plan. Since Cala Homes' successful legal challenge the RSS is at the present time part of the development plan. The Core Strategy was prepared in the context of being in conformity with the RSS and we have not altered its approach. It is considered that at the present time, and following the eventual revocation of RSS the spatial strategy for the borough and the strategic policies set out in this Core Strategy are considered to remain valid and are the preferred approach for Barnsley.</p> <p><b>Insert new sentence before bulleted list following paragraph 3.15:</b></p> <p>There are many elements of the RSS and its evidence base that remain relevant to this Core Strategy. These are:"</p>	C1
6. Spatial Strategy		
Paragraph 6.5	<p><b>Delete existing Paragraph 6.5 and insert new paragraph:</b></p> <p>Since it is considered that the planned growth with respect to housing numbers can be accommodated without the need</p>	C2

	<p>to encroach into the Green Belt, there will be no full scale review of the Green Belt during the plan period. A localized review will take place and will include minor changes to the Green Belt boundary to address such things as mapping anomalies, accuracy issues and changes in physical features and to provide more defensible boundaries. Changes will be shown on the Proposals Maps that will accompany the Development Sites and Places DPD. We will apply the term localized review to a small adjustment to the Green Belt boundary such as these, or to a site of significant size if it is needed to meet identifiable development needs. Specifically this would be for new employment land as identified in CSP11 Providing Strategic Employment Locations and evidenced by the Employment Land Review.</p> <p>Employment sites will only be identified in the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances which would justify a localized review of the Green Belt boundaries. Such exceptional circumstances would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• where there is an over-riding need to accommodate what would otherwise be inappropriate development,</li> <li>• where the development is necessary to deliver the spatial strategy,</li> <li>• where the development cannot be met elsewhere (on non Green Belt land), or</li> <li>• where Green Belt land offers the most sustainable option.</li> </ul>	
Paragraph 6.8	<p><b>Add following to the end of paragraph 6.8.</b></p> <p>'The general extent of Darton is intended to be that of the Darton UDP Community Area with the exception of the Green Belt to the north and west of the built up area (the built up area includes Darton, Staincross, Kexbrough, and Mapplewell). The general extent of Dodworth is intended to be that of the built up area of Dodworth UDP Community Area (including UDP Safeguarded land)'</p>	C3
<b>7. Spatial Portrait</b>		
Table 7.4 Settlement Hierarchy	<p><b>Amend</b> table at 7.4 to include Birdwell in the brackets after Hoyland Principal Town. From same table <b>delete</b> Birdwell from the list of villages.</p>	C4
Paragraph 7.9	<p><b>Add to the end of Para 7.9</b></p> <p>'It is within Urban Barnsley as a whole where most development should take place'.</p> <p>Delete Para 7.12</p>	C5
Paragraph 7.12 (now deleted)	<p><b>Add after Paragraph 7.12 (now deleted):</b></p> <p><u>Urban Barnsley</u></p>	C6

	<p>The Core Strategy policy CSP8 prioritises Urban Barnsley for development and identifies it as the main focus for housing, employment, shopping, health, leisure, business and public services in the region.</p> <p>CSP10 anticipates 9800 new homes for Urban Barnsley over the plan period. These homes will be distributed amongst the towns neighbourhoods using greenfield and previously developed safeguarded sites in proximity to good bus services. They will respect established neighbourhood character and integrate new development into networks of greenspace incorporating cycleways and footpaths.</p> <p>The opportunities for significant new housing in Darton afforded by the former colliery and other greenfield safeguarded sites will be fully explored as will those prompted by the soon to be redundant Kingstone and Priory (Lundwood) school sites. The potential opportunities in Dodworth will also be explored taking advantage of local employment and railway station.</p> <p>CSP12 anticipates the allocation of between 130 - 155 hectares of employment land in Urban Barnsley over the plan period.</p> <p>This land will be distributed in sustainable locations across Urban Barnsley and is likely to include land which was previously allocated in the UDP for employment use, which is suitable for continued allocation, particularly in Darton, Dodworth and Stairfoot and new employment land allocations.</p> <p>A number of opportunities for new employment land are being investigated. UDP safeguarded land adjacent to the recently opened West Green Link Road, Green Belt land adjacent to Claycliffe Business Park and the redundant Kingstone school site feature amongst the areas of opportunity, although this is not an exhaustive list.</p> <p>CSP17 supports the housing regeneration programmes in Urban Barnsley including those at Athersley/New Lodge and Worsbrough.</p> <p>In terms of transport CSP23 includes Urban Barnsley within the Accessibility Improvement Zone (AIZ) which is a focus for transport investment and improving accessibility. Urban Barnsley is also within the priority area for the Northern Barnsley Connectivity Study. CSP27 sets out the intention to develop a town centre parking strategy to influence people's travel choices.</p> <p>CSP29 expects a high quality development that will respect the distinctive features of Barnsley particularly in the Town Centre. The Conservation Areas in the town centre and Listed Buildings will be protected and improved by CSP30. CSP31 identifies Barnsley Town Centre as the dominant town centre in the borough with a sub regional role and will direct new retail and town centre uses here. The smaller local centres within Urban Barnsley will be supported to meet</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>the needs of their local area. CSP20 seeks to promote tourism and encourage the growth and development of cultural provision which is important in Barnsley town centre.</p> <p>CSP33 identifies the River Dearne Valley Corridor and the Historic Landscape Corridor as strategic parts of Barnsley's Green Infrastructure network. CSP34 protects the Green Belt the primary purpose of which in Urban Barnsley is to prevent the built up areas merging with the surrounding settlements of Cudworth, Royston, Darfield, Wombwell, Dodworth and Higham and to maintain the separate identity and character of these settlements in relation to surrounding countryside and landscape features.</p> <p>We want to encourage growth in what are our most accessible and sustainable locations in the borough. Urban Barnsley will be the main focus for development, and will support the important role of Barnsley Town Centre and the creation of a uniquely distinctive 21<sup>st</sup> Century Market town. We will protect the local distinctiveness of the places which make up Urban Barnsley, respect their separation and individuality, and support housing regeneration where the housing market is failing.</p>	
<p>Paragraph 7.20</p>	<p><b>Add after paragraph 7.20:</b></p> <p><u>The Dearne Towns</u>  The Core Strategy policy CSP8 identifies the Principal Towns such as Goldthorpe as a priority for development and the main local focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities.</p> <p>CSP10 anticipates 3000 new homes for Goldthorpe over the plan period. This is the highest number after Urban Barnsley. Many of the homes already have planning permission and are waiting to be built. The remainder will be identified for housing in the Development Sites and Places DPD within the three settlements that make up the Principal Town and are likely to be on greenfield and brownfield land around the periphery of the towns and central Goldthorpe associated with town centre regeneration.</p> <p>CSP12 anticipates the allocation of between 55 - 65 hectares of employment land in the Dearne Towns over the plan period.</p> <p>This is likely to include land which was previously allocated in the UDP for employment use, which is suitable for continued allocation, in Goldthorpe and Thurnscoe and new employment land allocations. Opportunities for new employment land may include the expansion of the successful Goldthorpe Industrial Estate into Green Belt land on the western periphery of Goldthorpe.</p>	<p>C7</p>

	<p>CSP17 supports the housing regeneration programmes in Goldthorpe, Bolton on Dearne and Thurnscoe which form part of the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder.</p> <p>In terms of transport CSP23 includes the Dearne Towns within the Accessibility Improvement Zone (AIZ) which is a focus for transport investment and improving accessibility. It also sets out the intention to deliver a Community Accessibility Study for the Dearne Towns. A pilot study has already been carried out in the Dearne Towns the findings of which are being used to inform and action plan to deliver improvements in accessibility to services. CSP31 identifies Goldthorpe as a District Centre with an important role serving localized catchments and meeting more local needs and will direct new retail and town centre uses here. The smaller local centres of Bolton on Dearne, Thurnscoe (Houghton Road) and Thurnscoe (Shepherd Lane) will be supported to meet the needs of their local area.</p> <p>CSP33 identifies the Dearne Valley Green Heart Corridor as a strategic part of Barnsley's Green Infrastructure network and the Dearne Valley Eco-Vision seeks to re-imagine the area as a low carbon community. CSP34 protects the Green Belt around Goldthorpe, Thurnscoe, and Bolton upon Dearne which safeguards the countryside, preventing the merging of the settlements and encouraging investment in the urban areas which assists regeneration.</p> <p>We want to regenerate and enhance the Dearne Towns which have suffered since the end of the coalmining industry, and are doing so through major regeneration schemes and masterplanning. We will plan for the towns of Goldthorpe, Thurnscoe and Bolton on Dearne together but will ensure that they retain their own unique identities at the heart of the Dearne Valley Eco-vision.</p>	
<p>Paragraph 7.28</p>	<p><b>Add after paragraph 7.28:</b></p> <p><u>Cudworth</u> The Core Strategy policy CSP8 identifies the Principal Towns such as Cudworth as a priority for development and the main local focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities.</p> <p>CSP10 anticipates 1800 homes for Cudworth over the plan period. The opportunities will be explored for new housing at both peripheral and central locations along the high frequency bus route which uses the now much more lightly trafficked road passing through Cudworth shopping centre. Some growth will also occur in Grimethorpe but will be less than other parts of the Principal Town to reflect the extent of change that has already occurred there and allow this to consolidate.</p> <p>CSP12 anticipates the allocation of between 70 - 80 hectares of employment land in Cudworth over the plan period.</p>	<p>C8</p>



	<p>This is likely to include land in Grimethorpe which was previously allocated in the UDP for employment use, which is suitable for continued allocation, primarily within the Park Springs, Grimethorpe employment area and new employment land allocations. Opportunities for new employment land may include the expansion of the successful Park Springs, Grimethorpe employment land area into Green Belt land between Cudworth and Grimethorpe.</p> <p>CSP17 supports the housing regeneration programme in Grimethorpe which forms part of the Green Corridor initiative.</p> <p>In terms of transport CSP23 includes Cudworth within the Accessibility Improvement Zone (AIZ) which is a focus for transport investment and improving accessibility. Cudworth is also within the priority area for the Northern Barnsley Connectivity Study and will benefit from a Community Accessibility Study. CSP24 sets out the intention to safeguard historical rail alignments to accommodate the potential reinstatement of former strategic railway lines including the former Cudworth line. CSP31 identifies Cudworth as a District Centre with an important role serving localized catchments and meeting more local needs and will direct new retail and town centre uses here. The smaller local centre of Grimethorpe will be supported to meet the needs of the local area.</p> <p>CSP34 protects the Green Belt which maintains the separate identities of Cudworth, Grimethorpe, Shafton and Brierley and prevents the settlements merging into one another, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assisting in urban regeneration.</p> <p>We want to take the opportunity of the new Advanced Learning Centre to improve social cohesion in Cudworth and to continue the improvement in the community infrastructure that the new primary care health centre has begun. We will plan for Cudworth, Shafton and Grimethorpe together but will ensure that we protect their individual distinctiveness. We will progress and consolidate the success of regeneration schemes completed and already underway such as the new bypass around Cudworth and the opportunity now provided by the reduction of through traffic presents to improve the public realm.</p>	
<p>Paragraph 7.31</p>	<p><b>Delete last sentence of paragraph 7.31 and insert the following text:</b></p> <p><u>Wombwell</u>  The Core Strategy policy CSP8 identifies the Principal Towns such as Wombwell as a priority for development and the main local focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities.</p> <p>CSP10 anticipates 2000 new homes for Wombwell over the plan period. Many of these homes will be built on the soon to be redundant Wombwell and Foulstone school sites. There are also opportunities to assess potential for new housing on central and peripheral UDP safeguarded land sites.</p>	<p>C9</p>

	<p>CSP12 anticipates the allocation of between 10 - 15 hectares of employment land in Wombwell over the plan period.</p> <p>This is likely to include land in Wombwell which was previously allocated in the UDP for employment use, which is suitable for continued allocation, and new employment land allocations. Opportunities for new employment land may include Green Belt land to the east of Darfield, which takes advantage of the transport links offered by the Dearne Valley Parkway. There are also opportunities to assess potential for new employment land on UDP safeguarded land sites.</p> <p>In terms of transport CSP23 includes Wombwell within the Accessibility Improvement Zone (AIZ) which is a focus for transport investment and improving accessibility and will benefit from a Community Accessibility Study. CSP24 sets out the intention to safeguard historical rail alignments to accommodate the potential reinstatement of former strategic railway lines including the Barnsley Doncaster route. CSP31 identifies Wombwell as a District Centre with an important role serving localized catchments and meeting more local needs and will direct new retail and town centre uses here. The smaller local centre of Darfield will be supported to meet the needs of the local area.</p> <p>CSP33 identifies the River Dove Valley Corridor as a strategic part of Barnsley's Green Infrastructure network. CSP34 protects the Green Belt which is important in protecting the narrow open areas on the southern edge of the area between Wombwell, Brampton, Cortonwood, Hemingfield, Elsecar, Jump, Hoyland and Platts Common. The Green Belt in Darfield maintains the separation between settlements and protects their character and the open land between them.</p> <p>We want Wombwell to continue to flourish as one of the borough's largest district centres offering a range of services and facilities. We will support the centre in Darfield possibly by way of added retail provision on the redundant Foulstone school site. The new Advanced Learning Centre, which is located between Wombwell and Darfield adjacent to Netherwood Country Park, will improve, integrate and coordinate the social and leisure facilities of the town as well as adding sustainable transport links. We will support improved connections between the two settlements whilst continuing to promote the distinctiveness of both communities.</p>	
<p>Para 7.32 Spatial Portrait (Hoyland)</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> Paragraph 7.32 to include Birdwell in the list of settlements included within Hoyland Principal Town (3<sup>rd</sup> sentence)</p>	<p>C10</p>
<p>Paragraph 7.33</p>	<p><b>Add after paragraph 7.33:</b></p> <p><u>Hoyland</u></p>	<p>C11</p>

	<p>The Core Strategy policy CSP8 identifies the Principal Towns such as Hoyland as a priority for development and the main local focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities.</p> <p>CSP10 anticipates 1800 new homes for Hoyland over the plan period. This growth will be accommodated on sites within Hoyland Principal Town where there are opportunities on greenfield UDP safeguarded sites on the periphery of the town. The area around Elsecar railway station is also a potential housing opportunity.</p> <p>CSP12 anticipates the allocation of between 50 – 65 hectares of employment land in Hoyland over the plan period.</p> <p>This is likely to include land in Hoyland which was previously allocated in the UDP for employment use, which is suitable for continued allocation, primarily along the Dearne Valley Parkway, and new employment land allocations. Opportunities for new employment land may include Green Belt land adjacent to the Dearne Valley Parkway and Junction 36 of the M1. There are also opportunities to consider greenfield UDP safeguarded land on the periphery of the settlement.</p> <p>It is anticipated that some of the sites being assessed may have the potential for mixed use development. Further detail on this will be considered in the Development Sites and Places DPD.</p> <p>CSP20 seeks to promote tourism and encourage growth of cultural provision and will safeguard and promote existing assets such as the Elsecar Heritage Centre.</p> <p>In terms of transport CSP23 includes Hoyland within the Accessibility Improvement Zone (AIZ) which is a focus for transport investment and improving accessibility and sets out that it will benefit from a Community Accessibility Study. CSP31 identifies Hoyland as a District Centre with an important role serving localized catchments and meeting more local needs and will direct new retail and town centre uses here.</p> <p>CSP34 protects the Green Belt which in Hoyland is drawn tight around the smaller settlements such as Worsbrough Village and Blacker Hill. This maintains an important break between Hoyland and Chapeltown, also between Hoyland and Jump and between Birdwell and Worsbrough Village and the main built up area of Barnsley.</p> <p>We want Hoyland to grow in housing and employment terms taking advantage of its accessible location and utilising strategic transport links. We will plan for Birdwell, Hemingfield, Jump, Blacker Hill and Elsecar along with Hoyland whilst seeking to protect their unique identities. The defined centres will be supported and additional development, particularly in Hoyland town centre will be welcomed to improve the vitality and vitality of this district centre and to compliment the LIFT centre which is nearing completion.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>Paragraph 7.36</p>	<p><b>Amend paragraph 7.36 to delete first two sentences ‘The Core Strategy.....could be improved.’ Delete ‘also’ from next sentence and add following wording after paragraph 7.36:</b></p> <p><u>Royston</u>  The Core Strategy policy CSP8 identifies the Principal Towns such as Royston as a priority for development and the main local focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities.</p> <p>CSP10 anticipates 1000 new homes for Royston over the plan period. Central Royston housing opportunities include the redundant Royston school sites as well as on peripheral greenfield sites. Additionally there is the opportunity to consider using part of the UDP safeguarded land on the western side of Royston. CSP17 supports the housing regeneration programme in Royston which forms part of the Green Corridor initiative and this will be an important consideration when planning housing provision in the town.</p> <p>CSP12 anticipates the allocation of between 10 – 15 hectares of employment land in Royston over the plan period.</p> <p>Due to the current limited supply of employment land in Royston this will be met through new employment land allocations which may include using part of the greenfield UDP safeguarded land on the western side of Royston, which could have potential for mixed use development. Further detail on this will be considered in the Development Sites and Places DPD.</p> <p>CSP17 supports the housing regeneration programme in Royston which forms part of the Green Corridor initiative.</p> <p>In terms of transport CSP23 includes Royston within the Accessibility Improvement Zone (AIZ) which is a focus for transport investment and improving accessibility. Royston is also within the priority area for the Northern Barnsley Connectivity Study and will benefit from a Community Accessibility Study. CSP24 sets out the intention to safeguard historical rail alignments to accommodate the potential reinstatement of former strategic railway lines including the former Cudworth line.</p> <p>CSP31 identifies Royston as a District Centre with an important role serving localized catchments and meeting more local needs and will direct new retail and town centre uses here. CSP34 protects the Green Belt around Royston which serves the purpose of maintaining the physical separation of Royston, Staincross and Athersley, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assisting regeneration.</p> <p>We want to support growth and change in Royston. The redevelopment of the former school site offers the opportunity for regeneration and consolidation of the town centre and its two shopping areas, possibly including new retail provision.</p>	<p>C12</p>
-----------------------	--	------------

	<p>Additionally the site is likely to deliver additional housing and green space that will transform this area of the town. Coupled with the housing and employment growth that will occur elsewhere in Royston over the plan period this will result in important changes for the town. We will ensure this is carried out in a way which increases the sustainability and accessibility of the town.</p>	
<p>Paragraphs 7.39 and 7.40</p>	<p><b>Delete existing paragraph 7.39 and add following wording after paragraph 7.40</b></p> <p><u>Penistone</u>  The Core Strategy policy CSP8 identifies the Principal Towns such as Penistone as a priority for development and the main local focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities. Development in Penistone will be restricted to that which will facilitate Penistone's renaissance as a market town.</p> <p>CSP10 anticipates 1100 new homes for Penistone over the plan period. In order to support the town's economic regeneration CSP10 provides for 1100 new homes at Penistone over the plan period. A large proportion of these homes already have planning permission and are waiting to be built. Additional land will need to be allocated in the town to accommodate the remaining dwelling requirement. This will be greenfield and previously developed sites that are within the built up area with possibly limited peripheral greenfield sites</p> <p>CSP12 anticipates the allocation of between 4.5 – 6.5 hectares of employment land in Penistone over the plan period. This is likely to include land in Penistone which was previously allocated in the UDP for employment use which is suitable for continued allocation, and new employment land allocations.</p> <p>In terms of transport CSP23 identifies Penistone for a Community Accessibility Study which will aim to improve accessibility to housing, leisure, retail, work and leisure facilities. CSP29 expects a high quality development that will respect the distinctive features of Barnsley particularly in Penistone and the rural villages in the west of the borough. The Conservation Area in Penistone and the Listed Buildings which contribute to the town's historic character will be protected and improved by CSP30.</p> <p>CSP31 identifies Penistone as a District Centre with an important role serving localized catchments and meeting more local needs and will direct new retail and town centre uses here. CSP20 seeks to promote tourism and encourage the growth and development of cultural provision and tourist related development in rural areas such as Penistone will be protected and encouraged to support and diversify the local economy. CSP21 encourages a viable rural economy and sustainable diversification.</p> <p>CSP33 identifies the River Don Valley Corridor as strategic parts of Barnsley's Green Infrastructure network. Penistone</p>	<p>C13</p>

	<p>is close to the Peak District National Park. CSP34 protects the Green Belt around Penistone safeguarding the countryside and CSP37 will retain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of our Landscape Character Areas. CSP6 will protect against the harmful effects of development that produces renewable energy and recognises the issue of the undulating landscapes in the west of the borough.</p> <p>We want Penistone to be the main local focus for development in the borough's rural west, facilitating its renaissance as a market town and maximising its tourism role. Penistone is the main centre for the surrounding villages and we want to consolidate this role through the plan period. The town centre has recently undergone regeneration with a new supermarket and market hall now operational. A further town centre redevelopment scheme is planned close to these developments that may provide additional office space. We want to manage housing growth through the plan period to support growth but not to encourage excessive out commuting to regional centres such as Sheffield, Manchester &amp; Leeds.</p>	
<p>Paragraph 7.42</p>	<p><b>Delete paragraph 7.42 with replace with the following text:</b></p> <p><u>Villages</u>  The Core Strategy Policy CSP8 does not envisage any significant development in these villages and development will only be allowed if it is consistent with the Green Belt policy set out at CSP34 or necessary for the viability of the settlement and to meet local needs. Policy CSP16 seeks to provide affordable housing in rural settlements, CSP21 encourages a viable rural economy and sustainable diversification and CSP22 protects shops and services in villages. In transport terms the Core Strategy aims to improve public transport access to larger towns and to provide good access to job opportunities in other settlements.</p> <p>Housing development in the large and small villages outside the Principal Towns will be heavily constrained however CSP10 provides for 1000 homes to the villages over the plan period. A considerable proportion of this (500 homes) will be taken up by existing commitments. The remainder is likely to occur on small infill sites sensitive to Green Belt policy.</p> <p>CSP12 anticipates the allocation of up to 15 hectares of employment land in areas outside Urban Barnsley and Principal Towns identified in the Core Strategy over the plan period. This is likely to include land which was previously allocated in the UDP for employment use which is suitable for continued allocation and may include land on successful industrial estates, such as Wentworth Industrial Park, Tankersley and Park Springs, Little Houghton.</p>	<p>C14</p>
<p>9. Core Policies</p>		
<p>Paragraph 9.2.7</p>	<p><b>Add the following text as a new paragraph after existing paragraph 9.2.7</b></p>	<p>C15</p>

	<p>"The Regional Spatial Strategy set local targets for installed grid-connected renewable energy and the figures for Barnsley were 15 MW by 2010 and 34MW by 2021. Some progress has been made towards meeting this target. Currently, there is an existing wind farm which has a capacity of 6.5 MW that has planning permission until 2018 and a further three extant wind farm permissions totalling a potential capacity of 20.1 MW."</p>	
Paragraph 9.3.2	<p><b>Delete paragraph 9.3.2 and replace with:</b></p> <p>Barnsley gained Growth Point status in July 2008 and was awarded additional funding initially for 2009/10 and 2010/11. The additional funding was for projects to support a targeted programme for 2008-2016 of delivery accelerated housing growth at 21% uplift on the RSS net yearly supply target for Barnsley of 1015 homes. This increased the delivery for 2008 -2016 from 8120 new homes to 9824, an increase of 1704. The Government ended the Growth Point programme and funding from 31<sup>st</sup> March 2011. However the Core Strategy carries forward the Growth Point increase of 1704 as a constant to be delivered within the 2008-2026 period, rather than by 2016.</p> <p>The Growth Point increase of 1704 homes added to the underlying RSS requirement of 18 years at 1015 homes gives a total of 19974, to which has been added a flexibility of a further 1526 to give a total requirement of 21,500 new homes (net). In November 2010 the 2008 based household projections were published. These showed an annual household increase of 1000 during the plan period, which is a level of increase around the level of the RSS requirement of 1015 new homes per annum (net). Consequently the housing requirement at 21,500 is regarded as consistent with RSS and the latest household projections, and maintains the Council's commitment to growth.</p>	C16
CSP8 Location of Growth	<p><b>Add sentence after bullet points to read</b></p> <p>"Urban Barnsley will be expected to accommodate significantly more growth than any individual Principal Town to accord with its place in the settlement hierarchy"</p>	C17
Paragraph 9.3.3	<p><b>Add "Individual"</b> to start of the third sentence to read "<i>Individual Principal Towns will be the main local focus.....</i>"</p>	C18
At paragraph 9.3.20	<p><b>Replace</b> 'Green Belt Section' with 'Spatial Strategy Section' and <b>delete</b> 'which will be considered as a localized review' from the end of this paragraph.</p>	C19
CSP 11 Providing Strategic Employment	<p><b>Amend first sentence of policy CSP11 to read</b></p>	C20

Locations	"We will allocate 350 hectares of land in sustainable locations to go towards meeting the development needs of existing and future industry and business up to 2026"	
Paragraph 9.3.18	<b>Add a sentence to the end to read</b>  "It is considered that the allocation of 350ha of employment land goes some way towards meeting the identified need."	C21
CSP 12 The Distribution of New Employment Sites	<b>Remove</b> asterisk from against 350 ha total figure	C22
Paragraph 9.3.26	<b>Delete the first sentence that reads</b>  <i>"*The total amount of land allocated in the Development Sites and Places DPD will not exceed 350ha."</i>	C23
Paragraph 9.4.1	<b>Delete</b> 'best and' from first sentence of paragraph 9.4.1  <b>Amend final sentence</b> of paragraph 9.4.1 to read: 'We will also manage the release of housing land to ensure that regeneration programmes in recognised areas of housing regeneration and renewal as identified in CSP17 are supported'	C24
Para 9.4.8	<b>Add</b> "and the character of the area" to the end of the final sentence in this paragraph	C25
CSP15 Affordable Housing	<i>Change C26 is replaced by Inspector's Change I6 in Appendix E</i>	C26
CSP16 Affordable Housing Rural Exceptions	<b>Amend CSP16 to read</b>  "We will allow affordable housing in the green belt in, or on the edge of, the rural settlements of Cawthorne, Dunford Bridge, Gunthwaite and Ingbirchworth, High Hoyland, Hunshelf, Langsett, Oxspring, Silkstone, Stainborough, Tankersley, Thurgoland, Wortley, Billingley, Great Houghton and Little Houghton  Provided that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a proven local need for affordable housing; and</li> <li>• It is necessary to provide affordable housing within the specific settlement identified</li> </ul> A sequential assessment may be required to show that there are no sites available in a more sustainable location.	C27



	<p>The developer must show that arrangements have been put in place to keep the new homes affordable.</p> <p>To the end of footnote 25 add "Shafton is not included as it is within Cudworth Principal Town"</p>	
CSP 19 Protecting Existing Employment Land	<p><b>Amend second sentence of CSP 19 to read</b></p> <p>"The redevelopment of employment land and buildings for non-employment uses will only take place if..."</p> <p><b>Delete</b> 3<sup>rd</sup> criterion which reads "to re-establish an employment use would cause unacceptable traffic, amenity, pollution or other environmental problems; and"</p> <p><i>Please note these changes supersede the change to this policy suggested in response to the Inspectors question reference EE10.</i></p>	C28
CSP 23 Accessibility Priorities	<p><b>Amend accessibility priority B to read</b></p> <p>"B) Implementing transport network improvements as informed by the Northern Barnsley Connectivity Study process."</p>	C29
Paragraph 9.7.11	<p><b>Replace paragraph 9.7.11 with the following text:</b></p> <p>Barnsley has many important assets which reflect its cultural history. The borough has an important legacy of buildings and structures associated with its medieval and industrial past relating to coal mining, metalworking, textiles and glass making. In particular, there are a number of important designated historic assets including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The nationally significant landscapes and structures of the Don Valley. Wortley Top Forge and its associated water management system is acknowledged as being the oldest surviving heavy iron forges in the world and is the lone survivor of a network of water powered works that utilised the natural water supply of the upper reaches of the River Don.</li> <li>• Elsecar village (part of the Fitzwilliam Estate), an excellent example of an early industrial hamlet complete with (largely unaltered) miners and foundry workers cottages and an associated complex of workshops.</li> <li>• The Newcomen atmospheric beam engine which once pumped water from Elsecar Colliery. The engine (built in c.1795) is a designated Scheduled Ancient Monument and is the only engine of this very early type known to be still in situ in the country.</li> <li>• Low Mill Silkstone, one of the few surviving blast furnace and casting house iron-works remaining in England.</li> <li>• Hoylandswaine Nail Forge, an early and rare nail-making factory.</li> <li>• Gunthwaite Hall Barn, a large 16<sup>th</sup> century timber framed barn built for Godfrey Bosvile (1520-80).</li> </ul>	C30

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The well preserved remains of the Cluniac and Benedictine monastery of Monk Bretton.</li> <li>• Barnsley has a number of notable and listed 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century designed landscapes. The grounds of Wentworth Castle are the only Grade I (1) Registered Historic Park and Garden in South Yorkshire (and one of only 10 of this importance across the whole region). The park contains a number of highly graded listed structures including the grade I (1) listed house and six others at grade II* (2 star).</li> </ul> <p>The historic environment and its heritage assets is a valuable resource which, once lost, can never be replaced. As well as designated or statutorily protected assets, there a large number of non-designated historic assets in the borough. These assets represent the majority of the heritage resource in the area and contribute directly to the local character and distinctiveness of Barnsley being a vital part of the social and cultural identity of the borough. They help provide a sense of continuity and identity, valued by local people as part of the familiar and cherished local scene. We will explore the appropriate conservation, protection or re-use of the heritage assets that contribute to the borough's local distinctiveness, particularly when they are identified as 'at risk'. The heritage assets associated with Barnsley's historic and former industries as well as its notable 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Century designed landscapes offer great potential and stimulus for regeneration. As such we will work with local partners, trusts and organisations to ensure this potential for leisure, tourism and economic development is fully realised.</p>	
Paragraph 9.8.4	<p><b>Add new paragraph after paragraph 9.8.4:</b></p> <p><i>Key to the strategic direction for the town centre with over one million sq.ft. of new buildings is the Barnsley Markets Project. This is the largest single regeneration project ever undertaken in the borough and will attract visitors to Barnsley as well as providing jobs. In addition to offering a new purpose built and quality home for Barnsley's famous markets it will also bring contemporary shopping and leisure opportunities. These will include high quality retail units, restaurants and bistros, a brand new department store, multiplex cinema and town centre parking. It will provide Barnsley people with an exciting place to shop, socialise and be entertained. The development will also offer a large public space for performances and events and other areas will be landscaped to a high quality providing improved public realm and connectivity in the town centre.</i></p>	C31
Paragraph 9.8.5	<p><b>Delete the final sentence of paragraph 9.8.5</b></p>	C32
Paragraph 9.8.6	<p><b>Add after paragraph 9.8.6:</b></p> <p>The Smaller Centres Study (2010) considers the exiting role and potential future role of the District Centres. The study uses a vitality and viability index based on the indicators listed in PPS4 to score the centres as part of a health check. The study also includes conclusions on centres regarding their potential for growth or change and uses the categories</p>	C33

	<p>of expand, intensify, rationalise or consolidate.</p> <p><b>Cudworth</b>  Cudworth is one of the smaller district centres with the main retail and service provision located along the main Barnsley Road. It is average in terms of vitality and viability. Its strengths include the amount of shopping floorspace, the absence of floorspace outside the centre, the lack of charity shops and good pedestrian flows and availability of public transport. Aims for the future of Cudworth are to improve the provision of leisure, cultural and entertainment activities, attract non food multiple retailers, and to improve movement for pedestrians and cyclists. The strategic direction for Cudworth is to intensify, (that is to realise its potential within its existing boundaries by redeveloping and reconfiguring to intensify the level of current town centre uses).</p> <p><b>Goldthorpe</b>  Goldthorpe is one of the larger district centres with its main retail and service provision located along the main Barnsley and Doncaster Roads. It is average in terms of vitality and viability. Its main strengths are the number and type of shops, the good supply of offices, the absence of floorspace outside the centre, the variety of specialist and independent shops, the market, the availability of food shopping, good pedestrian flow and the availability of public transport. Aims for the future of Goldthorpe are to improve the provision of leisure, cultural and entertainment activities, enhance movement for pedestrians, cyclists and the disabled, improve access to the main attractions and to enhance security, address environmental problems and increase the quality of open spaces and landscaping. The strategic direction for Goldthorpe is to intensify.</p> <p>In 2008 a masterplan was produced for Goldthorpe to improve the village centre and develop the vision provided within the Renaissance Market Town strategy for Goldthorpe. The masterplan was revised and published in draft in July 2010. The objectives of the masterplan include improving public realm, new retail development and a public square, car park reorganisation and shop front refurbishment. As part of this work an economic study identified that Goldthorpe town centre has the potential to support a total of 40-50,000 sq ft of retail floorspace. This is less than the total retail floorspace in the town centre at present and it implies the need to consolidate and improve the retail offer and ensure its future viability and sustainability.</p> <p><b>Hoyland</b>  Hoyland is one of the smaller district centres. Its main retail and service offer is concentrated on High Street, King Street and Market Street radiating from the main square which includes the Town Hall and the Co-op supermarket. In terms of vitality and viability Hoyland is slightly above average. Its main strengths are the number and type of shops, the absence of floorspace outside the centre, the market, the low vacancy rates, high pedestrian flows and good bus services and linked trips. The aims for the future of Hoyland are to improve movement for pedestrians, cyclists and the disabled. The strategic direction for Hoyland is to intensify.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p><b>Penistone</b>                  Penistone is one of the smaller district centres. Penistone is a historic market town which has its main retail and service offer concentrated on Market Street which is further enhanced by the new Market Hall and Tesco supermarket. The overall vitality and viability is much better than average. Penistone has many strengths including the availability of pubs, cafes and restaurants, the market, the availability of food shopping, the evidence of recent investment by retailers, the very low vacancy rates, good pedestrian flow and public transport access, a feeling of security and high quality of the open spaces and landscaping. Aims for the future of Penistone are to improve the availability of leisure, cultural and entertainment activities, and to improve car parking and movement for pedestrians, cyclists and the disabled. Since the potential for expansion in Penistone has already taken place with the recent Tesco supermarket, the strategic direction for Penistone is to intensify within its existing boundaries.</p> <p><b>Royston</b>                  Royston is one of the smaller district centres and comprises two separate centres. The Wells and Midland Road which are separated by housing. The Wells is a centre located on a main road junction and Midland Road is a linear centre surrounded by residential areas. Royston is average in terms of vitality and viability. Its main strengths are the absence of floorspace outside the centre, the availability of food shopping, good car parking and the high frequency and range of places served by bus services. Aims for the future of Royston are to increase the range of pubs, cafes and restaurants, introduce non food multiple retailers, address high vacancy rates, and to encourage linked trips to the centre. The strategic direction for Royston is to expand (it is recognised that Royston has the potential to physically expand outside of its existing boundaries). The development of the vacant school site provides potential for this to be realised.</p> <p><b>Wombwell</b>                  Wombwell is one of the larger district centres. The main retail and service offer is located along High Street. Wombwell is better than average in terms of vitality and viability. Its main strengths are the number and type of shops, the large amount of shopping floorspace within the centre, the number of multiple retailers, the variety of specialist and independent retailers, the market, the low vacancy rates, good pedestrian flows and car parking provision, good bus services, and high quality environment. Aims for the future of Wombwell are to reduce the amount of retail, leisure and office floorspace which exists outside the town centre. The strategic direction for Wombwell is to intensify.</p>	
<p>Paragraph 9.9.9</p>	<p><b>After the last sentence add:</b></p> <p>“The Development Sites and Places DPD will consider the possibility of restoring the canals and safeguarding routes, where proven deliverable, particularly of the Barnsley Canal.”</p>	<p>C34</p>

CSP34 Green Belt	<p><b>Amend existing policy text in the purple policy box to read:</b></p> <p>CSP 34 Protection of Green</p> <p>The general extent of the Green Belt is shown on the Core Strategy Key Diagram.</p> <p>Its detailed boundaries will be shown on the Proposals Maps which will accompany the Development Sites and Places DPD.</p> <p>In order to protect the countryside and open land around built up areas the extent of the Green Belt will be safeguarded and remain unchanged.</p> <p>The Green Belt boundaries will be subject to localized review only which may result in changes necessary to deliver the borough's distribution of new employment sites as set out in CSP12.</p>	C35
Paragraph 9.9.12	<p><b>Delete paragraph 9.9.12 and replace with:</b></p> <p>As set out in the Spatial Strategy at Section 6 there will be no full scale review of the Green Belt during the plan period. A localized review will take place. This will include small adjustments to the Green Belt boundary and may also include significant changes to the Green Belt boundary to provide for identifiable employment development needs. Paragraph 6.5 of the Spatial Strategy sets out the exceptional circumstances which would justify a localized review of the Green Belt boundaries for employment purposes</p>	C36
CSP38 Minerals	<p><b>Add new bullet to policy CSP38 in purple box:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The surface coal resource and fireclay and brick clay will be protected from sterilisation from non mineral surface development through the Development Sites and Places DPD</li> </ul>	C37
Paragraph 9.11.5	<p><b>Delete final sentence and replace with</b></p> <p>'The surface coal resource and fireclay and brick clay will be protected from sterilisation through the Development Sites and Places DPD'</p>	C38
Paragraph 9.11.6	<p><b>Delete the first sentence and replace with</b></p> <p>'Annex 3 of MPS1 requires Mineral Planning Authorities to identify sources of building and roofing stone that they consider should be safeguarded'</p>	C39

		<b>Amend last sentence of this paragraph to insert 'suitable' before sandstone resources</b>	
CSP39 Contaminated Land		<p><b>Amend title of policy to read:</b></p> <p>'Contaminated and Unstable Land'</p> <p><b>Amend first paragraph to read:</b></p> <p>'Where the future users or occupiers of a development would be affected by contamination or stability issues, or where contamination may present a risk to the water environment, proposals must be accompanied by a report which:'</p> <p><b>Add 'or stability issues' in first bullet point after contamination</b></p> <p><b>Add final 4th bullet to second bullet point list as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addressing land stability issues resulting from former coal mining activities</li> </ul> <p><b>Move the 'and' from the end of bullet 2 to the end of bullet 3</b></p>	C40
Paragraph 9.13.5		<p><b>Add the following sentence to the end of paragraph 9.1.35</b></p> <p>"Appendix 5 sets out the infrastructure funding committed, or awaiting confirmation, as at March 2011. This table is an extract from the draft Barnsley Infrastructure Study Part 2 report. The figures in this table will be subject to change and will be updated as part of an Infrastructure Delivery Plan"</p> <p><b>Add Appendix C to Core Strategy</b></p>	C41
10. Monitoring and Indicators			
		<p><i>This section has been re-written. See Appendix B</i></p> <p><b>Add Appendix B to Core Strategy</b></p>	C42

**APPENDIX B****Barnsley Core Strategy DPD Examination: Monitoring and Indicators**

The Core Strategy must have clear arrangements for monitoring and reporting to ensure they continue to remain effective in their implementation. Individual policies will be monitored against the measures set out in the table below, and for the most part reported annually. This will allow us to assess their effectiveness and identify any changes required.

<b>LDF Core Policy: Climate Change</b>			
<b>LDF Strategic Objectives</b>	Objective 1: To be the spatial interpretation of the Sustainable Community Strategy Objective 6: To ensure all new development is sustainably designed and built to the highest standards Objective 8: To protect and improve the countryside and natural environment		
<b>SCS Ambitions</b>	Ambition 1 - Our Communities are attractive, clean sustainable places to live Ambition 5 - Barnsley people are healthier and live longer adding life to years and years to life		
<b>Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Implementation/Partners</b>
CSP 1 Climate Change	No specific target. This policy will be implemented by a number of the Core Strategy policies, in particular CSP 2, CSP 3, CSP 4, CSP 5, CSP 6, CSP 8, CSP 14, CSP 23, CSP 25, CSP 28, CSP 29, CSP 33, CSP 41	See indicators for policies listed as implementing policy CSP 1	<b>Implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Management, particularly through Design and Access Statements.</li> <li>• Continued involvement with corporate initiatives such as the Carbon Reduction Team to address and plan to adapt to climate change. In light of emerging Government policy to move away from collecting and reporting on National Indicators to a single dataset, Barnsley Council is currently reviewing its data collection and recording methods for climate change indicators, particularly former NI 188, NI 186 and NI 185.</li> <li>• Working through Barnsley's Sustainability Partnership which provides the overall direction for climate change and carbon</li> </ul>

			<p>reduction in the Barnsley borough.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managing Barnsley Council assets.</li> <li>• Funding mechanisms such as the Carbon Trust and Energy Savings Trust.</li> <li>• Continuing to work with Sheffield City Region partners to develop the Dearne Valley Eco Vision</li> <li>• Participation in the Leeds City Region Climate Change Group</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Yorkshire Climate Change Network</li> <li>• Leeds City Region Climate Change Group</li> <li>• Sheffield City Region partners</li> <li>• Developers and landowners</li> <li>• Local Businesses and employers</li> <li>• Sustainability Partnership</li> <li>• Barnsley College</li> <li>• Transport Operators</li> </ul>
CSP Sustainable Construction	2	<p>All developments to achieve at least Code Level 3 or equivalent rising to level 4 by 2013 and level 6 by 2016.</p> <p>All non residential development achieving BREEAM standard of 'very good' or equivalent</p>	<p>Number and percentage of developments each year achieving the required sustainability standards (Code for Sustainable Homes or equivalent for housing and BREEAM or equivalent for non-residential development)</p> <p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Management and Building Control regulations</li> <li>• Application of Code for Sustainable Homes in assessing residential development</li> <li>• Application of BREEAM standards in assessing non-residential development</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers</li> </ul>
CSP Sustainable	3	All developments to include SuDS	<p>Percentage of planning applications which incorporate SuDS</p> <p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers to consider SuDS provision in</li> </ul>



<p>Drainage Systems (SuDS)</p>	<p>(excluding exceptional circumstances where SuDS are demonstrated to be inappropriate)</p>		<p>early stage of planning and design in consultation with the Planning Authority, Environment Agency and Highways Agency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Management</li> <li>• Green Infrastructure Planning</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• Planning Authority</li> <li>• Environment Agency</li> <li>• Highways Agency</li> </ul>
<p>CSP 4 Flood Risk</p>	<p>No development granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flooding and water quality grounds</p>	<p>Number of planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flooding and water quality grounds</p>	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) and any subsequent updates</li> <li>• Potential for development of Surface Water Management Plans</li> <li>• Developers to take account of the SFRA, sequential approach and provide a specific Flood Risk Assessment (including impact on surface water run off) where appropriate.</li> <li>• Potential to develop Surface Water Management Plans with stakeholders to reduce the threat of surface water flooding</li> <li>• Development Management processes to ensure flood risk (including surface water flooding) is appropriately addressed including consultation with the Environment Agency</li> <li>• Green Infrastructure Planning</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>
	<p>No development in the functional floodplain  (excluding development related to the improvement of the floodplain function)</p>	<p>Hectareage of development in Flood Zones 2, 3 and 3b (functional Floodplain)</p>	
	<p>Policy CSP 3 will also implement this policy</p>	<p>See indicators and targets for policy CSP 3</p>	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• Landowners</li> <li>• South Yorkshire Drainage Officers Group</li> </ul>
<b>LDF Core Policy: Renewables</b>			
<b>LDF Strategic Objectives</b>	Objective 6: To ensure all new development is sustainably designed and built to the highest standards Objective 8: To protect and improve the countryside and natural environment		
<b>SCS Ambitions</b>	Ambition 1 - Our Communities are attractive, clean sustainable places to live		
<b>Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Implementation/Partners</b>
CSP 5 Including Renewable Energy in Developments and CSP 6 Development that Produces Renewable Energy	34 MW of renewable energy capacity provided by 2021  (In line with the local target set out in RSS)	Renewable energy capacity (MW) installed by type	<b>Mechanisms</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Management</li> <li>• Supplementary Planning Document detailing the application of the policy</li> <li>• Code For Sustainable Homes</li> <li>• Management of Council owned assets</li> </ul> <b>Key Partners</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sheffield City Region partners</li> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• Energy companies</li> </ul>
<b>LDF Core Policy: Location of Growth</b>			
<b>LDF Strategic Objectives:</b>	Objective 1: To be the spatial interpretation of the Sustainable Community Strategy Objective 2: To improve access, movement and connectivity with sustainable travel Objective 3: To secure safe, healthy and inclusive communities and promote wellbeing Objective 4: To make efficient use of land and infrastructure Objective 5: To accelerate economic growth Objective 7: To deliver a sufficient supply of housing to provide balanced mixed communities and support economic growth		
<b>SCS Ambitions:</b>	Ambition 1 - Our Communities are attractive, clean sustainable places to live Ambition 9 - Building a prosperous and sustainable local economy Ambition 11- Promote Barnsley, at home and abroad as a great place to live, work and visit Ambition 4 - Barnsley is recognised for its community spirit and diversity		

Core Strategy Policy	Targets	Indicators	Implementation/Partners
CSP 7 City Regions	No specific target. The additional homes associated with the Growth Point Programme have been incorporated within the provision in policy CSP9 and land for employment in CSP 10	<p>See indicators for policy CSP 9 and 10</p> <p>A range of indicators will be collected through both the Leeds and Sheffield Local Economic Partnerships</p>	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leeds and Sheffield City Region Partnerships and contributing to Manchester City Region as appropriate</li> <li>• Working as part of the Leeds and Sheffield Local Economic Partnerships and related external funding opportunities</li> <li>• Providing for housing and economic development within policies CSP 9 and 10 and allocations within the Development Sites and Places DPD</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sheffield and Leeds City Region partners</li> <li>• Homes and Communities Agency</li> </ul>

<p>CSP 8 Location Growth</p>	<p>The of</p> <p>No specific target. The proportion of development within the prioritised settlements (reflecting the spatial strategy) will be reported annually</p>	<p>Percentage of development by type and settlement</p>	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detail setting out how settlements will change and allocation of specific sites for development in the Development Sites and Places DPD and associated Proposals Maps</li> <li>• Development Management</li> <li>• Facilitating appropriate LIFT schemes</li> <li>• Barnsley Town Centre Area Action Plan</li> <li>• Housing Market Renewal programmes</li> <li>• Emerging Cultural Strategy</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers/landowners</li> <li>• Registered Social Landlords</li> <li>• Local Businesses</li> <li>• LIFT partners</li> </ul>
--------------------------------------	---	---	--

<p>CSP 9 The Number of New Homes to be Built</p>	<p>Trajectory requirements from annex 2 (and any reviews in future monitoring reports) achieved in each year for the period 2008-2026</p>	<p>Housing trajectory showing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Net additional dwellings over the previous 5 year period or since the start of the relevant DPD period, whichever is the longer</li> <li>(ii) net additional dwellings for the current year</li> <li>(iii) Projected net additional dwellings up to the end of the relevant DPD period or over a ten year period from its adoption, whichever is the longer</li> <li>(iv) The annual net additional dwelling requirement</li> <li>(v) Annual number of net additional dwellings needed to meet overall housing requirements, having regard to previous years performance</li> </ul>	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocation of housing sites within the Development Sites and Places DPD</li> <li>• 'Windfall' housing developments</li> <li>• Housing Market Renewal schemes</li> <li>• Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment</li> <li>• Annual five year supply assessments</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers/landowners/interest groups</li> <li>• Registered Social Landlords and other social housing providers</li> <li>• Public sector providers</li> </ul>
<p>CSP 10 The Distribution of New Homes</p>	<p>Progress towards the indicative figures for each settlement in CSP 10 will be monitored annually</p>	<p>Number of years supply of deliverable sites each year (supply of ready to develop housing sites)</p> <p>Net additional dwellings in each of the settlements set out in policy CSP 10</p>	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocation of housing sites within the Development Sites and Places DPD</li> <li>• 'Windfall' housing developments</li> <li>• Development Management</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers/landowners</li> <li>• Registered Social Landlords and other social housing providers</li> <li>• Public sector developers</li> </ul>
CSP 11 Providing Strategic Employment Locations	At least 5 years supply of market ready employment sites of the best type always available	Employment Land supply (ha) by type	<p><b>Mechanisms</b> Allocation of sites within the Development Sites and Places DPD and accompanying Proposals Map</p> <p>Employment Land Review and any subsequent review</p> <p>The Growth Plan for Barnsley's Economy and any subsequent review</p> <p>Town Centre Area Action Plan</p> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yorkshire Forward</li> <li>• Homes and Communities Agency</li> <li>• Potentially the Leeds and Sheffield LEP partnership</li> </ul>
		Number of years supply of market ready employment sites each year	
		Amount of new serviced land made available (ha) each year	
		Amount of land developed for employment by type (completed sq m gross internal floorspace) per year	
CSP 12 The Distribution of New Employment Sites	No target or indicator as this policy deals with the level of employment land to be allocated in the Development Sites and Places DPD and the associated Proposals Map		<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocation of sites within the Development Sites and Places DPD and accompanying Proposals Maps</li> </ul>
<b>LDF Core Policy: Housing</b>			
<b>LDF Strategic Objectives:</b>	<p>Objective 1: To be the spatial interpretation of the Sustainable Community Strategy</p> <p>Objective 3: To secure safe, healthy and inclusive communities and promote wellbeing</p> <p>Objective 4: To make efficient use of land and infrastructure</p>		

	Objective 7: To deliver a sufficient supply of housing to provide balanced mixed communities and support economic growth		
<b>SCS Ambitions:</b>	Ambition 1 - Our Communities are attractive, clean sustainable places to live Ambition 4 - Barnsley is recognised for its community spirit and diversity (added to initial CS list)		
<b>Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Implementation/Partners</b>
CSP 13 The Release of Allocated Housing Land	No specific target as the detailed phasing policy to be included in the Development Sites and Places DPD	Housing indicators monitored under policies CSP 10 and CSP 14 will be relevant	<b>Mechanisms</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criteria based policy and allocations within the Development Sites and Places DPD</li> <li>Monitoring and reporting of progress towards the indicative targets for the plan period and housing trajectory</li> </ul>
CSP 14 Housing Mix and Efficient Use of Land	Average of 40 dwellings per hectare, 45 dwellings per hectare in good public transport corridors and 55 dwellings per hectare in Barnsley Town Centre	Average density of housing development	<b>Mechanisms</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development Management</li> <li>Strategic Housing Market Assessment</li> <li>Guidance within relevant Supplementary Planning Documents concerning design of new housing development Strategic Housing Market Assessment</li> <li>Local authority interventions to bring long term empty homes back into use. However, targets for bringing empty homes back into use after 2011/12 are subject to a proposed change in Government approach emphasising the role of RSLs as opposed to local government. Progress towards and any revisions of targets will be set out in subsequent monitoring reports.</li> </ul>
	Between 55% and 65% new dwellings built on previously developed land	Percentage of new dwellings built on previously developed land	
	Applications to be approved in accordance with guidance in relevant SPD and Strategic Housing Market Assessment.	Number/percentage dwellings by type	
	Number of empty homes returned to use as a result of intervention by the local authority  2011/12 – 29 homes	Number of long term empty homes returned to use as a result of intervention by the local authority	<b>Key Partners</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing Associations</li> <li>Bernaslai Homes</li> <li>Homes and Communities Agency</li> </ul>

		2012 to 2015 – 69 homes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barnsley MBC</li> </ul>
CSP Affordable Housing	15	Number of affordable homes delivered	Number of affordable homes delivered (gross)	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annually updated affordable housing viability study</li> <li>• Supplementary Planning Document setting out further detail on the affordable housing viability study and the application of this policy. Will also include any future amendments to the threshold and percentages set out in policy CSP15</li> <li>• Strategic Housing Market Assessment</li> <li>• The targets for delivery of affordable housing provision after 2011/12 will be subject to review, due to radical change in availability of Government funding for affordable housing schemes and the poor economic forecast. Progress towards and any revisions to targets will be set out in monitoring reports</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Association partners</li> <li>• Berneslai Homes ALMO</li> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• Homes and Communities Agency</li> <li>• Barnsley MBC</li> </ul>
		2011/12 – 155 2012/15 – 279	Number of affordable homes secured as part of planning application	
CSP Affordable Housing Rural Exception Policy	16	No specific target. This issue is to be dealt with on a case by case basis.	Net additional affordable dwellings on rural exception sites.	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer or local authority lead assessments including demonstration of need and sequential assessments</li> <li>• Strategic Housing Market Assessment and any subsequent updates</li> </ul>



			<p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Association partners</li> <li>• Berneslai Homes ALMO</li> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• Homes and Communities Agency</li> <li>• Barnsley MBC</li> </ul>
CSP 17 Housing Regeneration Areas	No specific target as this is a qualitative measure that will be developed as and when funding opportunities are available	Indicators will be those required externally as part of the funding linked to the programmes for renewal.	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strategic Housing Market Assessment and any subsequent updates</li> <li>• Regional Growth Funding and any subsequent successor or alternative funding mechanisms</li> <li>• Private sector funding</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Association partners</li> <li>• Potentially City Region LEP Partners</li> <li>• Homes and Communities Agency</li> <li>• Developers</li> </ul>
CSP 18 Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	Progress against overall need will be monitored annually, detailed target to be set following identification of sites in the Development Sites and Places DPD	Net additional pitches (Gypsy and Traveller)	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of permanent sites in Development Sites and Places DPD and associated proposals maps</li> <li>• South Yorkshire Gypsy and Traveller Needs assessment (2007) and any subsequent updates</li> <li>• Strategic Housing Market Assessment and any subsequent updates</li> <li>• Private development</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public development</li> <li>Annual caravan count</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Private developers</li> <li>Homes and Communities Agency</li> <li>Bernaslai Homes ALMO</li> <li>South Yorkshire Local Authorities (in regard to new transit site provision)</li> <li>Barnsley MBC</li> </ul>
<b>LDF Core Policy: Economy</b>			
<b>LDF Strategic Objectives</b>	<p>Objective 1: To be the spatial interpretation of the Sustainable Community Strategy</p> <p>Objective 3: To secure safe, healthy and inclusive communities and promote wellbeing</p> <p>Objective 4: To make efficient use of land and infrastructure</p> <p>Objective 5: To accelerate economic growth</p>		
<b>SCS Ambitions</b>	<p>Ambition 1 - Our Communities are attractive, clean sustainable places to live</p> <p>Ambition 3 - Barnsley offers varied and exciting cultural opportunities to all</p> <p>Ambition 9 - Building a prosperous and sustainable local economy</p> <p>Ambition 11- Promote Barnsley, at home and abroad as a great place to live, work and visit</p>		
<b>Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Implementation/Partners</b>
CSP 19 Protecting Existing Employment Land	No more than 5 hectares employment land lost to other uses	<p>Losses of employment land (ha)</p> <p>Amount of employment land lost to residential development (ha)</p>	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development Management</li> <li>Working with local businesses</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local businesses</li> <li>Developers/landowners</li> <li>Barnsley Council</li> </ul>
CSP 20 Promoting	No specific targets - the policy will also be implemented by	See indicators for policies CSP 21 and CSP 31	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cultural Strategy - currently under</li> </ul>

Tourism and Encouraging Cultural Provision	policies CSP 21 and CSP 31		<p>development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Management</li> <li>• Promoting viable and vibrant town centres</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cultural and Tourism stakeholders</li> <li>• Local interest groups</li> <li>• Venue operators/landowners</li> <li>• Peak District National Park</li> <li>• Town centre management</li> <li>• Local shops</li> </ul>
CSP 21 Rural Economy	<p>No specific target as these applications will be considered on a case by case basis</p> <p>This policy will also be implemented by policies CSP 22, CSP 33, CSP 34, CSP 36, CSP 37</p>	<p>Number of planning applications for economic development in rural areas permitted by type</p> <p>See targets and implementation measures for the policies listed as implementing CSP 21</p>	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Balancing the potentially conflicting demands on rural areas through Development Management</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural Agenda Development Group</li> <li>• Rural communities and businesses</li> <li>• Cultural and tourism stakeholders</li> <li>• Rural service delivery partners</li> </ul>
CSP 22 Loss of Shops and Local Services in Villages	<p>No loss of village shops and local services</p> <p>(excluding those that which meet the criteria in policy CSP22)</p>	<p>Number of planning applications for the change of use of shops, post offices, petrol stations or pubs to new uses in villages</p>	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Management</li> </ul> <p><b>Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers/landowners</li> <li>• Local service providers</li> </ul>
<b>LDF Core Policy: Transport Strategy</b>			
<b>LDF Strategic Objectives</b>	<p>Objective 1: To be the spatial interpretation of the Sustainable Community Strategy</p> <p>Objective 2: To improve access, movement and connectivity with sustainable travel</p> <p>Objective 3: To secure safe, healthy and inclusive communities and promote wellbeing</p>		

	Objective 4: To make efficient use of land and infrastructure		
<b>SCS Ambitions</b>	Ambition 2 - Barnsley is one of the safest towns in Yorkshire Ambition 5 - Barnsley people are healthier and live longer adding life to years and years to life Ambition 10 - Barnsley has a high performing integrated transport system		
<b>Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Implementation/Partners</b>
Policies CSP 23 to CSP 28	<p>These policies (in particular CSP 23 Accessibility Priorities and CSP 28 Reducing the Impact of Road Travel) set out the strategic priorities for Barnsley's Transport Strategy.</p> <p>We are currently preparing a separate Transport Strategy document which will further develop the implementation of the policies within this section. This strategy provides the basis for Barnsley's input into the emerging Local Transport Plan 3 and any subsequent updates.</p> <p>A range of indicators (currently being determined) will be collected through the Local Transport Plan 3 and any subsequent updates.</p>		<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barnsley Transport Strategy and any subsequent updates</li> <li>• South Yorkshire Transport Strategy and any subsequent updates</li> <li>• Leeds and Sheffield City Region Connectivity Studies</li> <li>• Lobbying National Government and Service providers</li> <li>• Bidding for local service funding</li> <li>• Working with neighbouring authorities</li> <li>• Playing a role as part of the Integrated Transport Executive</li> <li>• Northern Route Utilisation Strategy, South Yorkshire Rail Strategy and any subsequent updates</li> <li>• Relevant Local Transport Plan working groups including the Freight Quality Partnership</li> <li>• Transport modelling</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local communities, employers, schools and service providers</li> <li>• Leeds and Sheffield City Region partners</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive</li> <li>• West Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive</li> <li>• Integrated Transport Executive</li> <li>• Local Transport Operating Companies including Barnsley Bus Partnership</li> <li>• National Transport Operating Companies and Service providers including Network Rail</li> <li>• National Government</li> <li>• Developers/landowners</li> <li>• Freight operators</li> <li>• Local interest groups</li> <li>• Potentially Local Economic Partnership</li> </ul>
CSP 24 Safeguarding of Former Railway Lines	Safeguard land within and adjacent to existing and historical rail alignments.	Number of new developments approved within or adjacent to the safeguarded rail routes	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Historical routes to be shown on the Proposals Maps accompanying the Development Sites and Places DPD</li> <li>• Development Management</li> <li>• Working with delivery partners to identify alternative routes where appropriate</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive</li> <li>• Integrated Transport Authority</li> <li>• Network Rail</li> <li>• Neighbouring Authorities</li> </ul>
CSP 25 New Development	As a minimum, development to conform to the RSS accessibility	Percentage of development conforming to the accessibility	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Management</li> </ul>

and Sustainable Travel	criteria	criteria set out in RSS	
CSP 26 New Development and Highway Improvement	This policy will be implemented by policy CSP 42	See targets and indicators for policy CSP 42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negotiations with developers</li> <li>• Supplementary Planning document setting out parking standards</li> <li>• Transport Assessments and travel plans</li> <li>• Transport modelling if appropriate</li> <li>• Highways Agency Active Traffic Management and Integrated Demand Management toolkits</li> <li>• Supporting the Green Infrastructure Strategy</li> <li>• Linking to walking and cycling and public transport networks</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• Local Highways Agency</li> <li>• Local Transport Plan partners</li> <li>• Local employers</li> </ul> <p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negotiating with developers and securing improvements through planning applications, planning obligations and conditions</li> <li>• Contributing towards the South Yorkshire Road Safety and Casualty Reduction Scheme and any subsequent successor schemes (currently delivered through the LTP)</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan partners</li> </ul>
CSP 27 Parking	No specific targets or indicators		<b>Mechanisms</b>

Strategy	as this policy relates to the scope of the parking strategy to be developed, particularly for the town centre.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relevant parking strategy outcomes will be reflected in the supplementary planning document on parking standards</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• Local Highways Agency</li> <li>• Local Transport Plan partners</li> <li>• Local employers</li> </ul>
	Policy CSP25 will be relevant to the implementation of the parking strategy	See indicators for policy CSP 25	

<p>CSP 28 Reducing the Impact of Road Travel</p>	<p>This policy will also implemented by policy CSP 23, CSP 24 and CSP 41</p>	<p>See indicators for policies listed as implementing policy CSP 28</p>	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barnsley Transport Strategy and any subsequent reviews</li> <li>• South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan and any subsequent reviews</li> <li>• Projects and programmes focussed on reducing carbon emissions</li> <li>• Emerging South Yorkshire Freight Quality Partnership Strategy and any subsequent successors</li> <li>• External funding sources and programmes</li> <li>• Implementing Air Quality Action Plans</li> <li>• Traffic management tools</li> <li>• Appropriate local highway improvements</li> <li>• Development Management – ensuring that relevant developments are designed to accommodate delivery vehicles</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Transport Plan partners</li> <li>• South Yorkshire Freight Quality Partnership</li> <li>• Fleet and freight operators</li> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• Highways Agency</li> <li>• Barnsley Council</li> </ul>
<p><b>LDF Core Policy: Local Character</b></p>			
<p><b>LDF Strategic Objective</b></p>	<p>Objective 3: To secure safe, healthy and inclusive communities and promote wellbeing Objective 5: To accelerate economic growth Objective 6: To ensure all new development is sustainably designed and built to the highest standards</p>		
<p><b>SCS Objectives</b></p>	<p>Ambition 1 - Our Communities are attractive, clean sustainable places to live</p>		



Ambition 11- Promote Barnsley, at home and abroad as a great place to live, work and visit			
Core Strategy Policy	Targets	Indicators	Implementation/Partners
CSP 29 Design	All new housing developments of 10 or more new dwellings achieving a Building For Life assessment of at least 'good' rating or equivalent	The number and proportion of new build completions in housing developments of over 10 dwellings achieving a 'very good', 'good', 'average' or 'poor' Building For Life assessment rating or equivalent	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development management</li> <li>• Design Panel</li> <li>• Supplementary Planning Documents to provide guidance on design of new housing development, housing extensions, designing out crime, advertisements and shopfront design</li> <li>• South Yorkshire Design Guide any subsequent reviews</li> <li>• Implementing design guidance contained in Planning Policy Statements</li> <li>• Public Spaces Strategy to guide decisions in the Town Centre</li> <li>• Building Heights Study to guide decisions in the Town Centre</li> <li>• Building for Life</li> <li>• Remaking Barnsley and any subsequent review</li> <li>• Development Sites and Places DPD detail about what is special in each locality</li> <li>• Green Infrastructure Strategy and any subsequent reviews</li> <li>• Green Spaces Strategy and any subsequent reviews</li> <li>• Conservation Area Statements</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbouring local authorities</li> <li>• Developers/landowners</li> <li>• CABE and any subsequent successors</li> <li>• Design Panel</li> </ul>
CSP 30 The Historic Environment	11 (of 18) by 31st December 2011	Number of completed conservation area statements	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protecting, conserving and managing our heritage assets through development management (including Listed Building and Conservation Area Consents and planning applications affecting heritage assets)</li> <li>• Developing Conservation Area Statements</li> <li>• Criteria based policy regarding development affecting the historic environment within the Development Sites and Places DPD</li> <li>• Designation of Conservation Areas in the Development Sites and Places DPD and any subsequent additions and revisions</li> <li>• Liaison with English Heritage to update the schedule of Listed Buildings with those identified of local interest in Barnsley</li> <li>• Protecting and conserving Listed Buildings through grant scheme funding (including English Heritage and Heritage Lottery Fund) where available</li> <li>• Working with the South Yorkshire Archaeological Service and English Heritage to protect and preserve Scheduled Ancient Monuments and archaeological sites of local importance</li> <li>• Work with English Heritage to actively manage and reduce the number of heritage assets on English heritage's annual Heritage</li> </ul>
	Manage and reduce the assets on the Heritage at Risk Register	Number of each heritage asset type at risk (as detailed on English Heritage's annual Heritage at Risk Register)	
	No demolitions of listed buildings	Applications granted for demolition of listed building	
	No applications approved where sustained objection by English Heritage	<p>Number of applications referred to English Heritage due to impact on historic environments</p> <p>% of referred applications granted despite sustained objection by English Heritage</p>	

			<p>at Risk Register</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultation with historical amenity societies where appropriate</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Heritage</li> <li>• Local historical amenity Groups</li> <li>• South Yorkshire Archaeological Service</li> <li>• Developers/landowners</li> </ul>
<b>LDF Core Policy: Town Centres</b>			
<b>LDF Strategic Objectives</b>	Objective 1: To be the spatial interpretation of the Sustainable Community Strategy Objective 5: To accelerate economic growth		
<b>SCS Ambitions</b>	Ambition 9 - Building a prosperous and sustainable local economy		
<b>Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Implementation/Partners</b>
CSP 31 Town Centres	Proportion reflecting the hierarchy set out in policy CSP 31	Number and proportion of approved applications for town centre uses within defined town centres, by type of centre and use	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centres will be defined on the Proposals Maps associated with the Development Sites and Places DPD</li> <li>• 3 yearly town centre health checks for town, district and local centres</li> <li>• Town Centre Area Action Plan</li> <li>• Remaking Barnsley and any subsequent updates</li> <li>• Development Management</li> </ul> <p><b>Key Partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Town centre businesses and users</li> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• Town centre management</li> </ul>
	To maintain or improve performance of defined centres against the viability and vitality index	Performance against the viability and vitality index	
		Defined town centres vacancy rates	
CSP 32 Small	No target. Applications will be	Number of small shops of 500 sq m	<b>Mechanisms</b>

Local Shops	considered on a case by case basis to support the needs of local communities	or less permitted outside defined centres Number of car parking spaces associated with small shops of 500 sq m or less permitted outside defined centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Management</li> </ul> <b>Key partners</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers</li> </ul>
<b>LDF Core Policy: Green Infrastructure</b>			
<b>LDF Strategic Objectives</b>	Objective 3: To secure safe, healthy and inclusive communities and promote wellbeing Objective 4: To make efficient use of land and infrastructure Objective 8: To protect and improve the countryside and natural environment		
<b>SCS Ambitions</b>	Ambition 1 - Our Communities are attractive, clean sustainable places to live Ambition 3 - Barnsley offers varied and exciting cultural opportunities to all Ambition 5 - Barnsley people are healthier and live longer adding life to years and years to life Ambition 6 - Enabling adults to have healthy and fulfilling lives Ambition 7 - Barnsley children and young people aiming high, enjoying life and seizing opportunity Ambition 11- Promote Barnsley, at home and abroad as a great place to live, work and visit		
<b>Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Implementation/Partners</b>
CSP 33 Green Infrastructure	No specific target. This policy will be implemented by other Core Strategy policies, in particular CSP3, CSP4, CSP25, CSP29, CSP35, CSP36, CSP37, CSP42	See indicators for the policies listed as implementing policy CSP33 Net loss/gain of open space within the strategic green infrastructure network	<b>Mechanisms</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development and implementation of Barnsley's Green Infrastructure Strategy and any subsequent reviews</li> <li>• Work with Natural England and City Region partners to implement the Leeds City Region and South Yorkshire Green Infrastructure Strategies and any subsequent reviews</li> <li>• Development Management process actively protecting and providing new open spaces and green infrastructure as in line with related LDF policies</li> <li>• Green Spaces Strategy and any subsequent reviews</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflecting the relevant elements of Green Infrastructure on the Proposals Maps and Development Sites and Places DPD</li> </ul> <p><b>Key partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developers</li> <li>Sheffield and Leeds City Region partners</li> <li>private sector</li> <li>Agencies such as Natural England and RSPB</li> </ul>
CSP 34 Protection of Green Belt	No net loss of Green Belt land to development (other than in very special circumstances)	Green Belt lost to development by type (ha)	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed Green Belt boundaries (including localised review) to be reflected on Proposals Maps to accompany the Development Sites and Places DPD</li> <li>Development Management including implementation of national policy (particularly PPS2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Key partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developers/landowners</li> </ul>
CSP 35 Green Space	No net loss of green spaces to new development	Net change of green space in the borough (ha)	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementing the Green Space Strategy and any subsequent updates</li> <li>Green Spaces shown on the Proposals Maps accompanying the Development Sites and Places DPD</li> <li>Green Space Part Two documents 'In Your Neighbourhood' documents will give a local assessment of green space for each town and village and set local priorities for improvement</li> </ul>
		New green space (ha)	
		Loss of green space (ha)	
	For district parks an increase of 2 green flag percentage points each year	The Number of eligible open spaces managed to a Green Flag Award standard	
	Average Green Flag percentage point of District Parks		
	This policy will also be implemented by policy CSP 42	See targets and indicators for policy CSP 42	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supplementary Planning Document setting out detailed guidance on the provision, layout, and design of green space associated with new development</li> </ul> <p><b>Key partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developers</li> <li>Parish Councils</li> <li>Trans-Pennine Trail</li> <li>Community groups (such as 'friends of' groups)</li> <li>Barnsley Council</li> </ul>
CSP 36 Biodiversity and Geodiversity	No loss in the number and area of ecological designation	Net change in areas of biodiversity importance	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Biodiversity and geodiversity sites to be protected shown on the Proposals Maps accompanying the Development Sites and Places DPD</li> <li>Supplementary planning document to provide further guidance on biodiversity and geodiversity, including how developments will be expected to maximise biodiversity enhancements</li> <li>Supplementary Planning Document to provide further guidance on trees and hedgerows</li> <li>Protection of priority habitats and species identified in Biodiversity Action Plan and any subsequent updates</li> <li>Monitoring qualitative change to NHSs with the Local Sites Partnership</li> <li>Green Infrastructure Strategy and any subsequent review</li> </ul>
	No loss of ancient woodland to development	Ancient woodland in the borough (ha)	
		Development approved within ancient woodland (ha)	
	Monitoring progress towards the Natural England Target of one hectare of Local Nature Reserve per 1000 population	Number of Local Nature Reserves declared	
	95% nationally designated SSSI's in favourable condition or recovering	Natural England SSSI condition survey	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to work with local, and City Region partners to develop biodiversity opportunity mapping and use this to develop habitat creation, protection and management proposals and identify biodiversity networks and enhancement opportunities.</li> <li>• Proactive partnership working between the Council, local partnerships and Natural England to progress towards the Natural England set target for the provision of Local Nature Reserves</li> <li>• Natural England currently monitors the quality of SSSI's</li> </ul> <p><b>Key partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local sites partnership</li> <li>• Natural England</li> <li>• Biodiversity Trust</li> <li>• Sheffield and Leeds City Region partners</li> </ul>
CSP Landscape Character	37	No damage to landscape character as a result of new development	<p>Number of planning applications approved where Natural England have advised that the proposals would harm landscape character</p> <p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape Character Assessment and any subsequent updates to guide Development Management Process</li> <li>• Supplementary Planning Document to provide more detail on how to assess the impact of development on the landscape</li> <li>• Seeking opportunities for conservation, management and enhancement of Landscape Character through development and land management.</li> </ul> <p><b>Key partners</b></p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers/landowners</li> <li>• Natural England</li> </ul>
<b>LDF Core Policy: Waste and Recycling</b>			
<b>Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Implementation/Partners</b>		
No policy	This Core Strategy does not contain policies or proposals regarding waste and recycling. These issues are covered by a separate Joint Waste Plan being prepared by the three metropolitan borough councils of Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham		
<b>LDF Core Policy: Minerals</b>			
<b>LDF Strategic Objectives</b>	Objective 8: To protect and improve the countryside and natural environment		
<b>SCS Ambitions</b>	Ambition 1 - Our Communities are attractive, clean sustainable places to live		
<b>Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Implementation/Partners</b>
CSP 38 Minerals	No specific target. There is no requirement to achieve a specified amount of mineral development	<p>No specific indicators as policy CSP 38 deals with how non aggregate mineral resources and their extraction will be managed</p> <p>Barnsley does not have any aggregate resources, therefore no indicator to record them is included</p>	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Management</li> <li>• Sites with planning permission for the extraction of minerals and areas of search will be shown on the proposals maps</li> <li>• The Regional Aggregate Working Party (RAWP) are responsible for monitoring aggregate extraction in the region. However, as Barnsley does not have any aggregate to monitor it is not included in the survey.</li> <li>• Petroleum exploration licences where it can be demonstrated it would be environmentally acceptable in line with Government Guidance</li> <li>• Proposals for reclamation to be considered in line with Barnsley's Biodiversity Action Plan and Green Infrastructure Strategy</li> <li>• Joint Waste Plan provides policy framework</li> </ul>



			<p>for proposals outside mineral sites to recycle construction and demolition wastes and recover secondary and recycles aggregates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barnsley Biodiversity Action Plan and any subsequent reviews</li> <li>• Green Infrastructure Strategy and any subsequent reviews</li> </ul> <p><b>Key partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joint Waste Plan partners</li> <li>• Regional Aggregate Working Party</li> <li>• Minerals developers/site owners</li> <li>• Environment Agency</li> </ul>
<b>LDF Core Policy: Contaminated Land and Pollution</b>			
<b>LDF Strategic Objectives</b>	<p>Objective 2: To improve access, movement and connectivity with sustainable travel</p> <p>Objective 3: To secure safe, healthy and inclusive communities and promote wellbeing</p> <p>Objective 6: To ensure all new development is sustainably designed and built to the highest standards</p>		
<b>SCS Ambitions</b>	<p>Ambition 1 - Our Communities are attractive, clean sustainable places to live</p> <p>Ambition 5 - Barnsley people are healthier and live longer adding life to years and years to life</p>		
<b>Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Implementation/Partners</b>
CSP 39 Contaminated Land	All approved planning applications meeting requirements of SPD	Planning permissions in accordance with SPD	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supplementary Planning Document to detail application of the policy</li> <li>• Development Management mechanisms requiring detailed contamination reports where appropriate</li> </ul> <p><b>Key partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regulatory agencies including the Environment Agency</li> </ul>

CSP 40 Pollution Control and Protection	Policy CSP 4 will also implement this policy	See indicators and targets for policy CSP 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers</li> </ul> <p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Control of pollution is governed by Planning and Environmental Health laws</li> <li>• Application of the precautionary principle</li> <li>• Supplementary Planning Document to provide further guidance on how will deal with hot food takeaways</li> <li>• Consulting the Environment Agency on issues concerning surface and ground water quality</li> </ul> <p><b>Key partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• Other regulatory agencies such as the Environment Agency</li> </ul>
CSP 41 Development in Air Quality Management Areas	No residential developments except where the developer provides, to the Councils satisfaction, an assessment showing acceptable living conditions for future residents	Number and type (use class) of development permitted in AQMA's	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The council will undertake regular reviews of air quality as part of its duty as Environmental Health Authority</li> <li>• The Council will keep a record of current Air Quality Management Areas and any subsequent reviews</li> </ul> <p><b>Key partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• Barnsley Council</li> <li>• Other regulatory agencies such as the Environment Agency</li> </ul>
<b>LDF Core Policy: Community Infrastructure</b>			
<b>LDF Strategic</b>	Objective 3: To secure safe, healthy and inclusive communities and promote wellbeing		

<b>Objectives</b>	Objective 4: To make efficient use of land and infrastructure Objective 5: To accelerate economic growth Objective 7: To deliver a sufficient supply of housing to provide balanced mixed communities and support economic growth Objective 8: To protect and improve the countryside and natural environment		
<b>SCS Ambitions</b>	Ambition 1 - Our Communities are attractive, clean sustainable places to live Ambition 8 - 21st century environments for 21st century learning, enterprise, skills and services		
<b>Core Strategy Policy</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Implementation/Partners</b>
CSP 42 Infrastructure and Planning Obligations	Provision will be measured against the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and SPD requirements	Number and total financial contributions secured by Planning Obligations, by type of infrastructure  Number and type of on-site contributions secured by Planning Obligations	<b>Mechanisms</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing the Infrastructure Delivery Plan</li> <li>• Securing necessary on site physical, social and economic infrastructure through Development Management</li> <li>• Supplementary Planning Document to provide further guidance on the requirements for and mechanisms for securing infrastructure provisions</li> <li>• The use of planning obligations to secure required infrastructure not provided directly by developers and/or developing a CIL schedule and related charging mechanism</li> <li>• Appropriate pooling contributions to deliver infrastructure where necessary</li> <li>• Green Infrastructure and Green Space Strategies and any subsequent reviews</li> <li>• Related infrastructure strategies lead by the council or delivery agencies</li> </ul> <b>Key partners</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• Infrastructure providers and agencies</li> <li>• Barnsley Council</li> </ul>

CSP 43 Educational Facilities and Community Uses	The Education Sites DPD and Core Strategy policy CSP 42 will also help to implement this policy	See monitoring and delivery mechanisms included within the Education Sites DPD and indicators for policy CSP 42	<p><b>Mechanisms</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites allocation for Advanced Learning Centres to be shown on the Proposals Map</li> <li>• The Councils Remaking Learning strategy</li> <li>• Building Schools for the Future programme</li> </ul> <p><b>Key partners</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community groups and facility owners</li> <li>• Developers</li> <li>• Schools</li> <li>• PFI partners</li> <li>• South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Authority</li> <li>• Barnsley Council</li> </ul>
	No net loss of required community uses	Net change in community uses by type	

**APPENDIX C Infrastructure Funding**  
**Summary of funding committed or proposed as at**  
**March 2011**

tegy DPD, Inspector's Report May 2011

Scale of Source of Funding	Responsibility (Source)	Programme	Funding Committed	Timeframe	Notes
<b>National/Regional / City-Regional</b>	Homes and Communities Agency	Local Investment Plan 2010-2014	<b>2010/2011</b> Affordable £27.061m Housing Other £11.366m HCA Funding Single £6.252m Housing Pot	As stated	Funding Requirement as set out within Barnsley's Local Investment Plan 2010 to 2014..
			<b>2011/2014</b> Estimated £12 million		
			Housing Growth Point Fund		
Department for Transport	Section 31 Grant for Cudworth and West Green Bypass		£2.967m (2010-11 allocation but requirement more likely to be £3.549m)	2010-11	As set out within BMBC Capital Funding 2010/11. Grant claimed in arrears.
Department for Transport Local Transport Plan 2	LTP Integrated Transport Block Locally Funded (Direct Grant)		£1.506m (reduced by 25% in-year).	2010-11	As set out within BMBC Capital Funding 2010/11. Received in quarterly instalments from DfT.
Department for Transport Local Transport Plan 2	LTP Maintenance Block (supported borrowing)		£3.456m	2010-11	As set out within BMBC Capital Funding 2010/11.
Department for Transport Local Transport Plan 2	LTP Integrated Transport Block Centrally Funded including RFA Uplift (Direct Grant)		£2.573m BMBC share of South Yorkshire ITA/PTE pot	2010-2011	As set out within BMBC Capital Funding 2010/11. Grant claimed in arrears.
BMBC	Winter Maintenance/Repairs	Road	£2.148m to undertake remedial works following adverse winter weather.	2010-2011	

**APPENDIX C Infrastructure Funding**  
**Summary of funding committed or proposed as at**  
**March 2011**

tegy DPD, Inspector's Report May 2011

Scale of Source of Funding	Responsibility (Source)	Programme	Funding Committed	Timeframe	Notes
	Department for Transport Local Transport Plan 3	LTP Maintenance Block (Direct Grant)	£3.467m	2011-2012	To be set out within BMBC Capital Funding 2011/12 grant claimed in arrears.
	Department for Transport Local Transport Plan 3	Integrated Transport Block (BMBC) Locally and Centrally Funded (Direct Grant)	£1.5m-£2.0m BMBC share of South Yorkshire ITA/PTE block	2011-2012	Funding still to be decided for 2011-2012. Grant claimed in arrears
	Department for Business, Innovation and Skills	Regional Growth Fund	£1.4b nationwide	2011/14	Waiting to hear results of first bid. Second round bid to be made in the spring.
	Department for Transport	Local Sustainable Transport Fund	£560m nationwide	2011/15	Bids currently being prepared for the first of three tranches of funding. Funding for Barnsley
	Department for Communities and Local Government	Community Infrastructure Funding	£1.842	2010-11	As set out within BMBC Capital Funding 2010/11. To fund infrastructure improvements to enable housing development in the Dearne Valley. Some expenditure incurred 2009/10. Original proposals as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A6195 Cathill Roundabout £0.550</li> <li>- A633 Junction Improvements £0.575</li> <li>- A635 Quality Bus Corridor £0.375</li> <li>- Barnsley Intelligent Transport System £0.200</li> <li>- Dearne Walking and Cycling Strategy £0.638</li> </ul>
	BMBC/ERDF	Various bids to £45m South Yorkshire Target allocation of ERDF programme including:	Urban Centre Infrastructure £3m approx Cultural Infrastructure £2.94m	Present-2013	Funding as yet unconfirmed

**APPENDIX C Infrastructure Funding**  
**Summary of funding committed or proposed as at**  
**March 2011**

tegy DPD, Inspector's Report May 2011

Scale of Source of Funding	Responsibility (Source)	Programme	Funding Committed	Timeframe	Notes
					Funding as yet unconfirmed
	The Environment Agency	Flood Alleviation	£300k	2011-2013	Flood Risk Management Measures
<b>Local</b>	Barnsley Council	Capital Investment Programme	Decent Homes £20m Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder Grant £4.193m 2010-2012 Green Corridor £1.8m 2011-2012 Regional Housing Board/Local Authority Investment Programme £6.144m 2010-2011 Social Housing New Build Schemes £10m Barnsley Market Development Costs/CPOs £7.8m	Various	Source: Barnsley MBC Development Capital Funding for 2010/11
		Building Schools for the Future	£350m	Up to 2012	Delivering 9 Advanced Learning Centres and 2 Special Needs Schools
		Primary Capital Programme	Supported Borrowing: Condition defects (£1-1.8m), School Access Initiative (£150,000), Athersley North Primary School (£250,000) Primary Capital Programme Grant (£3.4 m): Heather		Schemes funded prior to 2009-10 that will be on site in 2009-11 include:  Ward Green Primary Phase 1 (£1.6m already approved and £1.6m proposed for 2010-11), Cawthorne Primary (£550,000), Jump Primary (£350,000), Athersley South Primary school

**APPENDIX C Infrastructure Funding**  
**Summary of funding committed or proposed as at**  
**March 2011**

tegy DPD, Inspector's Report May 2011

Scale of Source of Funding	Responsibility (Source)	Programme	Funding Committed	Timeframe	Notes
			Garth Primary School (£800,000), Richard Newman Primary School (£500,000), Dearne Highgate Primary (£500,000); Grimethorpe Ladywood Primary (£600,000) 2010-2011 Modernisation grant drawn down for use in 2009-10: Silkstone Common Primary (£650,000 from advance of grant, total scheme cost estimate £1.15m); Birdwell Primary (£650,000 from advance of grant, total scheme cost estimate £800,000), Small PCP Matched funding schemes (£844,000)		(£446,000)
	Learning and Skills Council	Barnsley College Old Mill Lane Building		2010-2011	
		LIFT Centres	£22m	2010-2012	Extending LIFT provision across the Borough with four new centres.
Electricity*		YEDL 2008/2009 Financial Plan	£8.415m	2010 (per annum)	Plus £192m investment in distribution system
Gas*		Northern Gas Networks National Grid	£0.871m £5.51m	2010 (per annum)	
Water Supply*		YWS AMP	Approx £7.065m	2010 (per annum)	



**APPENDIX C Infrastructure Funding**  
**Summary of funding committed or proposed as at**  
**March 2011**

tegy DPD, Inspector's Report May 2011

Scale of Source of Funding	Responsibility (Source)	Programme	Funding Committed	Timeframe	Notes
	Sewerage*	YWS AMP	Approx £10.332m	2010 (per annum)	
	Communications*	Based on BT Openreach expenditure 2007 - 2010	£3.562m	2010 (per annum)	£100m investment via the South Yorkshire Digital Region programme
	Waste and Recycling	Private Finance Initiative	£140m		Joint municipal waste facility in partnership with Doncaster and Rotherham.
	Ambulance	5-year Business Plan	Accident and Emergency (A&E) £153.597m Patient Transport Services (PTS) including events £30.865m GP out-of-hours £1.754m Hazardous Area Response Team (HART) £2.791m Other Income £6.709m	2010/11	Based on the total income assumption 2010-11 as set out in the Annual Business Plan 2010-11
	Fire and Rescue	Revenue Finance	£56.9m	2008/9	As set out in the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service Corporate Plan 2008-2011
£59.5m			2009/10		
£59.8m	2010/11				
£61.4m	2011/12				
	Police	Capital Funding Programme Police General Grant	£11.8m	2008/9	As set out in the South Yorkshire Police Force Capital Programme
£3.1m			2009/10		
£2.3m			2010/11		
	Police	Capital Funding Programme Police General Grant	£1,164,048	2010-11	As set out in the South Yorkshire Police Force Capital Programme
£8,168,212			2011/12		
£3,309,000			2012/13		
£3,309,000			2013/14		
		External Grants	£1,128	2010/11	As set out in the South Yorkshire Police Force Capital Programme
		Capital Receipts	£3,329,000 £130,000	2010-11 2011/12	As set out in the South Yorkshire Police Force Capital Programme

**APPENDIX C Infrastructure Funding**  
**Summary of funding committed or proposed as at**  
**March 2011**

tegy DPD, Inspector's Report May 2011

Scale of Source of Funding	Responsibility (Source)	Programme	Funding Committed	Timeframe	Notes
		Capital/Helicopter Reserves	£1,848,952	2010/11	As set out in the South Yorkshire Police Force Capital Programme
		Direct Revenue Financing	£1,000,000	2010/11	As set out in the South Yorkshire Police Force Capital Programme
		Supported Borrowing	£1,591,000	2010-11	As set out in the South Yorkshire Police Force Capital Programme
			£1,821,100	2011/12	
			£1,706,000	2012/13	
			£1,706,000	2013/14	
		Unsupported Borrowing	£9,156,360	2010-11	As set out in the South Yorkshire Police Force Capital Programme
			£781,750	2011/12	
			£157,000	2012/13	
			£181,000	2013/14	
<b>Private Sector</b>	Developer Contributions	Section 106/CIL	Dependant upon build out rates and individual agreements	Per Annum	Barnsley Borough

Source: Barnsley MBC, Drivers Jonas Deloitte and Arup extract from Barnsley Infrastructure Study draft Part 2

\* Figures for electricity, gas, telecommunications, water supply and sewerage have been derived on a per capita basis; figures have been taken from overall capital expenditure as set out in business plans, development strategies. The figures represent expenditure on maintenance and enhancement of assets. The figures set out are representative and approximate. More detailed figures should be determined in conjunction with the individual utility provider.

## APPENDIX D

### Further proposed minor editorial changes to Submission Version of the Core Strategy Consolidated Schedule April 2011

*This document has been produced to support the Submission version of the Core Strategy. It sets out the proposed changes to be made to the policies and supporting text of the Submission version of the Core Strategy. These changes are proposed to ensure that the document is legible and up to date, and to amend typographical errors.*

*The schedule includes the minor editorial changes set out the Further Proposed Minor Editorial Changes Table Jan 2011, the updated version of this table of March 2011 and has been updated throughout the Examination Hearings.*

*The schedule below lists all the changes which are proposed in the order they appear in the document.*

Core Strategy Policy/Paragraph	Change required
Generic	
References to the 'Transportation Strategy'	Amend all references to the 'Transportation Strategy' to read 'Transport Strategy'
General/all policy sections Pink Boxes	Add new section to the end of each Pink Box called 'Evidence' to include cross references to appropriate sources of evidence in support of the main policies.
3. Relationship with Other Plans and Strategies	
Para 3.3 table of Planning Policy Statements	Add Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning for the Historic Environment March 2010 to the table after PPG5
Evidence Base Paragraph 3.30	<b>Add additional paragraph after paragraph 3.30 as follows:</b>  'The main sources of evidence which underpin the Core Strategy Policies are included in the Pink Boxes as the start of each section. The Regional Spatial Strategy and the Sustainable Community Strategy are not specifically mentioned in each Pink Box as they have informed all of the Core Strategy Policies.'
9. Core Policies	
Para 9.0.2	Amend reference in first sentence to 'Section 8 Monitoring and Indicators' to read 'Section 10 Monitoring and Indicators'

<p>9.1 Climate Change Pink Box</p>	<p><b>Add 'Evidence' section as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REG 11 Integrated Regional Framework</li> <li>• REG35 Climate Change Plan for Yorkshire &amp; the Humber 2009 – 2014</li> <li>• REG36 Yorkshire And Humber Regional Climate Change Adaptation Study - Local Area Report - Barnsley Metropolitan Borough</li> <li>• BMBC 23 Barnsley Carbon Management Strategy and Implementation Plan</li> <li>• BMBC 29 Barnsley Strategic Level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment</li> <li>• NG 14 PPS25 Development and Flood Risk</li> <li>• NG 18 Securing the Future – delivering UK Sustainable Development Strategy</li> <li>• NG 21 Nottingham Declaration of Climate Change</li> <li>• NG 22 Kyoto Protocol</li> <li>• NG 23 PPS1 and Climate Change Supplement</li> <li>• NG 28 Code for Sustainable Homes</li> <li>• NG46 BREEAM and Planning</li> <li>• NG47 BREEAM in Use</li> <li>• NG48 The Stern Review: The Economics of Climate Change</li> <li>• LEG 4 Flood and Water Management Act 2010</li> <li>• LEG9 Climate Change Act 2008</li> </ul>
<p>9.2 Renewables Pink Box</p>	<p><b>Add 'Evidence' section as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NG12 PPS22 Renewable Energy</li> <li>• NG 27 Energy White Paper</li> <li>• REG37 Planning for Renewable Energy Targets in Yorkshire and Humber</li> </ul>
<p>9.3 Location of Growth Pink Box</p>	<p>In bullet point 6, under The Current Position, replace the reference to '97, 400 homes (HIP2003) with '104,266 (HFR 2010)'</p> <p><b>Add 'Evidence' section as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REG 2 Moving Forward the Northern Way First Growth Strategy</li> <li>• REG 11 Integrated Regional Framework</li> <li>• REG 12 Regional Economic Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber 2006-2015</li> <li>• REG 13 Regional Housing Strategy</li> <li>• REG 15 Leeds City Region – Growth Point Programme of Development</li> <li>• REG 16 Sheffield City Region growth with renewal: The Doncaster and South Yorkshire New Growth Point</li> <li>• REG 19 New Growth Points – the programme of development for LCR 2000-2016/17</li> <li>• REG 21 Sub regional spatial strategy for South Yorkshire</li> <li>• REG 23 Regional Settlement Study</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REG 30 South Yorkshire Partnership Refreshing the Vision</li> <li>• BMBC 3 Barnsley Settlement Assessment</li> <li>• BMBC 4 Barnsley's Settlement Assessment 2007 Update</li> <li>• BMBC 5 The Growth Plan for Barnsley's Economy</li> <li>• BMBC 7 BMBC Strategic Housing Service Housing Strategy 2003-2008</li> <li>• BMBC 15 Barnsley LDF Housing Assessment Methodology</li> <li>• BMBC 59 Barnsley LDF Housing Assessment Methodology Update</li> <li>• BMBC 16 Barnsley Employment Site Assessment</li> <li>• BMBC 18 Urban Housing Potential Study</li> <li>• BMBC 19 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment</li> <li>• BMBC 26 Housing Land Supply</li> <li>• BMBC 27 Employment Land Review</li> <li>• BMBC 30 Local Investment Plan 2010-2014 Housing Investment Plan</li> <li>• BMBC 58 Housing Land 5 Year Supply Note 2009 – 2010</li> <li>• BMBC 60 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2009 Update</li> <li>• BMBC 61 SHLAA Appendix 4 Site Schedule</li> <li>• NG 6 PPS3 Housing</li> <li>• NG 7 PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth</li> </ul>
Paragraph 9.3.3	Delete 'and' before health in second sentence
9.4 Housing Pink Box	<p><b>Add 'Evidence' section as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REG 4 The Green Corridor Strategic Framework and Spatial Plan</li> <li>• REG 10 The South Yorkshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment</li> <li>• REG 20 South Yorkshire Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder (making the difference strategic framework)</li> <li>• BMBC 14 Goldthorpe Masterplan</li> <li>• BMBC 17 Barnsley BMBC Affordable Housing Viability Study final report</li> <li>• BMBC 19 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment</li> <li>• BMBC 25 Barnsley Housing Needs, Markets and Affordability Update (Strategic Housing Market Assessment)</li> <li>• BMBC 30 Local Investment Plan 2010-2014 Housing Investment Plan</li> <li>• BMBC 58 Housing Land 5 Year Supply Note 2009 – 2010</li> <li>• BMBC 60 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2009 Update</li> <li>• BMBC 61 SHLAA Appendix 4 Site Schedule</li> <li>• NG 1 Circular 01/2006 Planning for Gypsy and Travelling Caravan Sites</li> <li>• NG 6 PPS3 Housing</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NG 29 Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites a good practice guide</li> <li>• LEG4 Flood and Water Management Act 2010</li> </ul>
9.5 Economy Pink Box	<p><b>Add 'Evidence' section as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REG 12 Regional Economic Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber 2006-2015</li> <li>• BMBC 5 The Growth Plan for Barnsley's Economy</li> <li>• BMBC 27 Employment Land Review</li> <li>• NG 7 PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth</li> <li>• NG 17 Living Working Countryside: The Taylor Review of the Rural Economy and Affordable Housing</li> <li>• NG 30 Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism</li> </ul>
Paragraph 9.5.17	Delete word 'facing' from first sentence and replace with 'of'
CSP 21	<p><b>Amend the 6<sup>th</sup> bullet point to read:</b></p> <p>"be directly related, where appropriate, to the needs of the settlement"</p>
9.6 Transportation Pink Box	<p><b>Add 'Evidence' section as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REG 2 Moving Forward the Northern Way First Growth Strategy</li> <li>• REG 3 Dearne Valley Eco-vision</li> <li>• REG 5 South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2 2006-2011</li> <li>• REG 6 Yorkshire and Humber Route Utilisation Strategy</li> <li>• REG 7 Rail Strategy and Delivery Plan – South Yorkshire making rail a better choice</li> <li>• REG 9 A Draft South Yorkshire Freight Strategy</li> <li>• REG 11 Integrated Regional Framework</li> <li>• REG 17 Leeds City Region Connectivity Study – Phase 1 Summary Report</li> <li>• REG 18 Sheffield City Region Connectivity Study – Phase 1 Report</li> <li>• REG 24 South Yorkshire LTP2 Congestion Delivery Plan 2006-2011</li> <li>• REG 25 Moving Forward: The Northern Way Direction for Transport</li> <li>• REG 26 Moving Forward: The Northern Way Short, Medium and long term transport priorities</li> <li>• REG 27 Transforming our Economy and our connectivity – high speed rail for the north</li> <li>• REG 28 South Yorkshire Road Safety and Casualty Reduction Strategy 2006-2011</li> <li>• REG 40 The Leeds City Region Transport Strategy – Main Report</li> <li>• REG 41 Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy 2011-2026 - Approved by ITA Draft for District Approval</li> <li>• BMBC 24 Barnsley Health Profile</li> <li>• BMBC 28 Barnsley LDF Study</li> <li>• BMBC 31 Barnsley Cycle Strategy and Action Plan</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BMBC 32 Northern Towns Transport and Access Study</li> <li>• BMBC 33 Accessibility Programme Review – final report</li> <li>• BMBC 39 Draft Air Quality Action Plan – consultation version</li> <li>• BMBC 40 Air Quality Action Plan</li> <li>• NG 11 PPS13 Transport</li> <li>• NG 15 Delivering a Sustainable Transport System</li> <li>• NG 25 Making the Connections; Final Report on Transport and Social Inclusion</li> <li>• NG 31 Workwise UK</li> <li>• NG 32 Guidance on Transport Assessments</li> <li>• NG 33 Good Practice Guidelines; Delivering Travel Plans through the Planning Process</li> <li>• LEG 1 The Local Transport Act</li> <li>• LEG 10 DfT Circular 02/2007: Planning &amp; the Strategic Road Network</li> </ul>
CSP 23 Accessibility Priorities	In the first sentence, delete the words 'and are' and replace with 'as'.
Para 9.6.40	<p>Delete the word 'route' from the end of bullet point 5 and add the words 'and the former Cudworth (referred to as Barnsley Growth Corridor) Railways'</p> <p>Delete final sentence of bullet point 7 and add to the end of bullet point 8</p>
9.6.70	Insert a paragraph space between the final sentence and the next title and move the title to left.
9.7 Local Character Pink Box	<p><b>Add 'Evidence' section as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BMBC 6 Remaking Barnsley Strategic Development Framework 2003-2033</li> <li>• BMBC 10 Barnsley Town Centre Public Spaces Strategy</li> <li>• BMBC 11 Barnsley Buildings Heights Study</li> <li>• NG 6 PPS3: Housing</li> <li>• NG 19 By Design – Design in the Planning System</li> <li>• NG 28 Code for Sustainable Homes</li> <li>• NG 40 PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development</li> <li>• NG 41 PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment</li> <li>• NG 41 PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment: Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide</li> <li>• NG 49 English Heritage Guidance on Conservation Area Appraisals</li> <li>• NG 50 English Heritage Guidance on the Management of Conservation Areas</li> <li>• NG 51 English Heritage Heritage at Risk Register 2010: Yorkshire &amp; the Humber</li> <li>• NG 52 Building for Life – Delivering Great Places to Live</li> <li>• REG 38 South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REG 39 Raising the Standard of Residential Design in South Yorkshire</li> </ul>
CSP 29 Design	Replace the word Silver with 'good' in the final bullet point.
CSP 30 Historic Environment	Delete last part of 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet which reads 'and other historic landscapes including key views from and within these landscapes' and move to the end of 5 <sup>th</sup> bullet where it was intended to be
9.8 Town Centres Pink Box	<p><b>Add 'Evidence' section as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BMBC 6 Remaking Barnsley Strategic Development Framework 2003-2033</li> <li>• BMBC 8 Barnsley Retail and Leisure Study</li> <li>• BMBC 9 DTZ Retail Analysis and Health Check of Barnsley 2007</li> <li>• BMBC 41 Barnsley Smaller Centres Study</li> <li>• NG 7 PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth</li> <li>• NG 53 Planning for Town Centres: Practice Guidance in Need, Impact &amp; the Sequential Approach</li> </ul>
CSP 32	<b>Delete</b> the word 'may' from the first sentence and <b>replace</b> with 'will'
9.9 Green Infrastructure Pink Box	<p><b>Add 'Evidence' section as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REG 29 Leeds City Region Green Infrastructure Strategy</li> <li>• REG 31 Countryside Character Volume 3 Yorkshire and the Humber</li> <li>• BMBC 2 Barnsley Green Spaces Part One our Strategy</li> <li>• BMBC 12 Barnsley Biodiversity Action Plan</li> <li>• BMBC 13 Barnsley Biodiversity Action Plan second edition 2008-2012</li> <li>• BMBC 20 Barnsley Borough Landscape Character Assessment</li> <li>• NG 4 PPG2 Green Belts</li> <li>• NG 8 PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation</li> <li>• NG 10 PPS12 Local Development Frameworks</li> <li>• NG 10 PPS12 Local Spatial Planning</li> <li>• NG 34 UK Biodiversity Action Plan</li> <li>• NG 42 PPS 7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas</li> <li>• NG 43 PPG 17 Planning for Open Space Sport and Recreation</li> <li>• LEG 2 Countryside and Rights of Way Act</li> </ul>
CSP 37	Insert a space between 'CSP' and '37'
9.10 Waste and Recycling Pink Box	<p><b>Add 'Evidence' section as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REG 32 The Yorkshire and Humber Regional Sustainable Development Framework</li> <li>• NG 20 Waste Strategy for England 2007</li> <li>• NG 9 PPS10 Planning for Sustainable Waste Management</li> <li>• NG 13 PPS23 Planning and Pollution Control</li> <li>• NG 18 Securing the Future – Delivering the UK Sustainable Development Strategy</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BMBC 57 BMBC Municipal Waste Management Strategy 2007</li> </ul>
9.11 Minerals Pink Box	<p><b>Add 'Evidence' section as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REG 33 The Coal Authority Plan Yorkshire and Humber Regional Surface Coal Resource Areas 1:300,000 2008</li> <li>• REG 34 British Geological Survey South Yorkshire Mineral Resources Map 1:100,000 2006</li> <li>• BMBC 55 British Geological Survey Barnsley Mineral Resources Dataset 2009 (Barnsley Mineral Resource Map IDA: 177350 IPR/117-222DW)</li> <li>• BMBC 56 The Coal Authority Barnsley District (B) Surface Mining Coal Resource Areas Map 2009 Scale 1:100,000</li> <li>• NG 27 Energy White Paper</li> <li>• NG 35 UK Low Carbon Transition Plan (National Strategy for Climate Change and Energy)</li> <li>• NG 36 MPS1 Consultation Paper on Annex 2 and 3 to MPS1</li> <li>• NG 37 MPG Coal Mining and Colliery Soil</li> <li>• NG 38 Planning and Minerals Practice Guide</li> <li>• NG 39 Revised national and regional guidance for the provision of aggregates in England for the 16 year period 2000-2016</li> <li>• NG 44 MPS1 Planning and Minerals</li> </ul>
9.12 Contaminated Land and Pollution Pink Box	<p><b>Add 'Evidence' section as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BMBC 39 Draft Air Quality Action Plan 2010 consultation draft</li> <li>• BMBC 40 Air Quality Action Plan</li> <li>• NG 13 PPS23 Planning and Pollution Control</li> <li>• NG 45 PPG14 Development on Unstable Land</li> <li>• LEG 5 Environmental Act 2005</li> <li>• LEG 6 Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2007</li> </ul>
Paragraph 9.12.8	Insert word 'normally' after not in first sentence
9.13 Community Infrastructure Pink Box	<p><b>Add 'Evidence' section as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BMBC 37 Barnsley Education Sites Development Plan Document</li> <li>• BMBC 38 Infrastructure Delivery Plan – Part 1 Report</li> <li>• BMBC 62 Barnsley Infrastructure Study – Part 2 Report draft</li> <li>• NG 10 PPS12 Local Development Frameworks</li> <li>• LEG 7 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010</li> <li>• LEG 8 Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations</li> </ul>
Para 9.13.6	Delete sentence "The government has recently consulted on regulations to set out how the Community Infrastructure Levy will work"
Appendix 4 Superseded Policies	
After paragraph 4.1	<b>Add additional introductory paragraph 4.2 to read:</b>

	<p>'Until all the LDF documents are in place, some parts of the UDP are being 'saved' to ensure comprehensive planning policy coverage remains in place. Saved parts of the UDP remain in force and will be used in determining planning applications until replaced. The full list of saved UDP policies is available on the Councils website. In particular policies with associated notations shown on the UDP Proposals Maps, will continue to apply until such time as the Proposals Maps associated with the Development Sites and Places DPD and the Town Centre Area Action Plan are adopted. These include the policies and notations relating to such things as the Green Belt and town centres.'</p>
CSP 18	Delete reference to H10 being superseded
CSP 19	Delete reference to ED7 being superseded
CSP 23	Delete reference to T3 being superseded
CSP 30	Delete reference to NE14, DA11, HN13, PE14 and WR19 being superseded
CSP 31	Delete reference to S1, S2, S3, S5, TC46, WW20 and WW21 being superseded
CSP 34	Delete reference to GS6, WR5, BA9, DT5, DO5, RO5, NE7, DA5, DE7, WW7, HN5, PE5 and WR10 being superseded
CSP 36	Delete reference to GS18 being deleted