

# **Barnsley Employment Land Review**

***Looking Beyond Recession - Barnsley's Employment  
Land Requirements to 2026***

Development Industry Workshop  
15<sup>th</sup> December 2009

1

## **Context**

- The Employment Land Review aims to create a portfolio of employment land which is accessible to its workforce, environmentally sustainable and attractive to the market.....
- For the purpose of this presentation, Employment Land is treated as land for industry and commerce and accommodated on land reserved for that purpose (eg as industrial estates or business parks) rather than town centres, retail areas or within the general fabric of the settlements

2

## The Local Development Framework

- We have consulted on “Preferred Options” for a “Core Strategy”
- The Core Strategy document
  1. proposes 350 ha (gross) of employment land (including existing allocations confirmed)
  2. Sets out priorities for location
- Next year we will prepare a “Sites DPD”

3

## Purpose and Timescales

- Employment Land is needed to meet the needs of the Economy, new enterprises and the need for Jobs
- Creating new sites is typically a long lead-in exercise and it is unlikely that anything would come to fruition less than five years from the date of Strategic Aspiration
- The sites themselves have a typically long cycle, and most new sites would have capacity remaining in 2026

4

- *Barnsley has suffered shortage of land in the past at times of potential opportunity but when good quality employment sites and employment units have come forward demand has generally followed*
- *Looking beyond recession we need to make sure land is available to grow the economy balanced with other planning and market considerations*

5

## Where we are

- The existing Unitary Development Plan, eventually adopted in December 2000, provided for 408 ha of Employment land
- By April 2008 only 148 ha of this land remained

6

- The UDP (Adopted December 2000) provided for 408 ha of Employment land *over a 15 year (?) planning period*
- In 2004, the Economy Background Paper for the new Local Development Framework estimated that a supply of 18ha a year was required
- From 2004 to 2009 approximately 100ha of employment land was taken up

7

## Quality of Remaining Land

- Much of the remaining was less attractive or less freely available.(50ha was effectively tied up in “expansion land” for existing firms)
- A 2007 study by Crossland Otter Hunt (commissioned by Renaissance South Yorkshire) had identified only 33 ha of market ready employment land available in Barnsley
- We suggest deletion of 21 ha of this remaining land with limited or nil prospects of development

8

## The Barnsley Growth Plan

- The Barnsley Growth Plan (Barnsley's Economic Masterplan identifies that Barnsley has
  - one of the lowest proportions of jobs relative to working age population
  - even with very high out commuting, one of the lowest proportions actually in employment
- And sets a target of 15,000 jobs and 1550 new businesses to reach the (fairly undemanding) standards of our near neighbours

9

## Accommodating the Growth Plan

- 15,000 jobs can be located in many places
  - At Home or "on site"
  - In Town Centres
  - Elsewhere in the urban fabric like schools and hospitals
  - Or on employment sites
- At 25-30 persons per hectare
  - 5,000 people on employment sites would use up about 200 hectares net
  - At 10,000 the total could be about 400 ha

10

## Regional Spatial Strategy

- Says that Barnsley should have at least a five year supply of the best market ready sites throughout the plan period
- Gives an indicative figure of 110 ha (**net**) change for industrial and warehousing use classes up to 2021 but does **not** cover
  - from 2021-2026 nor
  - Land requirements other than manufacturing and warehousing

11

## The LDF Calculus

- The components of the LDF Employment Land Calculation are
  - Net change in Industry and Warehousing
  - Net change in other Employment Land Uses
  - Loss of Employment Land lost to other uses
  - Allowance for 2021 - 2026
  - Land remaining at end of Plan Period (incl. 5yr supply of market ready good quality land)

12

## Allocating New Land

- The Priority Sequence is
  - The Sub-regional Town (Urban Barnsley, including Dodworth, Darton and Worsbrough)
  - The Principal Towns (Cudworth, Hoyland, Goldthorpe/ Dearne, Penistone, Wombwell and Royston)
  - Other ?

13

## How can you help?

- What do you think (is this realistic) ?
- How is the market like out there ?
- *What has been your experience in matching economic requirements to property over the last ten years?*
- *Looking beyond the current recession do you have any views on the size, composition and general locations of employment land to 2026?*
- *Refer to next stage sites DPD /how and when to make reps.*

14

## **ELR Stakeholder Consultation Event 15.12.09 - Note of Discussion**

### **Attendance**

The event was attended by 13 representatives of the development industry and other expert opinion relating to the assessment of economic development property requirements

### **Presentation**

Kevin Swift delivered and spoke to a powerpoint presentation "**Looking Beyond Recession - Barnsley's Employment Land Requirements to 2026**". He also circulated copies of the "**Green Top**" tables which charted the course of events in relation to the UDP designated employment land development areas, and summarised the Council's view of the extent and character of availability and the appraisal of remaining sites.

Views were sought

### **Discussion and debate (following Presentation Part 1)**

Kevin Swift asked for views/comments (either then or later) on the contents and assessments in the 'Green top' tables. Had we missed anything out? Had we misclassified sites? and had we got it right as to which ones should be kept as allocations and which discarded?

**Query from Attendee** Asked what was the impact of land lost to housing on the employment land supply? Also asked whether we made seen any patterns in plot ratios?

**Kevin Swift (KS)** Approximately 10 ha per year lost to housing, although this has pre-dominantly been Employment Policy Areas, the loss of Employment Proposal allocations has been minimal.

**Questioner** Was this due to churn/ relocation?

**KS** Yes. Also where firms had gone out of business. Density/ Plot ratios still to be looked at and this information will come from the premises/ site survey we undertook (Summer 2009). Although we estimate 20/30 jobs per hectare

**BDA rep** Stated that Professor Fothergill work undertaken for 2005 LDF Preferred Options made some assumptions on density and illustrated a trend for reduced densities (Is this actually so? - comment from note writer).



- Second attendee** Asked whether there had been any qualitative assessment for the sites proposed for deletion?
- KS** Yes, they had been based on the Babbie study.
- Third Attendee** What about the practicality of development costs (have abnormal costs for site preparation, infrastructure requirements been assessed).
- KS** This is an attribute of deliverability. As yet development costs have not been assessed.
- Third Attendee** Reiterated that a Development Appraisal is essential if sites are to be realistically developable. Developers must have certainty.
- Fourth Attendee** Stated this was an issue with the 2005 COH report as it did not include detailed development appraisals.
- BDA Rep** Stated this is a general problem for planning. Cost of completing development appraisal is restrictive. (This view seemed to meet with general agreement amongst most other participants).
- KS** As it is a long term plan it is difficult to determine the cost/ amount that would be prohibitive to the development of a site.
- First Attendee** What is the spatial breakdown of development?
- BDA rep.** Enterprise Zone status influenced development (especially in the East of the Borough).
- Second Attendee** All development has benefited from the strength of the market and therefore regards it difficult to plan long term as development is (ultimately) down to the market.
- BDA rep.** Success in the East was due to the availability of start up units and move on space.
- KS** Queried whether the pattern of development would have been different if there was more availability (of larger sites) in Urban Barnsley. And went on to request participants' input on what types of development and in which locations where/ would be realistic in market terms.

- BDA rep** Reiterated the need to strive for more employment land in Urban Barnsley. Land was needed in the places which will serve the market and meet local peoples jobs needs.
- First Attendee** Out of centre' Employment parks create reverse commuting flows as poor lunch time offer means that employees don't rate such employment parks.
- Second Attendee** Planning needs to allow shops etc on Business Parks to improve the attraction of out of centre sites. Also stated that Capitol Park required more car parking spaces.
- Fifth Attendee** Stated that the Council are concentrating on B1, B2 and B8 uses and need to broaden the scope of the review.
- KS** Inferred that the Town Centre Capacity Study hoped to address this issue. The problem of suitable sites for the wider (non "B") uses was exacerbated by the loss of much urban Employment land for housing/ other non-economic uses
- KS** How can we create versatile employment land, what uses can we allow ?
- Fourth Attendee** With General Election approaching and possible change of Government it is likely that housing targets may be lowered. Potential for residential allocations to be reallocated for employment use.
- First Attendee** Issue of shortage of parking at Barnsley BBIC (Barnsley Business and Innovation Centre). Suggestion of locating new employment in town centre would not go down well. Has experience of people relocating from DMC(Digital Media Centre) to BBIC.
- KS** (Recognising the issue) Policies are handed down from above. Parking standards are set to increase the use of public transport.
- Alice Hetherington (AH)** Said it stemmed from the whole sustainability issue.

**Second Part of Presentation - Future Requirements followed by resumption of Discussion**

- Seventh Attendee** Are you going to differentiate between normal supply and five year supply?
- KS** No (What was meant by this response ? - Comment by Note Compiler )
- First Attendee** You said you are finding it difficult to allocate new land. Other than Green Belt what are the constraints ?
- KS** Poor access, infrastructure provision, ground conditions
- BDA rep** Are there real concerns that 350ha cannot be achieved?
- KS** Putting aside policy issues, 'no'. We are looking for 'sustainable' sites close to existing urban settlements, public transport links etc...
- Second Attendee** How up to date is the evidence base, does it take into account 'current market conditions' (recession, credit crunch etc)
- KS** Premises survey undertaken this summer. This should provide us with an indication of things out there. However, the plan is long term, and needs to provide land for when the recession has ended.
- Second Attendee** Doesn't this advocate the need for more flexibility i.e. for mixed use development?
- KS** Discussions have been held on this issue. But no consensus reached as yet.
- Second Attendee** HCA policy promotes mixed use development
- BDA rep** RSS requirements this would increase the land requirement since the employment yield would be lower (hectare for hectare)
- First Attendee** What are the pros and cons for mixed use planned extension vs drip, drip, drip
- KS** Require end user - drip...drip..drip doesn't allow for infrastructure provision
- Sixth Attendee** Are windfall site being taken into account ?
- KS** If existing employment land this is treated as churn in existing supply.

- AH** Hypothetical (!) site in question would be against 'pure' policy view !
- First Attendee** Which of the sectors of the future are for Barnsley?
- BDA Rep** Has devolved decision making been taken account of ?  
Need growth in private sector and green jobs
- KS** Because we can't forecast with certainty, the important thing is to keep our options open. So far as public sector jobs are concerned, stability is the best that can be hoped for.

**Discussion after** the formal session included the issue of main town centre uses on employment sites, and under what circumstances planning permission could be given for speculative schemes

**One Email** came afterwards

- Deletions had been generally accepted
- Less prescription needed re uses on Employment Sites
- Case for at least one big site in urban Barnsley to carry the costs of infrastructure
- Welcomed further investigation into density
- Regretted RSS focus on industry and warehousing