





## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Note on Preparation</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Part One - Background</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>Character of the Employment Land Market</b>	<b>6</b>
	<b>Economic Background and The Barnsley Growth Plan</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Part Two - Planning Policy context</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>National Planning Policy Context</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>Regional Spatial Strategy</b>	<b>8</b>
	<b>The Unitary Development Plan (UDP)</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>The Local Development Framework</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Part Three - The Existing Stock</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>The Inherited Employment Land Position - Background</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>The Inherited Employment Land Position - As at April 2008</b>	<b>12</b>
	<b>Land Owned (or otherwise controlled) by End Users</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>Deallocation and Reallocation</b>	<b>16</b>
	<b>Existing Allocations To Be Carried Forward</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Part Four - Future Requirements</b>	<b>18</b>
	<b>How Much Land Needs to be Allocated</b>	<b>18</b>
	<b>Job Growth Implications of the Barnsley Growth Plan</b>	<b>18</b>
	<b>Provision for Employment Site Users other than Industry and Warehousing</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>Job Density</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>Land to remain Available Throughout the Plan Period</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>RSS derived Baseline Calculation of Employment Land Requirements</b>	<b>22</b>
	<b>Assessment of total Requirement</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Addendum - Relationship of Review to Ongoing LDF Process</b>	<b>24</b>
	<b>Meeting the Core Strategy</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>■</b>	<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>1</b>	<b>Employment Land Review - Premises Study Methodology</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Extract of Roger Tym study for Regional Planning Body</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>RSS Policy E3</b>	<b>30</b>
	<b>Supporting Documents</b>	<b>31</b>

## 1 . Note on Preparation

- 1.1** This Review was prepared during 2009, with further amendment during Spring 2010. It follows the advice in the 2004 Government Guidance (“the Brown Book”). Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for Yorkshire and the Humber (issued in May 2008) provides the most important planning policy base.
- 1.2** During the period of preparation of this Review in 2009, the Regional Planning Body commissioned work to develop guidance to assist in translating RSS net future job change figures into employment land requirements, and initial findings gave reassurance to the approach adopted in this Review.
- 1.3** In the summer of 2009 the Council consulted on its Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy Revised Preferred Options. The employment land proposals in the emerging LDF have been informed by early work on this Review.
- 1.4** The Review utilises considerable work already carried out, including:-
- LDF Assessment of Employment Sites, (the Babbie Study) including sustainability assessment of sites and potential market attractiveness
  - LDF Economy Background Paper 2005 (including the work on jobs and employment land by Sheffield Hallam University)
  - Crossland Otter Hunt Assessment of Employment Sites (2007) itself a response to the GVA Grimley South Yorkshire Land and Property Study which highlighted extensive constraints affecting the SY land supply)
  - The Growth Plan for the Barnsley Economy (MTL Associates, Nov. 2007) Commonly referred to as the Barnsley Growth Plan or simply “the Growth Plan”
- 1.5** Most of this work remains relevant (eg assessments of sustainability and attractiveness) and we do not propose to repeat it except where it has been clearly overtaken by events, eg where land previously assessed has now been developed.
- 1.6** New work has been undertaken in connection with the current review, and has been drawn on as appropriate. This includes:-
- The Barnsley Premises Study (2009) covered all existing premises within the scope of this Review and is the first 100% survey of these industrial and business site premises in Barnsley. The study itself is complete, providing essential information on density and Use Class split, and further analysis continues. The methodology used in carrying out the Premises Study is attached at appendix 1.
  - The emerging Barnsley Town Centre Office Capacity Study is aimed at determining how much of future office requirements can be delivered within the Barnsley Town Centre, and fits well with the requirements of the new PPS4
- 1.7** A Stakeholder Workshop was held in mid December 2009. The presentation and notes of this workshop are contained in Supporting Document 1 "ELR Stakeholder Workshop December 09 Presentation & Notes" on Barnsley's [Consultation Portal](#). Click the link to navigate to the Consultation Portal.

## 1 . Note on Preparation

- 1.8** On 29th December 2009 the new Planning Policy Statement 4 (PPS4) - Planning for Sustainable Economic Development - was published. This replaces PPG4 and all or parts of other Statements and Guidance (notably PPS6 on Town Centres and Retail Planning). This Review was substantially complete by that date but the provisions confirm the approach adopted by the Employment Land Review in relation to local evidence and circumstances. The Employment Land Review provides a significant part of the evidence base for Plan Making required by PPS4.
- 1.9** PPS4 defines economic development use very widely, and includes everything that provides jobs including social and commercial community facilities such as schools, pubs, churches, and health facilities which are generally located in centres, local neighbourhoods or within the general urban fabric.
- 1.10** This Employment Land Review concentrates on land for business use on non town centre sites set aside for employment use. Main Town Centre Uses (as defined in PPS4 ) are taken account of insofar as they can be expected to occupy employment land sites outside town centres. In this respect the Employment Land Review may have anticipated the wider scope of economic development adopted in PPS4 rather than the perceived emphasis of RSS on traditional industry and warehousing.
- 1.11** In February 2010 the emerging guidance commissioned by the Regional Planning Body reached draft stage. The approach closely parallels that adopted in this Employment Land Review and some of our assumptions have been modified in the light of its findings and emerging advice. The introduction to this study is attached at appendix 2.
- 1.12** The following timescales relate to key policies and targets:-
- The annual rates of net employment change set out in RSS are adopted for the LDF Core Strategy period from 2011 to 2026
  - The Barnsley Growth Plan has a much shorter timescale (from 2008 – 2016) for the achievement of its targets but this is likely to be extended in the light of the economic downturn, bringing it more closely into alignment with the RSS.

## 2 . Introduction

**2.1** The Employment Land Review is structured as follows:-

- Part One of the Review - “Background” - sets out the development and economic context
- Part Two gives the national, regional and local Policy context
- Part Three examines the scale, composition and character of the existing stock of employment allocations
- Part Four assesses future requirements primarily, though not exclusively, in relation to RSS
- Part Five is an addendum addressing the relationship between the review and the ongoing LDF process

**2.2** The purposes of the Employment Land Review are to:-

- Inform and support the preparation of the LDF
- Support the implementation of the Growth Plan
- Inform the public and private investment processes

**2.3** The Review addresses the need for adequate supplies of employment land - the right sites in the right place at the right time - up to and including 2026, the period covered by the Local Development Framework (LDF). It evaluates the adequacy and suitability of the current portfolio against the assessed requirement for employment land.

**2.4** The Barnsley Growth Plan sets out the Council’s policy for stimulating business and jobs. The provision of employment land to support and complement those initiatives is part of the purpose of this Review.

**2.5** 80% of the population of Barnsley is included within the RSS Regeneration Priority Area. It is regeneration need, backed by regeneration initiatives, rather than commercial pressures that determine both the level and the character of land provision required to meet the economic potential of the borough.

**2.6** At local level the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) is Barnsley’s current Development Plan, which was adopted in December 2000 and designated 422 ha of employment land. Particular characteristics of the Plan were:-

- Provision was disproportionately in the south and east of the Borough, as opposed to urban Barnsley and the M1 corridor.
- The effective base date for employment purposes was approximately 1995 and the 422 ha provision was partially depleted by the date of UDP Adoption
- Part of the provision comprised of “Areas for Investigation” that in final form yielded a significantly smaller area than the original headline figures

**2.7** Levels of employment land available for development are very substantially less than comparable neighbouring areas (see RSS Table 11.3) particularly in relation to both need and potential.

## 2 . Introduction

- 2.8** The UDP is being replaced by the “Local Development Framework” (LDF). The LDF has now reached what is termed “Publication” stage of the Core Strategy. The “Development Sites and Places” Development Plan Document (DPD) which will define sites, is in the initial stages of preparation.
- 2.9** Consideration is being given to how to designate land currently held or otherwise controlled by end users. The recommendation of this review is that employment proposal allocations in this category are carried over into the LDF provided they are capable of satisfactory independent development. However the likelihood is that a substantial proportion of this category of land will probably remain undeveloped at the end of the LDF Plan Period.
- 2.10** The economic downturn creates an uncertainty for the early years of the LDF because of the uncertainty over timing of recovery. This applies both to the demand from potential end users and developer confidence. It is addressed in the emerging Core Strategy by a cautious approach both to allocation and by the provision for phasing.
- 2.11** The lead in times for delivery of completely new employment land sites (both Planning system and development process) mean that it will be some time before any new allocations in the LDF will come on stream to meet the need for land and premises. In the meantime it is necessary to make the best use of the existing stock of premises and allocations. However progress towards adoption of a Development Sites and Places DPD will put Barnsley into as good a position as possible to benefit from the recovery.

## 3 . Part One - Background

### Character of the Employment Land Market

**3.1** The market for Employment Land is characterised by:-

- Wide range of developer and end-user requirements ; size, price, tenure (eg freehold), location, character and quality
- Wide range of management strategies and owner intentions - eg many will only dispose on “design and build” terms which some prospective takers find off-putting
- A consequent lack of fluidity in the market, and the need for a relatively large stock to maintain the range of availability and choice to facilitate the matching of requirements with availability
- Most potential inward investment has a wide range of locational choice (with no specific need to be in Barnsley) and can be very demanding in its specified criteria
- Lower land values than for other uses, particularly housing
- Long lead in times for the development of scheme, (the “pipeline” as referred to by Roger Tym and Partners)
- Especially long Periods from initial strategic decision through to actual jobs on the ground. This means little if anything can be expected from wholly new allocations for a period of years
- Long development/life cycle for schemes. Most wholly new schemes can be expected to have continuing capacity at the end of the Plan period (indeed there would be major problems were this not the case).
- A significant proportion of available land is in the form of uncompleted portions of partially completed schemes - few wholly undeveloped allocated sites remain.

### Economic Background and The Barnsley Growth Plan

**3.2** The Barnsley Economy is too small, with too few jobs and too few businesses.

**3.3** Economically, environmentally and socially, Barnsley has come a long way from where it was in the mid 1990s, following near total loss of its traditional industry. From a very low base, employment is massively improved, providing many more jobs in a much diversified economy.

**3.4** Despite this impressive growth record, the Barnsley economy is too small, with too few jobs and too few businesses for a town of its size. It has one of the lowest levels of jobs per population of working age anywhere in the country of any comparable town. Addressing and remedying this problem is at the heart of the Barnsley Growth Plan.

## 3 . Part One - Background

- 3.5** This lack of jobs does not, however, fully show up in conventional unemployment rates and is masked by:-
- Exceptionally low economic activity rates with a correspondingly high level of “worklessness” (People outside the workforce as officially defined)
  - Of those in work, an exceptionally high percentage travel elsewhere for employment, primarily by car (public transport access to employment opportunities is often poor)
- 3.6** The Barnsley Growth Plan was prepared and approved in 2007 with the support of the Regional Development Agency, Yorkshire Forward and sets out a strategy for the Barnsley economy.
- A key proposal is that a start is made to “rightsized” the economy by making it bigger and hence more closely in proportion to the size of the Borough
  - To increase the employment rate to 76%, equal to the current level of the best placed of its former coalfield neighbours, though still well below the government’s average target rate of 80%
  - Consistent with the above two points, to increase the number of locally available jobs by 15,000
  - To increase the number of VAT registered businesses by 1550
- 3.7** Closely linked to the Government’s national objectives, major programmes are under way to overcome barriers to employment, including skills, which if successful will substantially increase both the proportion of the population participating in the workforce (whether actually employed or not) and the size of that workforce.
- However, unless this is matched by growth in available and accessible employment, some or all of the following consequences will ensue:-
  - The effectiveness of the worklessness programmes will be lessened and they will fail to achieve full potential and/or
  - Conventionally recorded unemployment will increase, achieving an improvement in statistical transparency, but at the cost of reduced household incomes for an already deprived section of the community and/or
  - Out commuting will further increase, with higher travel costs for low income groups, adverse sustainability impacts and adverse impacts on employment levels in other areas.
- 3.8** If the Growth Plan is to achieve its objectives it is important that the planning system plays its part in ensuring that policies are in place to facilitate the provision of sites and premises of a scale and character that will enable the local economy to achieve its full potential, notwithstanding that it may involve sustained growth over a longer period than achieved in the past.
- 3.9** It may be noted that the Growth Plan does not set out a sectoral split for the additional jobs, and this Review applies the split adopted by RSS in assessing the proportion of future jobs on employment land. (See para 6.12)

## 4 . Part Two - Planning Policy context

### National Planning Policy Context

- 4.1** PPS4 was published on 29th December 2009, after the main body of work for this Review had been completed. The main thrust of the PPS, particularly in respect of its broader approach to the scope of Economic Development, is both welcome and supportive of the approach adopted in this Review.
- 4.2** The Introduction to PPS4 states the government's overarching objective as sustainable economic growth and that to achieve this, the objectives for Planning are to:-
- build prosperous communities by improving economic performance of cities, towns, regions, sub-regions and local areas
  - reduce the gap in economic growth rates between regions, promoting regeneration and tackling deprivation
- 4.3** These objectives are closely in line with RSS, Barnsley MBC's emerging LDF Core Strategy and the Barnsley Growth Plan.
- 4.4** PPS4 Policy EC2 - "Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth", deals with the content of Development Plans. The following parts are particularly relevant:-
- EC2.1 a. clear economic vision and strategy, RSS, the UDP and the emerging LDF all set out growth strategies to specifically target high deprivation areas coupled with regard to the need for a high quality environment
  - EC2.1b. Flexibility and quick response to change require versatile sites with enough slack in the system (the RSS "churn") to take advantage of the unpredicted change, particularly given the long lead in for completely new sites
  - EC2.1d. requires a wide range of sites, "...reflects the different location requirements of businesses, such as the size of site required, site quality, access and proximity to markets, as well as locally available workforce" It also seeks to make efficient use of land. Already developed and serviced land should clearly be utilised rather than meet employment land needs by going into more new Greenfield land.

### Regional Spatial Strategy

- 4.5** The current Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) was issued by the Secretary of State in May 2008. LDFs must be in general conformity with RSS. The Economy section of RSS aims to enable the region to meet its economic potential. It gives guidance on the assessment of the type, quantity and location of development for employment purposes, with a key focus on potential net job change.
- 4.6** Policy E1 says that in order to create a more successful and competitive regional economy, plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes should help to deliver, (A) Economic growth, restructuring and diversification, taking into account of the potential job growth indicated by Tables 11.1 and 1.2 and more detailed sub regional or local forecasts as they become available.

## 4 . Part Two - Planning Policy context

- 4.7** Table 11.1 gives a potential annual job growth figure of 1,430 jobs per annum for Barnsley and Table 11.2 breaks these down into:
- 630 as “Main Employment Land Uses” (ie manufacturing and storage - Use Classes B1b,B1c, B2 and B8)
  - 420 are classified as Main Town Centre Uses. Some of these will need to / appropriately be accommodated on employment land
  - No locational assumptions are made in RSS about the remaining 400 jobs
- 4.8** In the context of this Review we are satisfied that all of the manufacturing and storage and some of the other two categories will appropriately (or unavoidably) be accommodated on employment sites.
- 4.9** Policy E2 states that “Plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes should strengthen the role and performance of existing city and town centres
- (A) The centres of Regional Cities and Sub Regional Cities and Towns should be the focus for offices, retail, leisure, entertainment, arts, culture, tourism and more intensive sport and recreation across the region. The centres of Principal Towns...should be the focus for local services and facilities
- 4.10** Policy E3: Land and Premises for Economic Development, is set out in full as Appendix 4, and says that local authorities in preparing employment land reviews should:
- Ensure a sufficient supply of land and premises to meet the needs of a modern economy, making use of appropriately located previously developed land and current locations
  - Take into account the potential job growth referred to above and the guidance on employment land in Table 11.3
  - Review existing sites with a view to reassessment of need and suitability and consider reallocation where appropriate
  - Identify a market ready “Portfolio of the Best” sites, equal to not less than a five year supply
- 4.11** For manufacturing and warehousing Use Classes only, RSS converts net job change into an indicative land area net change, calculated on the basis of an average employment density of 86 persons per hectare and yielding a figure of 110ha. This is too high a density figure for Barnsley and a lower figure is used in calculating future land requirements, see later paragraphs on density and Part Four on future land requirements.
- 4.12** Probably because it is the only figure actually set out in this way, attention has centred on this 110 ha net change figure for Industry and Warehousing, but it is only a part of the overall RSS approach, and is in any event a highly qualified figure.

## 4 . Part Two - Planning Policy context

- 4.13** What RSS does not seek to do is set out a total allocation, a fact that was stressed heavily and repeatedly by the EIP Panel and it does not say:-
- how much employment land is needed for uses other than industry and warehousing.
  - how much is needed to replace net losses
  - how much is needed to cover what it calls “churn” (although it does give guidance on the calculation of part of this latter component in the form of the high quality portfolio)
- 4.14** As noted in “Note on Preparation” draft guidance on the application of RSS to the preparation of employment land reviews was produced in February 2010.

### The Unitary Development Plan (UDP)

- 4.15** The UDP was adopted in December 2000, and will continue (alongside RSS) to be the Development Plan for Barnsley until superseded by the LDF.
- 4.16** The UDP addressed the major land use transition necessitated by the end of the mining industry.
- 4.17** Many former mining industry sites were redeveloped for employment uses. However the distinctive development and settlement patterns associated with the mining legacy did not always translate readily into the requirements of a modern economy, and the inherited Green Belt (which closely reflected these patterns) posed a major constraint on the scale of change needed to provide new employment land in the places where it was required. As a result the areas achieved were less than considered necessary, the UDP nonetheless provided 422ha for employment development (outside town centres) This figure includes the two Areas for Investigation at Grimethorpe and Houghton Main Colliery sites.
- 4.18** Significant UDP policies include:-
- Policy ED1 provided for the allocation of 323 ha of land (excluding the two “Areas of Investigation”) as employment proposals
  - Policy ED7 sets out the policy for the definition of areas of existing employment use as Employment Policy Areas, and says what uses are permitted in such areas
  - Community Area Policies define specific Employment Policy and Proposal Areas across the Borough
  - Policy ED 11 deals with sites which are suitable for the expansion of existing firms but are unsuitable for independent development.
- 4.19** As stated above the it has not been possible to secure the scale of land release necessary to fully meet the requirements of economic transformation and by April 2008 only 150ha (of all descriptions) of UDP allocated employment proposal land remained unbuilt.

## 4 . Part Two - Planning Policy context

### The Local Development Framework

- 4.20** The 2009 LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options were informed by work carried out at an earlier stage of the preparation of this review and proposed that 350ha of employment land be allocated outside the town centre on a phased delivery basis. The LDF Core Strategy Publication version maintained this level of provision and indicates the broad areas of location.
- 4.21** The relationship between this Review and the ongoing LDF process is addressed more fully in the Addendum. It will be noted that the proposed level of provision is lower than the full requirement as assessed in Part Four below and reflects a degree of uncertainty over:
- Identification and deliverability of sustainable new sites in some areas.
  - The speed of recovery from the current downturn.
  - Progress in relation to infrastructure planning.
  - The opportunities for Mixed Use Allocation and the potential for higher levels of focus on centres which will emerge in the Development Sites and Places DPD
- 4.22** In line with RSS, the Core Strategy also sets out priorities for location within the Borough:-
- The town centre, where practicable, for “main town centre uses”
  - Urban Barnsley
  - The Principal Towns
- 4.23** In line with this approach, the emerging Core Strategy sets out the broad distribution across the different settlement areas across the Borough. This is expressed as a series of ranges and will include any carryover from the UDP.
- 4.24** In Autumn 2010 the Council will consult on its Development Sites and Places DPD Revised Preferred Options. This will be the planning document which defines the allocations.
- 4.25** In Part Four of this Review we recommend that approximately 128ha of currently allocated UDP Employment Proposal land be carried forward to the LDF, leaving the Development Sites and Places DPD to identify 222 ha to be allocated in the broad locations specified in the emerging Core Strategy.
- 4.26** Most opportunities for employment development on previously developed land have already been used and increased requirements for new sites in turn increases the requirement for greenfield or greenbelt land.
- 4.27** The Publication Core Strategy assumes a reduced rate of loss of employment land to other development, predominantly housing. At 5ha per annum rather than 10ha as experienced over the past decade, this amounts to 75ha over the Plan period under the RSS net change. Achieving this reduction will be challenging, but will minimise the need for new greenfield and/or greenbelt sites requiring new infrastructure.

## 5 . Part Three - The Existing Stock

### The Inherited Employment Land Position - Background

- 5.1** Because of its coal mining background, Barnsley had a very low level of industrial land and very little by way of other traditional industrial areas.
- 5.2** Prior to the UDP land coming on stream during the past decade, availability and hence take up was very constrained. Coinciding with a favourable period, average take up was then fully in line with expectations for a period of years until the current downturn.
- 5.3** As stated previously, UDP employment land provision had fallen short of Barnsley's stated requirements both in overall area and in location and character. As a consequence therefore, of successful delivery and take up, there is now not enough employment land and not enough of the right type, see below.

### The Inherited Employment Land Position - As at April 2008

- 5.4** Supporting Document 2 - "Remaining UDP Employment Land" tracks the progress of the UDP 422 ha. to 2008 and where sites are recommended for "carry over" to the UDP or for deletion. Supporting Document 2 can be found on Barnsley's [Consultation Portal](#), click the link to navigate to the Consultation Portal.
- 5.5** Of the 150 ha outstanding (at 1.04.08)
  - Less than 50 ha were regarded as meeting the standard for the RSS Portfolio of Market Ready "Best" sites. (Crossland Otter Hunt's 2007 study for Renaissance South Yorkshire found only 33ha of suitable land immediately available)
  - Over 50ha were tied up under the control of end users (mostly capable of independent development and some of them potentially attractive sites in their own right)
  - The balance is a mixture of the less attractive and less available. It includes some potentially very attractive (but currently unavailable) sites, and also residual unfinished plots in otherwise well established developments.
  - Of this remaining balance, 22ha (including some now wholly undevelopable land) will be recommended to be deleted as allocations, broadly the same areas recommended for deletion in the 2005 Preferred Options.

## 5 . Part Three - The Existing Stock

<b>Table 1 Summary of UDP Employment Land Proposals Remaining at 2008 (i)</b>			
To be read in conjunction with Supporting Document, "Remaining UDP Employment Land"			
<b>Land Category</b>		<b>Ha.</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Total unbuilt land brought forward		149.37	
Recommended for deletion to date (ii)		21.72	
Remaining for development		127.65	
Land taken up/ controlled by end user  (52.36 ha. in all)	With definite (unstarted) development proposals	13.00	Counts towards meeting overall 2026 land requirements but <u>not</u> treated as currently available
	Without specific known firm employment development plans	39.36	Adjuncts to "main" premises (often within same fenceline)  Counts towards meeting overall 2026 land requirements but <u>not</u> treated as currently available  Realistically, much of this category (iii) will still be unbuilt at 2026, but de-allocation remains problematic despite uncertain prospects of development over plan period, and consequent issues of RSS/PPS4 conformity.
"Non end user" land remaining for development		74.29 (ii)	Not all presently "Available" to developers or end users
Land meeting "Market Ready Best Sites" RSS Portfolio standard		45.1	Site status may fluctuate over time, both on quality but particularly on market ready factor

## 5 . Part Three - The Existing Stock

### NOTES FOR TABLE 1

1. Remaining UDP Provision (all Barnsley MB).
2. Hectarage figure includes "Market Ready Best Sites" Portfolio.
3. It is not possible to know specifically **which** plots will remain unbuilt.

**5.6** As detailed above, at April 2008, out of an original 422 ha proposed for Employment Land Development in the UDP, 150 ha of land (35%) had yet to be used for the provision of new employment premises, although much of it was already partially developed, on partially developed sites, or had been taken up by end users.

**5.7** Although much of the 150ha is serviced and/or otherwise prepared for further development and some is of excellent quality, some is of very limited potential. Some is comprised of the remaining parcels on otherwise developed sites and with little flexibility, will typically take a longer period to find a match against user/developer requirements. The major constraint on availability however, relates to ownership and control, and the varied intentions of landowners.

**5.8** Since the 150ha is what remains of an original 422ha provision it is not surprising that it contains a higher proportion of land with constraints. Indeed were it not for the masking effect of the current downturn there would soon be real deficiencies in supply before any new allocations became fully effective

**5.9** The 150ha outstanding from the UDP have been evaluated at Preferred Options stage of LDF preparation in 2005. Sites above 1 hectare were also assessed by Crossland Otter Hunt as part of a wider assessment for Renaissance South Yorkshire to ascertain the extent of genuinely market ready employment land.

**5.10** These earlier studies were checked for continued relevance and the results are reflected in the conclusions, summarised on Table One and slightly more fully detailed in Supporting Document 2 - "Remaining UDP Employment Land", as to which land should be recommended for inclusion in the LDF Development Sites and Places DPD.

**5.11** The suggested de-allocations are essentially as proposed in the 2005 Preferred Options Employment Sites DPD.

**5.12** The next section explores one of the key constraints of where the land has been taken up by an end user but without early (or indeed in some instances any) specific prospects of building.

## 5 . Part Three - The Existing Stock

### Land Owned (or otherwise controlled) by End Users

- 5.13** One particular issue in employment land provision is land held by end users against potential future requirements (often referred to as “expansion land”). Land may remain unbuilt for very long periods (two or more Plan periods is not unknown). This does not sit comfortably with government policy that authorities should not retain non performing allocations.
- 5.14** This is a significant issue as approximately 54ha plus (over one third of remaining unbuilt UDP provision) is allocated in the UDP in the normal way but controlled by end users for their own possible future purposes. This is in addition to the dedicated “ED11” situations described below which also account for a substantial land area but which are not considered to be part of the normal supply.
- 5.15** Essentially the choices in the LDF are either:-
- to de-allocate large areas held by firms for the benefit of their businesses and otherwise wholly suited to allocation
  - to retain them as allocations in the knowledge that significant areas are unlikely to be developed during the Plan Period, or contribute to choice and availability during the latter parts of the Plan Period.
- 5.16** In line with earlier rounds of Development Plans in Barnsley, the UDP gave specific attention to a further category of Expansion Land and included Policy ED11 to cover that situation. This was land seen as necessary to safeguard the future development requirements of existing firms but not necessarily suitable and/ or desirable for independent development. Not only was the policy aimed at securing the employment benefits of the prospective expansion but also of ensuring that the firm did not relocate away from Barnsley or even close down if it was unable to carry out necessary modernisation at those premises
- 5.17** Where a site was suitable for independent development the UDP applied a normal Employment Proposal allocation but where such land is owned or otherwise controlled by the relevant company, the resulting situation is comparable to that described in para 5.16 in that the land is not available to anyone else, in some instances over a protracted timescale.
- 5.18** The desire for land for future development (it is not always “expansion” but sometimes simply the need for additional accommodation or new installations to meet the changing requirements of the existing operation) continues to be a feature of some major new developments, sometimes a condition of the inward investment or relocation proposal.
- 5.19** Over time, the experience has been that development on “expansion land” has been the exception rather than the rule. Government policy, however, as expressed through PPS4 and RSS, lays an emphasis on not automatically rolling over existing allocations where there are poor prospects of development during the Plan Period.

## 5 . Part Three - The Existing Stock

- 5.20** It is clear from experience (and up to date intelligence, where available) that the overall prospects of development during the Plan Period are probably not particularly high for this class of land but in relation to any specific individual site it can be very difficult to know with certainty whether there is a real prospect of development. Indeed the firm themselves will commonly be unable to predict with any certainty, let alone commit themselves.
- 5.21** UDP Policy ED11 designations are procedurally more straightforward and a view can be taken in relation to the particular site and firm, however, problematical this maybe in practice.
- 5.22** Where the land is part of a normal Employment allocation but controlled by an adjacent business for its own purposes, however, the position is more difficult to resolve in a way that fits with government policy. For the most part these allocations are otherwise perfectly suited to be carried over into the LDF except that collectively a significant proportion is likely on past performance to remain outstanding at the end of the Plan period.
- 5.23** Table 1 summarising existing supply, and Supporting Document 2 detail the cases covered by normal allocations. It will be seen that the position adopted in this Review is to treat the land as counting to the Plan Period supply but not to current supply. In practice that approach overstates the effective supply and a discounting approach (if permissible) might be more appropriate
- 5.24** As stated above the 54ha are included in the calculations to 2026. Whilst all of it is physically capable of development by 2026, it is highly unlikely that all of it will be, indeed it is questionable whether most of it will be developed. Whatever the uncertainty about the position at 2026, most of this land is not realistically available at the present time.

### Deallocation and Reallocation

- 5.25** Both PPS4 and RSS suggest that authorities should not carry forward employment allocations that have poor prospects of development, and it may appear in the light of preceding paragraphs 60 - 65 that a larger area than 22ha of employment allocations ought now to be deleted. In reality the position is less straightforward.
- 5.26** De-allocation is a process fraught with difficulty. As stated above, much of the outstanding allocated land has in practice been at least partially developed in the form of servicing and/or site preparation and by the same token quite a lot is situated within partially completed estate developments.
- 5.27** In such circumstances de-allocation (or re-allocation) may simply not be a practical proposition.

## 5 . Part Three - The Existing Stock

### Existing Allocations To Be Carried Forward

- 5.28** 128ha are recommended to be carried forward into the LDF Development Sites and Places DPD. Most of it is at least partially developed in the form of servicing and/or site preparation. Employment development is characteristically a long term process, and it is unlikely that much of the entirely new allocations will be available to meet the needs of developers and end users until well into the Plan period.
- 5.29** These lead in times (referred to by Roger Tym and Partners as the pipeline) mean that Barnsley will remain dependent on this carry forward land for some years. Although 128ha may seem a significant cushion to bridge the gap until new allocations come fully on stream, the shortcomings in its composition subsequently reduce its effectiveness.
- 5.30** The carry over of land in the pipeline is not only inevitable but essential if the latter period of one plan, and the initial years of the next, are not to be constrained by a limited range of availability. It is important that the latter years of the LDF Plan Period are not characterised by a run down in the range and availability of employment land.

## 6 . Part Four - Future Requirements

### How Much Land Needs to be Allocated

**6.1** Employment land requirements are comprised of four components:-

- A stock (or “Portfolio”) of land to be maintained through the Plan Period to meet the differing needs of developers and end users, including inward investors. RSS requires at least 5 years supply of Market Ready best sites to be maintained
- Sufficient land coming forward over the Plan Period to offset depletion and to refresh the stock (including land to offset net gain/loss of employment land to other uses)
- An allowance for other land remaining undeveloped but not part of the effective stock (eg expansion land)
- Any additional provision required to address qualitative shortfalls in the overall provision (eg in location, plot size or suitability for difficult uses)

**6.2** Following the adoption of the LDF Development Sites and Places DPD the initial supply will be the carry over from the UDP until LDF allocations progressively come forward. Past experience suggests that it may be the second half of the current decade before it is possible to rebuild the stock to meet the full range of requirements, (see previous references to lead in times) raising a concern that Barnsley may be unable to take full advantage of recovery opportunities as they arise.

**6.3** The central calculations are summarised in Table 2 and supporting paragraphs, and are based on the provisions of RSS.

**6.4** The following paragraphs examine four issues relevant to the Calculation:-

- An examination of the employment land job requirements of the Barnsley Growth Plan as compared to RSS
- The employment land requirements of economic development uses other than traditional industry and warehousing
- Job density - a critical issue in translating job change numbers into land requirements
- The minimum portfolio to be maintained throughout the Plan Period (and by inference outstanding at the end)

### Job Growth Implications of the Barnsley Growth Plan

**6.5** The Growth Plan strategy to “rightsize” Barnsley’s economy has a target of 15,000 additional jobs and 1,500 extra VAT registered businesses, a target very closely compatible with the numbers set out in RSS but with a more ambitious target of 2016. The timescale is now expected to be relaxed as a consequence of the economic downturn, and as a result is likely to become more closely aligned with RSS.

**6.6** The land use and spatial planning implications of the Growth Plan depend on which sectors the additional employment comes from, and the extent to which those sectors locate on employment land. The Growth Plan does not actually specify the sectoral split and our operational assumption is to follow that used by RSS for additional employment potential. On this assumption approximately 9,000 jobs(plus) of the 15,000 additional jobs would be on employment sites.

## 6 . Part Four - Future Requirements

- 6.7** The more pessimistic outlook for population related services in general (dependent as they are on household disposable incomes) and public services in particular, would probably be to lessen reliance on these sectors, both of which have a low propensity to locate on employment sites. The likelihood is therefore that attaining a 15,000 net job gain would actually have a greater rather than a lesser dependence on employment site locations than assumed in the previous paragraph.
- 6.8** The conclusion is that if the Growth Plan is to be realised the estimate of 9,000 net additional jobs on employment sites is likely to be conservative and although derived from a different calculation, nonetheless supports the RSS based approach.

### Provision for Employment Site Users other than Industry and Warehousing

- 6.9** RSS emphasises traditional industry and Warehousing in its guidance but it is clear that newer development embraces a wider range of employment use, reflected in the new PPS4 broad definition of Economic Development.
- 6.10** The Barnsley Premises Study shows an overall average (across all categories and ages) of 22.5% of employment land in use occupied by Use Classes other than industry and warehousing (defined in RSS as B1b, B1c, B2 and B8).
- 6.11** This is the operational assumption adopted in this Review and these assumptions will be refined by ongoing analysis of the findings of the Barnsley Premises Study.
- 6.12** B1a office use has not hitherto been a major user of non-town centre business park space (a total of 19ha in the Barnsley Premises Study). This use is outside the RSS provision for Industry and Warehousing. Barnsley Council policy, in respect of Remaking Barnsley and the emerging LDF, aligns with both RSS and the new PPS4 in seeking a town centre focus for office development. The Digital Media Centre is an example of this approach.
- 6.13** The Town Centre Capacity Study is assessing the capacity of Barnsley Town Centre to accommodate office and leisure uses. Initial findings have identified only limited short to medium term capacity to deliver the particular range of office development (primarily private business users) at present going mainly to certain employment sites. This was corroborated by market experience at the December 2009 stakeholder event where it was confirmed that the types of office development planned for the town centre fail to meet the operational needs of firms currently opting for a business park setting.
- 6.14** In the circumstances it may be prudent to retain an element of ongoing capacity for B1a development in other areas.

## 6 . Part Four - Future Requirements

### Job Density

- 6.15** Job densities per hectare vary a great deal more than housing, partly through the differing operational requirements of different types of business, and are more difficult to influence through planning policies. There is also change over time, both on existing sites and on new development.
- 6.16** Most measured densities relate to actual developed plots but for development plan purposes we need to know what density to apply to whole allocations, including the land that will be “lost” as the boundaries of subsequent schemes are more precisely demarcated, major roads laid out etc.
- 6.17** The UDP assumed a density of 30 jobs per hectare (jph).
- 6.18** Earlier work carried out for the LDF Preferred Options 2005 by Sheffield Hallam University recommended a figure of 50 jobs per ha. This is acknowledged as being in excess of local figures but anticipating future higher density trends, including a higher proportion of office development.
- 6.19** Based on earlier studies, mainly in the southeast of England, RSS assumed significantly higher job densities, averaging approximately 86 jobs per hectare. Initial work on this Review followed the RSS assumptions, although it was known that these were above previously observed densities in the Borough.
- 6.20** The Barnsley Premises Study in 2009 confirmed job density on employment land in Barnsley across the full range of uses to be around 30 jobs per hectare. Further work continues to refine these findings in terms of different types and age of development, but there can be no automatic assumption of trends to significantly higher densities, particularly if we are looking to steer the (higher density) office development into the town centres (a recent very major development approved was as low as 10 jph).
- 6.21** Also during 2009 the initial results from the Regional Planning Body commissioned work to advise on the application of the RSS at local level were indicating that the earlier density assumptions used for RSS were probably too high for Yorkshire and the Humber.
- 6.22** Emerging guidance from this study for assessment of employment land requirements in accordance with RSS now suggests a default density of 57 workers per hectare based on net plot area. This is a smaller area than total allocated area and particularly for new allocations would overstate the number of jobs which to be expected.
- 6.23** Allowing for some increase in local job density, a density of 55 jobs per hectare appears prudent and that figure will be used in the calculations in this Review.

## 6 . Part Four - Future Requirements

### Land to remain Available Throughout the Plan Period

- 6.24** The section which deals with Inherited Land Supply states that the outstanding UDP employment land provision (at 2008) is 150ha. The following paragraphs make clear that this is inadequate in quantity and character. A better minimum supply is required during the next Plan Period if it is to sustain development take up to meet RSS and Growth Plan figures. This requirement is about the range, choice and quality within the stock as well as simply the aggregate number number of hectares.
- 6.25** RSS is clear that allocations need to be greater than anticipated consumption during the Plan Period to allow for the necessary range and choice and for what it calls “churn”. This will include the RSS requirement in Policy E3C for a Market Ready Portfolio of the “best sites” equal to at least five years supply (1/3 of the Plan period) to be available throughout the Plan Period.
- 6.26** Most of this portfolio would be partially developed by the end of the Plan Period, typically being serviced with roads and sewers and/or the preparation of development platforms, although without building or other works for the provision of business premises having commenced.
- 6.27** The portfolio is estimated at 100ha based on:-
- Apportionment of minimum RSS net change and replacement over the Plan period (98.9ha)
  - Previous estimates of requirements
  - Annual take-up during periods of good supply
- 6.28** There will inevitably be other land outstanding at end of Plan period, for similar reasons as now, and at different stages of the development process. (See in particular, earlier section on End User land) Most would appropriately be rolled forward to the next Plan Period. Based on current experience this would be not less than 75ha, primarily comprised of:-
- End User controlled Land
  - Other non- available but otherwise suitable land (either through development delays, ownership issues etc)
  - “Remnant” areas from larger development
- 6.29** The total estimate of land outstanding at end of the LDF Plan Period is 175ha

## 6 . Part Four - Future Requirements

### RSS derived Baseline Calculation of Employment Land Requirements

- 6.30** Table 2 - “Baseline Employment Land Requirements Components” sets out the basic RSS derived calculations.
- 6.31** RSS Table 11.2 gives a 15 year total of 9450 net additional jobs in industry and warehousing use classes. At 55 jobs per hectare (jph) this requires 171.8ha. Grossing this up to allow for other uses in line with para 102 gives 221.7ha net employment land change.
- 6.32** In line with the replacement provision of 5ha per annum, 75ha would be needed over the Plan Period giving a total 15 year “consumption” figure of 296.7ha, and a consequent minimum 5 year figure of 98.9ha “Market Ready Best Sites” Portfolio in accordance with RSS Policy E3C.

### Assessment of total Requirement

<b>TABLE 2 BASELINE EMPLOYMENT LAND REQUIREMENT COMPONENTS (i)</b>		
<b>2011-2026 - Based on RSS minimum requirement adjusted for density</b>		
<b>Category of requirement</b>	<b>15 year Potential Job Growth (RSS)</b>	<b>Land Requirement (ha) (ii)</b>
Industry and Warehousing (iii) (Net Additional)	9450	171.8
Other Employment Land Uses (Net Additional)		49.9 (iv)
Replacement Allowance		75 (v)
“Market Ready Best Sites” portfolio		98.9 (vi)
<b>Total</b> (for above components only)		<b>395.6 (i)</b>

## 6 . Part Four - Future Requirements

### NOTES FOR TABLE 2

1. Emerging Core Strategy provides 350ha, including additional components not detailed above:
    - Barnsley Growth Plan
    - Difference between total allocated areas and (net) area of development plots.
    - Higher level of provision for non B1b/B1c/B2/B8 employment land requirement. The Barnsley Premises Study shows an **overall** level of 22.5% and this issue requires further analysis relating to new development and consideration in the light of the wider approach to Economic Development in PPS4.
    - Provision for “unplanned” residue. The LDF Sites DPD will decide the extent of allocation of lower prospect “carry over” sites (eg of end user “expansion” land or other remnant sites) of which a significant proportion can be expected to remain unbuilt on at the end of the Plan Period.
    - 100ha for the RSS Portfolio.
    - Allowance for longer period covered to 2026.
  2. Density @ 55 jobs per hectare based on:
    - LDF Economy Background Paper.
    - Draft Guidance on Implementation of Y&H RSS Employment Land Provisions.
    - Local Average Densities.
  3. Defined in RSS as Use Classes B1b/B1c/B2/B8.
  4. At 22.5% of Employment Land total (based on Barnsley Premises Study) Core Strategy assumes a higher level (see (v) below).
  5. Reduced allowance of 5ha per annum (currently 10ha to housing alone).
  6. Five year supply at 1/3 of 15 year requirement (RSS requires [at least]five years supply to be maintained throughout the Plan Period).
- 6.33** Taking the total minimum RSS derived figure (including “Best Sites” Portfolio) of 395.6ha together with the 175ha estimate of land remaining at 2026 gives a (rounded) total of 470 ha. total requirement for the period of upto and including 2026.
- 6.34** A figure of 470 ha (including existing provision rolled forward) is adopted as the quantitative assessment of this Review for employment land requirements for the period upto and including 2026.

## 7 . Addendum - Relationship of Review to Ongoing LDF Process

### Meeting the Core Strategy

- 7.1** This section of the Employment Land Review is an addendum to the main document in response to the current stage of our LDF Core Strategy, to provide some context to the Core Strategy Publication Version and the relationship with this Employment Land. The policy implications, rationale and relationship between the Core Strategy and ELR will be explored further in a Topic Paper at Submission stage of the LDF Core Strategy. The LDF Development Sites and Places DPD will be a key tool to delivery of employment land allocation requirements identified in the ELR.
- 7.2** The 2010 Core Strategy Publication Version specifies a total allocation of 350ha (275ha net) of Employment Land, including existing allocations carried forward.
- 7.3** We are recommending that 128 ha be carried over from the UDP into the LDF, leaving approximately 220 ha to be identified in the LDF Development Sites and Places DPD.
- 7.4** Because of the constrained composition of the 128 ha this inherited initial provision will not meet either the RSS portfolio requirement nor the practical requirement for sites to meet the range of needs until some of the existing constraints are released and some progress is made on releasing new sites through the planning system and delivering the necessary subsequent investment to secure delivery.
- 7.5** Core Strategy Publication Version sets out the following locational priorities (while stressing the importance of where the opportunities are) Outside Urban Barnsley these also broadly follow the best accessibility from the strategic highway network
- Urban Barnsley (the Sub-Regional Town)
  - Principal Towns:- Cudworth/Grimethorpe, Hoyland,Goldthorpe/Dearne, Penistone, Royston and Wombwell

## 7 . Addendum - Relationship of Review to Ongoing LDF Process

Settlement Area	Carry Over from UDP	Discounted New Development Opportunities	TotalTargetRange (rounded)
<b>Urban Barnsley</b>	34.5	95 - 120	130 – 155
<b>Cudworth/Grimethorpe</b>	20.5	50 - 60	70 - 80
<b>Goldthorpe/Dearne</b>	23.85	30 - 40	55 - 65
<b>Hoyland</b>	34.7	15 - 30	50 - 65
<b>Penistone</b>	1.4	3 - 5	4.5 - 6.5
<b>Royston</b>	-	10 - 15	10 - 15
<b>Wombwell</b>	4.5	5 - 10	10 - 15
<b>Other Areas</b>	8.6	- 20	8.6 - 30
<b>All Areas</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>208 - 300</b>	<b>338.1 - 432</b>

**7.6** Table 3 shows the distribution of the carry over UDP provision, and suggested additional provision by settlement area, set out as a range.

**7.7** It will be noted that the bottom of the aggregated target range fails to meet the 350 ha requirement in the Core Strategy Revised Preferred Options, while even the maximum aggregated figure falls short of the 470ha full requirement set out in Part 4.

**7.8** The level of under-allocated provision reflects:-

- Identification and deliverability of sustainable new sites in some areas.
- The speed of recovery from the current downturn.
- Progress in relation to infrastructure planning.
- The opportunities for Mixed Use Allocation and the potential for higher levels of focus on centres which will emerge in the Development Sites and Places DPD

**7.9** The role of the LDF Development Sites and Places DPD in achieving employment land provision, combined with the Town Centre Capacity Study and Barnsley's Local Economic Assessment is crucial. Thus the content of this section of the ELR remains as an addendum and fluid until such time as all of these elements are realised.

## Appendix 1 . Employment Land Review - Premises Study Methodology

- 1.1** The Premises Study was undertaken as part of a full employment land review, undertaken to meet the needs of Barnsley's LDF, and annual updates are anticipated.
- 1.2** All land designated as UDP Employment Proposal or Policy, Mixed use, and other land where traditional employment uses were typically undertaken was mapped in GIS using Ordnance Survey MasterMap, aerial photography, and existing GIS / Database information used for annual monitoring of employment land uptake.
- 1.3** Land was split into Areas, which subdivided into Plots. Physical building outlines were also plotted. This exercise was undertaken March – April 2009. Site and field visits were undertaken from April – May 2009. The site visits recorded:
  1. Status of all units on each plot (under construction/ vacant/derelict/occupied).
  2. The number of storeys of the units.
  3. The occupier of occupied units.
  4. The activity of the occupiers.
  5. The planning use of the occupiers.
- 1.4** Resulting information, including amendments in plot area or floorspace was recorded into a Database. Floorspace was recorded either from planning applications gross internal, or from plans available from the internal footprint of the GIS layer. Where activities had no floorspace a nominal figure of 1 metre was recorded for floorspace to enable equations on the data to be undertaken.
- 1.5** 687 hectares of this land were recorded as developed for employment purposes. For ELR purposes, 681 hectares were used to analyse land use. Land use categories were calculated on a proportional basis depending upon the planning activity of the units or the site as a whole (hence the need for plots in use with no floorspace being given the nominal value of 1).

## Appendix 1 . Employment Land Review - Premises Study Methodology

### 1.6 (Uses other than B1b/B1c/B2/B8 took up 22.5% of total occupied areas)

Table 1.1

Use Class	Hectares
A1 area	27.2
A2 area	1.3
A3 area	2.4
A4 area	4.6
A5 area	0.1
B1A area	19.4
B1C area	0.3
B2 area	332.2
B8 area	110.4
C1 area	2.6
C2A area	0.7
D1 area	2.4
D2 area	0.6
SG area	74.8
Class unknown	12.0
Vacant Premises	90.1

## Appendix 2 . Extract of Roger Tym study for Regional Planning Body

### INTRODUCTION

- 2.1** This report was commissioned in 2009 to provide guidance to planning authorities on the assessment of future need for employment land. The report is intended as part of a wider guidance note on employment land reviews, the evidence base documents that support employment land policies in local development plans. It relates to one particular technical question: how should authorities translate future jobs into future land requirements, as they are required to do by the Regional Spatial Strategy, the Yorkshire and Humber Plan.
- 2.2** As part of its policies for the growth and restructuring of the regional economy, the Yorkshire and Humber Plan requires local authorities to take account of 'potential job growth' forecasts by local authority area, which are shown in the Plan at Table 11.1 and may be updated or modified in future. The RSS suggests that local employment land reviews should translate the job forecasts into land requirements, which in turn should be translated into employment allocations in local development plans.
- 2.3** The Plan at Tables 11.2 and 11.3 provides a partial version of this translation, though again it notes that its figures are indicative and may be updated, modified by more detailed work at local or sub-regional level, or both. In practice, local authorities have found it difficult to produce robust assessments of land requirements on this basis. In this report we aim to resolve these difficulties, recommending a clear and consistent calculation method that authorities can follow.
- 2.4** The starting point of the calculation is an employment growth target or scenario for the local authority area – which may be derived from Table 2.11 of the RSS or from updated or alternative forecasts. Regardless of its source, the employment growth scenario needs to break down future jobs into activity sectors (industries and services), as per the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC). To derive land provision targets, the calculation comprises three stages, as follows:
- Sector to land use - Translate the above jobs by sector into jobs by land use, identifying those future jobs that will occupy 'employment space' or B-class space - that is, offices, industrial space and warehousing<sup>1</sup>.
  - Jobs to land - Translate the above employment change into change in land use, using assumptions about employment densities (floorspace per worker) and plot ratios (floorspace to site area).
  - Margins - To translate the net change above into a gross provision target, showing how much land should be allocated for B-class development, add to the net change above:
    - An allowance to compensate for any existing employment sites that may be lost in future ('churn');
    - Further allowance for land in the planning and development pipeline; and for choice, competition and uncertainty.

## Appendix 2 . Extract of Roger Tym study for Regional Planning Body

- 2.5** This study focuses on 'employment land uses' as traditionally defined by planners, broadly equivalent to Classes B1 to B8 of the Use Classes Order. There are of course many other land uses that provide jobs, such as retail, leisure and public services, but these other uses are planned for in other ways and are not discussed in this report.

## Appendix 3 . RSS Policy E3

### POLICY E3: Land and premises for economic development

A Plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes should make use of appropriately located previously developed land and current allocations, and ensure the availability of sufficient land and premises in sustainable locations to meet the needs of a modern economy and in particular take account of:

1. The need for additional floorspace for office, retail and leisure uses as indicated by the potential job growth in Table 11.2 and the considerable scope for this to be focussed on city and town centres.
2. The ongoing restructuring and modernisation of the manufacturing sector and the guidance on land for industrial uses set out in Table 11.3.
3. The need for land and extended premises to support the development of public services, health, sport, leisure, tourism, cultural industries and education as key employment generators and the contribution of mixed use development to employment supply.

B Local employment land reviews to inform LDFs should take account of the potential job growth set out in Tables 11.1 and 11.2 and the guidance on employment land in Table 11.3 along with more detailed sub regional or local forecasts or more up-to-date information about land needs. Joint working should be undertaken where commercial property markets cross administrative boundaries. Land in use or allocated for economic development should be reviewed during the preparation of LDFs. Sites no longer needed or those that would undermine the delivery of the Core Approach should be considered for alternative uses.

C Local Authorities in partnership with Yorkshire Forward, developers, private businesses, sub regional and local partnerships and other organisations should monitor the availability and suitability of employment sites on a 3- year rolling basis so as to ensure that they continue to meet current or longer term needs for economic development. A portfolio of the best sites, representing at least a five-year supply of market-ready sites, should be identified and protected for those purposes.

## Supporting Documents

For electronic copies of all Supporting Documents, please go to Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council's Consultation Portal. To go to the Consultation Portal click the link below.

[Barnsley's Consultation Portal](#)

Included in the Supporting Documents are:

Supporting Document 1 - "ELR Stakeholder Workshop December 09 Presentation & Notes"

Supporting Document 2 - "Remaining UDP Employment Land"

