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Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the Barnsley Local Plan provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the Metropolitan Borough provided that a number of main modifications (MMs) are made to it. Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council (the Council) has specifically requested me to recommend any MMs necessary to enable the plan to be adopted.

The MMs all concern matters that were discussed at the examination hearings. Following the hearings, the Council prepared schedules of the proposed MMs, carried out Sustainability Appraisal of them and updated the Habitats Regulations Assessment. The MMs were subject to public consultation over a six week period. In some cases I have amended their detailed wording and I have recommended their inclusion in the Plan after considering all the representations made in response to consultation on them.

The MMs can be summarised as follows:

- Decreasing the jobs target from 33,000 to 28,840 and the employment land requirement from 307 hectares to 297 hectares;
- Increasing the 2014 – 2033 housing requirement from 20,900 to 21,546 dwellings or 1134 dwellings per year;
- Including villages in the list of locations where new development will be located in Policy LG2;
- Deleting site RSV1 from the plan;
- Deleting site UB16 for employment and allocating it for housing;
- Allocating twelve additional sites for housing development and identifying one additional area for safeguarded land;
- Clarifications and updates to employment, housing and mixed use site policies;
- Updating the housing trajectory to take account of additional allocations, deletions, planning permissions and completions; and
- Revisions to the wording of development management policies for consistency with national guidance, positive preparation and to reflect updated evidence.
Introduction

1. This report contains my assessment of the Barnsley Local Plan ('the plan') in terms of Section 20(5) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the 2004 Act) (as amended). It considers first whether the plan’s preparation has complied with the duty to cooperate (DtC). It then considers whether the plan is sound and whether it is compliant with the legal requirements. The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) (NPPF) (paragraph 182) makes it clear that in order to be sound, a Local Plan (LP) should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

2. The revised NPPF was published in July 2018. It includes a transitional arrangement in paragraph 214 whereby, for the purpose of examining this plan, the policies in the 2012 NPPF will apply. Unless stated otherwise, references in this report are to the 2012 NPPF. In addition, references to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) are to the previous versions of the guidance in place before the revised NPPF.

3. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the local planning authority has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The basis for the examination is the Publication Consultation version (2016), submitted in December 2016. It is the same document as was published for consultation in August 2016 under Regulation 19 of the 2012 Regulations1. The Council has supplemented the evidence base of the plan in relation to jobs growth and the assessment of housing need during the course of the examination and has identified additional sites for housing development. However, this has not fundamentally changed the spatial strategy and distribution of development in the plan.

4. The plan provides a development strategy and detailed policies and identifies specific sites to deliver the full objectively assessed need for employment and housing development over the plan period to 2033. The capacity of the plan area to meet those needs has been assessed in relation to environmental factors including the Green Belt and infrastructure capacity including transport. It seeks to provide a comprehensive planning framework and delivery will be supported by Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD).

5. The substantive Local Development Scheme (2007) (LDS) covers earlier planning documents including the Core Strategy (2011) (CS) and Development Sites and Places document (DSP). Updates to the LDS were published in 2015 and 2017 and whilst there has been some slippage in timescale, the scope of the plan accords with those documents.

6. Part of the Borough falls within the Peak District National Park which is covered by the Peak District National Park Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2011). Consequently, references to the plan area in this report relate to that part of the Barnsley Metropolitan Borough which is outside the National Park.

1 The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012
The Examination

7. The examination was carried out in four stages. At Stages 1 and 2 the DtC, legal requirements, soundness of the employment and housing objectively assessed need and land requirements, spatial strategy, Green Belt, transport, the environment and the town centre were covered. In August 2017 my interim findings on the Stage 1 and 2 matters concluded that whilst the DtC had been met, the plan’s employment and housing strategies were not aligned. I also found that the plan’s approach to the villages was not based on up-to-date evidence and not positively prepared.

8. Following consideration of the options presented to it, the Council decided to proceed with the examination and undertake further work to address the soundness issues identified. Pending the completion of that work, the soundness of the employment and housing site allocations proposed as part the submitted plan were considered at the Stage 3 hearings in December 2017.

9. The Council’s further work revised the plan’s economic strategy, reducing the jobs target from 33,000 to 28,840 and increasing the housing requirement from 20,900 to 21,546 to align with the revised jobs target. In order to meet the increased figure and address the shortfall in the delivery of some housing sites identified following the Stage 3 hearing sessions, additional housing sites were proposed including in villages. The additional evidence produced on the employment and housing land requirement, additional proposed housing sites and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) were subject to public consultation from 29 January to 12 March 2018 alongside the Matters, Issues and Questions on the remaining Main Matters. The Stage 4 hearing sessions considered all the responses received.

Main Modifications

10. In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act the Council requested that I should recommend any main modifications (MMs) necessary to rectify matters that make the plan unsound and thus incapable of being adopted. My report explains why the recommended MMs, all of which relate to matters that were discussed at the examination hearings, are necessary. The MMs are referenced in bold in the report in the form MM and are set out in full in the Appendix.

11. Following the examination hearings, the Council prepared a schedule of proposed MMs and carried out SA and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). The MMs schedule was subject to public consultation from 13 July to 28 August 2018. For the avoidance of doubt, the proposed modifications which were referenced as ‘MAIN’ in the consultation document (MC1) have been referenced as MMs within the Appendix to this report. I have taken account of the consultation responses in my conclusions and in this light I have made some amendments to the detailed wording of the MMs where necessary for consistency or clarity. None of the amendments significantly alters the content of the MMs as published for consultation or undermines the participatory processes and SA that has been undertaken. Where necessary I have highlighted these amendments in the report.
12. The Council has published ‘additional modifications’ alongside the MMs which are modifications that do not materially affect the policies in the plan\(^2\). The Council is accountable for these changes and they do not fall within the scope of the examination.

**Consultation**

13. Consultation leading up to the submission of the plan took place over a number of stages including on the DSP document. The examination has been conducted in stages including a period of consultation on additional evidence and sites. I acknowledge that the process has the potential to be confusing, particularly for those who become engaged in the later stages of the examination.

14. However the Council has taken steps to explain the process, respond to queries and has carried out full and widespread consultation on the plan before its submission, as part of the examination consultation and most recently on the MMs. The scope of the consultation on the work produced in response to my interim findings was necessarily broad and a wide range of representations were received, many of which were followed up through discussion at the Stage 4 hearing sessions. A wide range of representations have been submitted at each stage of consultation and I am satisfied that the consultation processes gave representors adequate opportunities to express their views.

15. It has been contended that in preparing the plan the Council has breached the ‘Gunning’ principle that consultation should be undertaken at a time at which it can genuinely influence decision making. This is argued primarily in connection with discussions between the Council and the agents/promoters for Site MU1 and the timing of the Green Belt review and submission of bids to the SCRIF for infrastructure funding, in particular for the Claycliffe Road link. I deal with these matters in relation to the specific issues raised later in my report.

16. Overall, I am satisfied that the consultation was undertaken in accordance with the 2012 Regulations and the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (2006) and the SCI Update (2015).

**Policies Map**

17. The Council must maintain an adopted Policies Map which illustrates geographically the application of the policies in the adopted development plan. When submitting a LP for examination, the Council is required to provide a submission Policies Map showing the changes to the adopted Policies Map that would result from the proposals in the submitted LP. The submission plan’s Policies Map is the ‘Policies Map Publication Draft 2016’.

18. The Policies Map is not defined in statute as a development plan document (DPD) and so I do not have the power to recommend MMs to it. However, a number of the published MMs to the plan’s policies require further

\(^2\) S23(3)(b) of the 2004 Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act
corresponding changes to be made to the Policies Map and its key. Those further changes were published for consultation alongside the MMs.

19. When the plan is adopted, in order to comply with the legislation and give effect to the plan’s policies, the Council will need to update the adopted Policies Map to include all the changes in the document entitled ‘Policies Map Publication Draft 2016’ and the further changes included in the document ‘Proposed Main Modifications Policies Map Changes’ published alongside the MMs.

**Sustainability Appraisal**

20. The SA work undertaken is contained in the Local Plan SA Publication (2016), SA Addendum Post Examination Hearings (December 2017), SA Site Assessment Addendum (January 2018) and Proposed Main Modifications SA (July 2018).

21. Throughout the documents, a consistent framework of eighteen objectives which were developed following scoping and consultation have been used to assess the plan. They are appropriate to its circumstances and to the national and local context. SA of the plan’s policies and allocations has been undertaken at the same level of detail as that of the reasonable alternatives and the reasons for selecting particular policy approaches and site allocations and rejecting others are clear. Specific representations on the SA work conducted during the examination are dealt with in the relevant sections of this report.

22. Overall, I conclude that the SA work undertaken in connection with the plan is adequate.

**Habitats Regulations Assessment**

23. Part of the Peak District Moors Special Protection Area (South Pennine Moors Phase 1) (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) are within the Peak District National Park area of the Borough and are therefore outside the plan area. A precautionary approach has been adopted and in consultation with Natural England, a 5km ‘buffer zone’ was established to ensure that development in proximity to the SPA and SAC would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of these sites.

24. HRA, including appropriate assessment (AA) of the submitted plan, was carried out together with HRA of additional sites and the MMs. Four policies were subject to AA where a likely significant effect on the SPA and SAC could not be ruled out. These effects included increased disturbance from recreation activity and air pollution from traffic associated with new housing distributed in accordance with the spatial strategy in Policy LG2 and the potential loss of habitat for SPA birds from development on three sites in or close to the buffer. The results of the AA are outlined in relation to Policy LG2 and the specific sites.

25. The MMs HRA report does not re-assess the plan as a whole and AA of the MMs has been undertaken only where a likely significant effect could not be ruled out. Overall, and having regard to the mitigation identified and the various MMs recommended, I conclude the plan’s policies and proposals taken
forward to AA would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA and SAC either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. Having taken account of the judgement of the Court of Justice of the European Union issued on 12 April 2018\(^3\), I concur with the Council’s conclusion that the HRA report is legally compliant.

**Assessment of Duty to Co operate**

26. Section 20(5)(c) of the 2004 Act requires that I consider whether the Council complied with any duty imposed on it by section 33A in respect of the Plan’s preparation. The statutory DtC applies where there are ‘strategic matters’ which would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas.

27. Regular engagement with adjoining local planning authorities and prescribed bodies has taken place on all strategic matters from an early stage in plan preparation, as documented in the Council’s DtC Statement and its Addendum. Barnsley is a single Housing Market Area (HMA) and the Council is seeking to provide for all of its own identified housing and other development needs within the plan area. The DtC process has established that adjoining authorities have no scope to accommodate any of Barnsley’s housing need. Adjoining authorities are at different stages of plan preparation and in some instances their own development needs have not yet been fully assessed, but at the present time there is no evidence to suggest that they are able to accommodate any part of Barnsley’s housing need. In addition, no neighbouring authority has made a formal request to the Council to accommodate any unmet housing need from outside the plan area.

28. Cumulative increases in traffic levels along the A635 which runs between the M1 and A1/(M) is a strategic matter which affects Doncaster Metropolitan Borough, in particular the communities of Hickleton and Marr to the east of Goldthorpe. Co-operation has resulted in mitigation measures being incorporated within specific site allocations and ongoing liaison to co-ordinate funding bids for highway improvements. Co-operation on renewable energy in relation to landscape protection has also resulted in mitigation measures within policies.

29. Barnsley lies within both the Leeds City Region (LCR) and Sheffield City Region (SCR). Regular engagement has taken place resulting in joint commissioning of evidence bases and joint approaches including the SCR Common Approach to the Green Belt Review. Whilst future governance arrangements for the SCR remain unclear this has not undermined the process of cooperation in relation to Barnsley’s contribution to the economic strategies of both the LCR and SCR. Overall I am satisfied that where necessary the Council has engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis in the preparation of the plan and the DtC has been met.

**Assessment of Soundness**

30. The plan will replace the saved policies in the UDP and the CS. Together with the Joint Waste Plan (2012), it will form the development plan for the plan

---

\(^3\) Case C323/17 People over Wind, Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta
area. The submitted plan does not explain this or identify the existing policies that will be superseded and MM3 and MM127 are necessary to rectify this and to ensure that the plan complies with the 2012 Regulations\(^4\).

**Main Issues**

31. Taking account of the representations, the written evidence and the discussions at the hearing sessions, I have identified ten main issues upon which the soundness of the plan depends. Under these headings my report deals with the main matters of soundness and it does not respond to every point raised in representations.

**Issue 1 – Is the employment land requirement soundly based and does the plan set out a positively prepared strategy for employment and the economy that is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**

**The Functional Economic Area**

32. Barnsley lies within the wider functional economic areas of the SCR and LCR. Travel to work patterns demonstrate strong cross boundary movement with 36% of Barnsley residents in employment commuting outside the Borough for work and approximately 23% of jobs being filled by workers from outside the area\(^5\). Having regard to the plan’s objective for more jobs to support improvements to job density, the plan area represents the most appropriate basis to assess the objectively assessed need (OAN) for employment.

**Employment OAN and Employment Land Requirement**

33. The Jobs and Business Plan 2014 – 2017 (2014) and Employment and Skills Strategy (2016) seek to improve the Borough’s economic prosperity. Jobs growth will also contribute to the SCR Strategic Economic Plan which aims to bolster the private sector and create 70,000 new jobs and 6,000 new businesses from 2014 - 2024, of which 7,500 jobs are apportioned to Barnsley. The LCR Strategic Economic Plan (2016) seeks to create an additional 36,000 jobs by 2036. The need for more jobs is supported by a wide range of evidence submitted to the examination.

34. Allied to the plan’s objective to increase job density is the need to create more businesses and improve skills and training. Whilst the number of young people not in education, employment or training has diminished significantly, education attainment levels continue to lag behind national and city region averages\(^6\). The English Indices of Deprivation (2015) ranks Barnsley as being the 39\(^{th}\) most deprived local authority (of 326) based on indicators relating to economic activity, health, skills and enterprise activity.

35. The submitted plan’s jobs target was for 33,000 new workplace jobs or 27,778 Full Time Equivalent (FTE). This included a ‘baseline’ figure of 12,555

---

\(^4\) Regulation 8(5) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning)(England) Regulations 2012  
\(^5\) 2011 Census  
jobs based on Regional Econometric Modelling (REM) and 17,558 ‘additional’ jobs to be secured through Council and partner interventions with the remainder accounted for by REM assumptions for additionality. In response to my interim findings, the Council re-assessed the jobs target based on the proportion of B1(a)(b)(c), B2 and B8 uses that could reasonably be expected to come forward on the proposed employment sites and the number of jobs created.

36. B1(a) office floorspace comprised 8% of the total take-up of employment floorspace from 2005 to 2015, with the remainder being taken up by other B1, B2 and B8 uses. The availability and proximity of office accommodation in Sheffield and Leeds, the office to residential conversion schemes that have taken place in Barnsley town centre and the trend for home based working indicate that the low take up of office floorspace is likely to continue. In contrast, the demand for industrial floorspace particularly logistics and warehousing in South Yorkshire is more buoyant. Barnsley’s strategic location on the M1, the availability of a local labour supply in the Borough and the Council’s education and skills strategy represent realistic opportunities to secure a greater proportion of jobs in that sector.

37. Whilst there is an inherent degree of uncertainty in economic forecasting, the proposed reduction in the proportion of B1(a) office use and increase in the proportion of B8 to inform the jobs target and employment land requirement reflects current market conditions and realistic opportunities. It is also consistent with the NPPF’s advice that plan preparation should be based on a clear understanding of economic markets operating in and across the area.

38. The Employment Land Review (2016) (ELR) identifies an objectively assessed need for 291 hectares of employment land. Assumptions on plot ratios and job densities for the different employment Use Classes expected to be accommodated on the allocated sites appear reasonable and robust. A 30% allowance for choice and flexibility is justified and comparable with assumptions made in adjoining authorities.

39. The requirement figure also incorporates a replacement allowance of 95 hectares (5 hectares per year) over the plan period. This compares with historical losses of 8 hectares per year lost to housing over the CS period of 2004/05 to 2011/12. This rate declined following the adoption of the CS in 2011 which included greater protection for employment land. Whilst the reduced figure of 5 hectares per year has been criticised for ‘inflating’ the employment land requirement, there is no evidence before me to substantiate a replacement figure of 2 hectares per year as proposed in representations. The ELR identifies the need for well-located sites that serve the needs of modern industry and many of the existing employment sites do not meet the requirements of the manufacturing and logistics sector which is expected to comprise a significant proportion of the Class B Uses. I conclude that the replacement allowance is justified.

40. Policy E1 of the submitted plan allocated ‘around’ 300 hectares of employment land whilst Policy E2 identified 307 hectares within the main settlements. The Council’s position was that the over-supply against the OAN of 291 hectares was to accommodate Site D1 at Goldthorpe to provide a well distributed portfolio of sites.
41. As submitted, Policies E1 and E2 do not reflect the revised jobs target and are unsound. Based on the assumptions underpinning the land requirement and having regard to the de-allocation of employment site UB16 and reduction in site HOY1, which are dealt with elsewhere in this report, the employment land requirement in Policies E1 and E2 should be 297 hectares. I am satisfied that the marginal over supply compared with the OAN of 291 hectares is justified to support a range of well distributed sites. To reflect the changes to the jobs target and employment land requirement, MM14, MM15 and MM16 are necessary. I have amended MM14, MM15 and MM16 to sensibly round down the employment land requirement to a whole figure, 297 hectares.

42. Policy E2 sets out the distribution and amount of allocated employment land by settlement. The overall total should not be viewed as a target or maximum ceiling and MM16 is also necessary to indicate that the distribution figures are approximate. In the interests of clarity, MM16 also updates the distribution figures in response to the changes to Sites N1, UB16 and HOY1 which are dealt with in Issue 4 and confirms that the employment use on Site MU1 is included within the provision figure for Urban Barnsley.

Conclusion on Issue 1

43. Subject to the MMs proposed, the plan’s strategy for employment and the economy including the employment land requirement is soundly based.

Issue 2 - Is the housing requirement figure soundly based and does the plan set out a positively prepared strategy for housing that is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (OAHN)

Housing Market Area

44. Household moves display a strong degree of self-containment within the Borough, above the 70% threshold set out in the PPG. On this basis, there is no substantive evidence to challenge the conclusion of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014) (2014 SHMA) that the Borough represents an appropriate basis for assessing housing need. Whilst the 2014 SHMA included those parts of the Borough falling within the National Park, no quantifiable housing needs were identified within that area and the 2014 SHMA represents an accurate assessment of need for the plan area.

Demographic starting point and adjustments

45. The 2014 SHMA identified a baseline dwelling requirement of 806 dwellings per year based on the 2012 Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) sub-national household projections (SNHP).

46. However, the PPG advises local planning authorities to use the most up-to-date data to assess housing need and the submitted plan is not sound in this respect. To remedy this, the SHMA Update (March 2017) (2017 SHMA) was undertaken and in response to my interim findings, a further update to take
account of 2016-Mid Year Estimates and revised economic modelling was supplied in the Demographic Forecasts report.

47. Informed by the 2014-based DCLG SNHP, the 2017 SHMA identifies a baseline requirement of 880 dwellings per year over the 19 year plan period. In accordance with the advice in the PPG, a number of alternative trend scenarios were developed based on different migration and household formation rate assumptions. The use of a 10 year migration trend from 2005/06 to 2014/15 which takes account of fluctuations in economic cycles and unattributable population change is a robust and appropriate approach. A recovery in household formation rates in the younger age groups (15 – 44) also represents an appropriate adjustment and results in an increase in the baseline demographic need to 1088 dwellings per year. Based on the evidence, this represents an appropriate starting point on which to base any further uplift.

**Market signals**

48. The 2014 SHMA considered the need for adjustments in response to a range of market signals including house prices, affordability ratios, vacancy rates and overcrowding. These indicate limited pressure on the housing market and no uplift is proposed in response to those factors. This is a reasonable approach to take where an uplift for jobs growth increases the OAHN above the demographic requirement as detailed below.

**Affordable housing**

49. In accordance with the PPG, the 2017 SHMA considers whether an increase in the housing requirement could help to deliver the number of affordable homes required. Taking account of newly arising needs and the existing backlog it identifies an annual net shortfall of 292 affordable dwellings per year if the backlog of need is cleared over 10 years.

50. Based on the contribution that could be expected from outstanding permissions and proposed plan allocations and the percentage requirements set out in Policy H8, the overall supply of affordable dwellings would be approximately 2584 or 136 dwellings per year. This represents a shortfall of 156 dwellings per year against the 292 requirement. However, if the backlog is addressed over the plan period, the requirement would be 82 dwellings per year.

51. I consider that an uplift to the OAHN to support increased delivery of affordable housing as a proportion of open market schemes and enabling the need to be addressed over a shorter time frame is not justified for two principal reasons. Firstly, the Council is taking proactive steps to secure the delivery of affordable homes through a number of initiatives including direct delivery using the Homes England Grant, its own direct delivery arm Met Barnsley and partnership working with registered providers. These demonstrate a realistic prospect for supplementing the provision secured as a percentage of open market development through Policy H8. Secondly, the

---

7 Barnsley Demographic Forecasts (October 2017) Edge Analytics
uplift required would also necessitate delivery of around 1400 dwellings per year, compared with an annual average of 893 over the 10 year period 2004/05 to 2013/14. This would not be realistic as an annual average delivery rate to be achieved over the entire plan period and would therefore not be deliverable.

Jobs growth

52. The plan’s revised jobs target of 28,840 should feature within the OAHN. The ‘Demographic Forecasts’ report models three scenarios against different assumptions on commuting ratios and economic activity rates to establish the number of workers required to support the 28,840 jobs. The ‘Policy On’ scenario\(^8\) results in an OAHN for the Borough of 1134 dwellings per year, marginally above the housing requirement figure of 1100 in the submitted plan. I consider that the figure of 1134 dwellings per year is robust and justified for two main reasons.

53. Firstly, it assumes that the commuting ratio of 1.25 based on the 2011 Census would continue throughout the plan period rather than fall to the previous assumption of 1.19 made in the 2014 SHMA. Whilst this does create some tension with one of the plan’s economic aims for greater self-containment, it does reflect the reality that initiatives for improved transport connections, particularly rail, could support existing rates of commuting to adjoining areas for work, particularly to the SCR and LCR.

54. Secondly, based on Experian economic activity rates used in the REM forecasting model, it assumes an improvement in the aggregate economic activity rate in the 16 – 89 age group from 61% (2016) to 66.2% by 2033. This has been challenged by representors who consider the Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) economic activity rates to represent a more realistic forecast, leading to a higher level of population growth and housing need to support the planned jobs.

55. I note that ‘blended’ OBR and Experian rates have been applied to assess OAHN for Leeds. However, the combination of planned jobs growth, the Council’s employment and skills strategy and wider public policy initiatives including changes to the state pension age and more flexible working arrangements lead me to conclude that there is a realistic prospect of improvements to economic participation rates by the working age population. In short, the use of the REM Experian based model is appropriate to the circumstances of Barnsley.

56. I have had regard to arguments that the OAHN should be higher and lower than 21,546 but I consider that the figure is based on robust evidence and a reasonable set of assumptions in accordance with the PPG and is justified having regard to the circumstances of the Borough.

---

\(^8\) As referred to in ‘Updating the Demographic Evidence’ (March 2017) and ‘Demographic Forecasts’ (October 2017) reports Edge Analytics
Housing requirement

57. The plan seeks to meet the OAHN in full subject to consideration of environmental capacity including the Green Belt which I deal with elsewhere in my report. This accords with the NPPF which indicates that LPs should use their evidence base to ensure that the plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the HMA as far as is consistent with the NPPF’s policies.

58. Policy H1 of the submitted plan sets out a housing requirement of 20,900 dwellings or 1100 per year. Informed by the SA Addendum of different growth options, the OAHN is 21,546 dwellings or 1134 dwellings per year. Policy H1 of the submitted plan is therefore unsound. A number of changes are necessary to ensure that the housing requirement reflects the updated OAHN of 21,546 dwellings, an increase of 646 dwellings over the plan period. To ensure that the plan has been positively prepared to meet OAHN in full and that the housing requirement is justified, MM31 is necessary.

59. The revised NPPF states that, other than in exceptional circumstances, a new standard methodology should be used to determine local housing needs. For Barnsley the local housing need figure is 898 dwellings per year for the period 2016 - 2026, lower than the 1134 figure on which the plan is based. However, the plan is being examined against the 2012 NPPF. As set out in the PPG, the standard figure provides the minimum starting point for assessing the number of homes needed in an area. Changing economic conditions which would include the jobs growth envisaged in the plan are a circumstance where a higher figure than the standard method should be considered.

Housing mix, choice and windfall development

60. The 2014 SHMA assesses the need for specialist forms of housing including families, older people, people with support needs, homeless and minority ethnic households. Provision, including for adaptable homes, will be secured through Policy H7 and whilst no specific ‘quotas’ are identified in the policy, the supporting text makes clear that development proposals should be informed by needs identified in the SHMA. Policy D1 (Design) will also contribute to delivering accessible and adaptable homes.

61. Based on the current low demand for self build and custom homes, the plan does not make specific provision for this within the site policies or within the housing policies.

62. Development on unallocated ‘windfall’ sites is covered by Policies H5 and H6. Policy H6 which deals with proposals on large sites (more than 0.4 hectares) does not make provision for the development of sites in villages and restricts windfall sites to previously developed land only. To ensure consistency with the approach to villages as proposed to be modified in MM13 and to replace the reference to ‘previously developed land’ with ‘part previously developed land’, MM76 is required. Whilst it has been argued that this approach is unnecessarily restrictive, the priority given to development on brownfield sites accords with the NPPF which indicates that policies should seek to make
effective use of land including through the re-use of previously developed land.

**Affordable housing**

63. Policy H8 sets out the requirement for the delivery of affordable housing as a proportion of open market development on sites of 15 or more dwellings. Different percentages of 10%, 20% and 30% apply according to geographical location and reflecting the broad differences in the viability of development across the Borough identified in two viability studies. These were undertaken to establish whether a CIL charge would be viable but demonstrated that the percentages set out in Policy H8 would support a reasonable rate of return to a willing landowner. As such, the percentages sought are justified and the policy is sufficiently flexible to deal with individual scheme viability.

64. Policy H8 also supports exception sites for affordable housing. As submitted, the wording of the policy would preclude schemes from coming forward within the built up area of villages that are inset from the Green Belt which is unnecessarily restrictive. In order to ensure that Policy H8 is positively prepared and sets out suitable mitigation measures, MM78 is necessary. For consistency with national policy, MM78 also ensures that Policy H8 includes reference to providing some market housing where it will facilitate the provision of additional affordable housing by improving scheme viability.

65. There are pockets of low market demand within the plan area and Policy H9 supports housing regeneration within those areas. So that the policy has been positively prepared, it is necessary to clarify the geographical areas included and MM79 secures that together with minor wording changes.

**Gypsies and travellers**

66. The Barnsley Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpersons’ Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) (2015) identified an overall need for 33 pitches to 2034, 15 of which would be required in the five year period 2014/15 to 2018/19. The GTAA did not identify any need for travelling showpersons’ accommodation.

67. In order to meet the five year requirement, the submitted plan allocated 10 new pitches on site TRAV013A and 8 pitches as an extension to an existing site at Brierley (site AC46). A robust assessment of alternative sites was carried out to inform site selection. Since the GTAA was published, planning permission has been granted for three permanent pitches and five pitches have been brought back into use at the Ings site following flood alleviation works, reducing the overall requirement within the five year period to seven.

68. The Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS) indicates that traveller sites are inappropriate development in the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Site AC46 is a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site washed over by the Green Belt and as a former walled garden it is already enclosed from the wider countryside. The additional eight pitches proposed in the plan would be contained within the existing site boundaries and would not diminish the openness of the wider Green Belt. The site would remain washed over by Green Belt as shown on the Policies Map. Having regard to the overall need for gypsy and traveller sites identified in the GTAA
and that the proposal is for an extension to an existing site, I conclude that the proposed site allocation is justified and soundly based.

69. Due to uncertainty about the deliverability of Site AC46 during the course of the examination, an increase in the pitch numbers at site TRAV013A from 10 to 11 was proposed by the Council. Notwithstanding that the site owner has confirmed the availability of Site AC46, one additional pitch at Site TRAV013A would provide additional choice and flexibility in supply and **MM81** is necessary to increase the number of pitches from 10 to 11.

70. Policy GT1 provides appropriate and comprehensive criteria to assess planning applications for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpersons’ pitches and transit sites that may come forward in the plan period. Some minor wording clarifications and updates are necessary to ensure that Policy GT1 is positively prepared and consistent with national policy and these would be secured through **MM80**.

71. Overall, I am satisfied that the plan’s housing policies as proposed to be modified will support a mix and choice of housing on both allocated and windfall sites and would not preclude consideration of executive housing through the planning application process. No further modifications are necessary for soundness in this regard.

**Conclusion on Issue 2**

72. Overall and subject to the MMs proposed, the plan’s strategy for housing including the OAHN, housing requirement and delivering an appropriate choice and mix of homes is based on a robust and objective assessment of needs and is soundly based.

**Issue 3 – Are the plan’s vision and objectives appropriate and would the settlement hierarchy, spatial strategy and distribution of development be soundly based?**

**Vision and objectives**

73. The plan’s vision and objectives seek to improve economic prosperity and the quality of life of residents, reflecting the aims of the Council’s adopted economic, housing and other strategies. Whilst the target for jobs growth in the ‘Jobs and Business Plan 2014 - 2017’ has been reviewed during the course of the examination, the plan’s objectives remain relevant to addressing the economic, social and environmental challenges facing the Borough. To be consistent with the NPPF’s core principle to conserve and enhance the natural environment, the objectives should seek to achieve wider environmental outcomes in addition to achieving net gains in biodiversity and **MM1** and **MM2** will ensure that the plan’s objectives are consistent with the NPPF in this regard and reflect the updated jobs target and housing requirement.

74. Whilst Policy SD1 reflects a positive approach to achieving sustainable development, the policy as submitted is inconsistent with the NPPF and **MM8** is necessary. I have amended **MM8** to delete the text that duplicates NPPF paragraph 14.
Settlement hierarchy

75. The identification of Urban Barnsley as a single category within the settlement hierarchy is a logical and coherent approach. Whilst it encompasses different settlements and communities with distinct identities, it constitutes the main built up area around the town centre with opportunities to accommodate development in sustainable locations. For clarity, the main settlements in Urban Barnsley should be listed in the hierarchy and MM4 achieves that. The larger settlements are included and there is no justification to add smaller locations including Redbrook and Lower Barugh.

76. The Principal Towns include separate settlements with their own identity and characteristics. However, in recognition of the links between them and to support existing services and facilities, their inclusion within the Principal Towns is appropriate and justified. Hence the inclusion of Hoyland Common within Hoyland Principal Town is soundly based as is the inclusion of Darfield within Wombwell and there is no justification for them to be listed as separate locations within the settlement hierarchy.

77. Hunshelf is not identified as a village within the updated Settlement Assessment nor is Dunford Bridge which straddles the National Park boundary. For clarity, they should be deleted from the settlement hierarchy for which MM4 is necessary.

Spatial strategy

78. The plan’s spatial strategy is articulated through Policy LG2 and the settlement hierarchy which gives priority to new development in Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns of Cudworth, Wombwell, Hoyland, Goldthorpe, Penistone and Royston reflecting their size, wide range of services and accessibility by a range of transport modes.

79. As submitted, Policy LG2 did not identify villages as locations for new development unless consistent with Green Belt policy or if necessary for the viability of the settlement and to meet a local need. However, the definition of ‘local need’ and the mechanism for assessing viability at a settlement level are not specified. The Settlement Assessments underpinning the approach dated from 2003 and 2007. My interim findings concluded that the submitted plan had not been positively prepared in relation to villages and that the approach as set out in Policy LG2 was unsound.

80. To address this, the Council updated the Settlement Assessments with some alterations to the criteria and scoring process to reflect up-to-date circumstances. The update has been criticised in representations, in particular the scores attributed to some village facilities and the connections to Barnsley town centre. Planning judgements have to be made in an exercise of this nature but overall I am satisfied that the assessment is based on a reasonable set of criteria and consistent scoring process and provides a more robust evidence base on which to base the plan’s approach to villages.

81. Based on the findings of the Settlement Assessment, ten additional housing sites were proposed in villages which were identified to have a wider range of services and facilities with the potential to contribute to sustainable patterns of development. My conclusions on the soundness of those proposed
additional housing allocations are outlined in Issue 5 but in summary, seven of the sites in villages have been taken forward as MMs to the plan.

82. In accordance with the spatial strategy in Policy LG2, the priority for new development will continue to be Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns, with 5% of the housing requirement directed to villages. This would be achieved through site allocations in addition to windfall sites which would be assessed against Policies H5 and H6. So that the plan has been positively prepared, Policy LG2 should include villages in the list of locations where new development will be permitted and MM13 is necessary. Updates to the supporting text to Policy LG2 and the key diagram are also required to explain the more positive approach to villages and would be achieved by MM6 and MM7.

83. For clarity and consistency with the settlement hierarchy, the separate settlements within Goldthorpe Principal Town should be named in Policy LG2 and MM13 achieves that. For the avoidance of doubt, further references to Goldthorpe in this report include the Dearne towns of Thurnscoe and Bolton upon Dearne. Hoyland Principal Town includes Elsecar and MM5 will ensure that its historical significance is highlighted in the spatial strategy.

84. Whilst representations support a higher proportion of new housing development being directed to the villages, the MMs represent a proportionate response to the interim findings. The development identified for the villages will ensure a more even distribution of development across the plan area including in strong market locations. The delivery of affordable housing will be supported through other mechanisms including through exception sites and Neighbourhood Plans, in addition to being delivered as a proportion of open market housing through the application of Policy H8 (Affordable Housing).

85. The SA of the submitted plan tested reasonable alternatives for the spatial strategy against the SA objectives, including options for dispersing new development more widely across the Borough and a new settlement. The settlement pattern within the Borough, the location of rail and road networks, public transport and environmental constraints all limit the number of reasonable alternative strategies. Based on the assessment of these alternatives and the need for a more positive approach to the villages which would not significantly alter the overall spatial strategy, Policy LG2 as proposed to be modified in MM13 is justified.

86. The spatial strategy in Policy LG2 also provides an appropriate framework for the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans, including those underway for Oxspring and Penistone.

Distribution of development

87. Policy H2 sets out the distribution of new housing development broadly reflecting the spatial strategy in Policy LG2. So that the plan has been positively prepared and is justified, Policy H2 should reflect the approach to the villages as proposed to be modified in MM13, the latest position with regard to the yield from proposed site allocations and the most recent information on planning permissions and MM32 secures the necessary
changes. I have corrected a typo in paragraph 9.5 to delete Policy LG1 and insert Policy LG2.

88. The distribution of new housing is expressed as definitive percentages within Policy H2. This would be unnecessarily restrictive and the policy is unsound in this regard. To ensure that Policy H2 has been positively prepared, MM32 is required so that the distribution is expressed as an approximate percentage rather than a target or maximum ceiling.

89. Through the HRA, Policies LG2 and H2 were screened as having a likelihood of a significant effect due to a small indirect risk from increased recreational pressure on adjacent open areas including SPA/SAC sites. A range of mitigation measures were identified through Appropriate Assessment to ensure that development in proximity to the SPA/SAC would not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of protected sites, including the application of plan policies to safeguard biodiversity, provision of greenspace within new development and managing recreation activity at visitor destinations through the Peak District National Park Management Plan and the Rights of Way Improvement Plan.

Conclusion on Issue 3

90. Subject to the MMs identified, the plan’s vision and objectives are justified and appropriate to the circumstances of the plan area and the spatial strategy, settlement hierarchy and distribution of development are soundly based.

Issue 4 – Whether or not there is a need in principle to release land from the Green Belt to meet development needs and whether or not exceptional circumstances exist to add land to the Green Belt?

Overview

91. Currently, approximately 77% of the Borough is within the South Yorkshire Green Belt. Its functions include maintaining the separation between settlements within Urban Barnsley and between the town and surrounding Principal Towns, protecting the Borough’s wider countryside and focusing development within more sustainable locations. However, the current boundary is tightly drawn around the existing settlements which are identified as a priority for development in Policy LG2. Together with the overall extent of the Green Belt within the Borough, this means that the supply and suitability of land to meet longer term development needs outside the Green Belt is restricted.

92. Policy CSP34 of the CS made provision for a localised Green Belt review with small adjustments to the boundary to be included within the DSP document. However, the need for more significant changes to meet employment needs was also referenced in the CS. The plan has been prepared in the context of the 2012 NPPF which indicates that every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of
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an area and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Significant changes to the Green Belt boundaries are proposed in the plan together with the removal of approximately 654 hectares of land for employment and housing development, greenspace and for safeguarded land. This is approximately 2.2% of the Borough’s Green Belt.

93. The decision to undertake a Green Belt review was informed by a wide range of evidence including SA and the 2013 Strategic Housing and Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) which was updated by the 2016 Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA). The potential capacity of non-Green Belt housing sites within Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns which are the principal locations for new development was assessed as 6100 dwellings with planning permission and 8994 on sites identified in the plan outside the Green Belt. The shortfall of approximately 6000 dwellings established that there was an insufficient supply of housing sites to meet objectively assessed need for housing without development of Green Belt land.

94. One of the Green Belt purposes set out in the NPPF is to assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and urban land. The supply of previously developed land has diminished as former colliery and associated sites have been progressively restored and redeveloped. Approximately 12% of the housing sites and 9.5% of employment sites are on previously developed land and the site selection methodologies prioritise the use of previously developed land over greenfield. The Council published its Brownfield Land Register in August 2017 in advance of the Government’s deadline. The Regulations require the identification of sites for housing rather than employment. It lists brownfield sites with potential for housing but a number already have planning permission and will already be included within the calculations of land supply for the plan period. The evidence demonstrates that the plan has sought to maximise the use of previously developed land.

95. The scope for maximising housing densities to minimise the amount of Green Belt release necessary to meet the housing requirement has also been considered. Policy H7 already seeks a density of 40 dwellings per hectare within Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns. Whilst town centre sites or apartment schemes may have scope for higher densities to be achieved, there is no scope for an overall increase in the density figure set out in Policy H7.

96. The plan seeks to meet the employment OAN, OAHN and other development requirements in full and to identify sufficient deliverable sites to meet that need. Through the DtC it has been demonstrated that, at the present time, there is no scope for that need to be met within neighbouring authorities which are within different HMAs. Drawing matters together, there is a compelling case in principle to release land from the Green Belt to meet the objectively assessed need for development. This is, however, subject to exceptional circumstances being demonstrated for the alteration of Green Belt boundaries to justify the removal of specific sites from the Green Belt for development, a matter which I deal with in Issue 5.
Green Belt Review

97. The ARUP Green Belt review follows the SCR Common Approach and interprets the five purposes of the Green Belt in paragraph 80 of the NPPF. Notwithstanding the indication in the Green Belt review that there are no historic towns in Barnsley, I am satisfied that the contribution of the General Areas around Penistone to its setting and key views towards the Penistone Conservation Area which contribute to its character and appearance and landscape setting have been fully assessed as part of the review.

98. The Green Belt review followed a 3 stage process of assessing 114 General Areas around the settlements in the settlement hierarchy, including for completeness, villages inset from the Green Belt. General Areas were delineated by strongly defined boundary features and size variations do not undermine the robustness of the exercise. General Areas considered to be fulfilling the purposes of the Green Belt to a moderate degree or weaker (scoring 15 or less) were assessed for relevant site based constraints and any resultant land parcels were re-appraised against the five Green Belt purposes.

99. That there have been challenges to the scores attributed to the contribution of different General Areas to Green Belt purposes is almost inevitable given that a degree of planning judgement is involved. Importantly, the methodology incorporates a narrative alongside the scoring process which provides a ‘sense check’ particularly where anomalies, inconsistencies or errors may have occurred and it is important that the review is read as a whole. A number of representors also consider that the review was not sufficiently ‘fine grained’ in that smaller parcels within more strongly performing General Areas were not identified as resultant parcels to be taken forward through the site selection methodology.

100. The overall aims of the Green Belt Review are to identify land for removal which would cause least harm to Green Belt purposes and to identify new, permanent and defensible boundaries which are logical, robust and soundly based. The disaggregation of smaller parcels for assessment within strongly performing General Areas would undermine their integrity and the overall contribution that they make to Green Belt purposes. The Green Belt review is one component of a wider site assessment and selection process to identify a supply of suitable and deliverable sites to meet the Borough’s employment and housing needs.

101. In that context, I consider that the Green Belt Review is fit for purpose and provides an appropriate basis for sites to be identified for removal for more detailed consideration through the employment and housing site selection methodologies.

Green Belt additions

102. A number of minor alterations to the Green Belt boundary are proposed to reflect changes in physical features, planning permissions, cartographic errors and minor adjustments to create more defensible boundaries including in conjunction with the release of larger sites from the Green Belt. The changes which were illustrated in the Green Belt Background Paper are shown on the Policies Map. I find these alterations to be logical and appropriate. Two larger additions are proposed.
103. **Land south of Broadwater Estate, Bolton upon Dearne** – the area was designated as safeguarded land and washlands on the UDP Proposals Map and is proposed to be included within the Green Belt in the submitted plan.

104. The site has been assessed through the site selection methodology. Approximately half of the site falls within Flood Zone 1 but the remainder is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and the site has significant ecological value associated with the wetland and river Dearne corridor along the southern boundary. When viewed from the PROW running from the rear of the dwellings to the south of Broadwater, the site forms an integral part of the open and undulating land separating Bolton upon Dearne from Wath upon Dearne which is visible in long distance views to the south.

105. Whilst flood risk and biodiversity do not constitute the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the alteration of the Green Belt boundary, they represent a significant constraint to development and the site would not be effective in meeting longer term development needs. The existing Green Belt boundary to the west of the site follows the River Dearne. Due to the allocation of site H67 to the west, the Green Belt boundary would be fragmentated and would become a less defensible boundary to prevent further encroachment of the built up area of Bolton upon Dearne to the south. The rear boundary of existing development to the south of Broadwater would create a more cohesive and defensible Green Belt boundary to prevent further encroachment of the built up area to the south. I conclude that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the alteration of the Green Belt boundary as shown on the Policies Map to include the site within the Green Belt. Problems with anti-social behaviour and vandalism are matters that should be dealt with under other legislation.

106. **Land west of Fitzwilliam Street, Elsecar** – this area was designated as safeguarded land on the UDP Proposals Map. As submitted, part of the area was identified as a housing allocation (site H2) with the remainder proposed to be included within the Green Belt. Based on the findings of the Historic Area Assessment\(^\text{10}\) (2017), the site (together with Site H2) falls within a larger area that makes a significant contribution to the understanding of Elsecar as a planned industrial village within the wider Wentworth Estate and to the understanding of the early coal mining and iron working industry in the area. Development of the safeguarded land could prejudice further investigation of the surviving buildings and buried remains.

107. As a consequence of the deletion of site H2 which is dealt with elsewhere in this report, a further alteration of the Green Belt boundary is proposed to follow the rear of the existing development to the south of Foundry Street together with the watercourse and wooded area to the west. Modification of the Policies Map to show these alterations has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 25).
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108. Without this change the Green Belt boundary as submitted would be in an arbitrary position and not sufficiently robust to prevent the extension of the built up area to the south. The revised position would provide a stronger and more defensible boundary to prevent encroachment of the existing built up area into open countryside. The HAA represents a material change in the understanding of the site’s contribution to the historic significance of Elsecar. Overall, I conclude that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the inclusion of the area within the Green Belt and the alteration of the Green Belt boundary as shown on Policies Map Change 25.

**Green Belt policies**

109. Policy GB2 deals with the extension and alteration of existing buildings in the Green Belt. As submitted, the wording to avoid any ‘harmful impact’ on openness is inconsistent with the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy set out in paragraph 79 of the NPPF to keep land ‘permanently open’. So that the plan is consistent with national policy, **MM108** is necessary to address this and clarify how development proposals will be assessed having regard to character and appearance. Similarly, Policy GB3 deals with the change of use and conversion of buildings in the Green Belt and so that the plan will be effective, **MM109** is necessary to provide additional clarification on how development proposals will be assessed having regard to character and appearance.

110. Policies GB4 and GB5 deal with permanent and temporary agricultural workers dwellings and in order to ensure that the plan will be effective, **MM110** and **MM111** are necessary to provide additional clarification on how the character and appearance of proposals will be assessed.

**Safeguarded land**

111. The NPPF indicates that where necessary (my emphasis) areas of safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt can be identified to meet longer term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period. It also indicates that safeguarded land is not allocated for development and that planning permission for permanent development should only be granted following a LP review.

112. Having regard to the extent of the Green Belt and the boundaries around Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns which are the more sustainable locations for development, the identification of safeguarded land is appropriate to the circumstances of the plan area and necessary in the terms of the NPPF. The identification of safeguarded land will help to ensure that Green Belt boundaries will remain permanent and will not need to be altered in the long term.

113. After deducting the supply likely to come forward on windfall sites, the Council’s approach is to identify sufficient safeguarded land to supply 5 years’ worth of the annual housing requirement for delivery after the plan period. In the absence of any national guidance on the amount of safeguarded land that should be identified, this is a pragmatic and reasonable approach.

114. In the submitted plan the table accompanying Policy GB6 lists thirty three areas of safeguarded land which are shown on the Policies Map. Twenty five
safeguarded areas have been carried forward from the UDP and eight additional areas are proposed to be removed from the Green Belt for safeguarded land – SAF5, SAF6, SAF7, AC33, H79, H85, AC42 and AC41. Through the housing site selection methodology they were found to perform less favourably compared with the allocated sites and/or had deliverability issues which would be unlikely to be resolved within the plan period. The safeguarded sites proposed to be removed from the Green Belt all relate to resultant parcels (or part thereof) within the Green Belt review and for ease of reference I deal with the exceptional circumstances justifying their release at a site level in Issue 5.

115. Some of these safeguarded areas were proposed for additional housing sites during the examination consultation together with four additional safeguarded areas. My conclusion following the Stage 4 hearings was that the exceptional circumstances did not exist to justify the alteration of the Green Belt boundary for additional safeguarded areas EC2, EC7 and CA2a. In the interests of fairness I sought views on that position as part of the MMs consultation but I have seen no further evidence to justify coming to a different conclusion. As a consequence, only EC4 is justified as an additional safeguarded site to meet longer term development needs at Shafton and I deal with that in Issue 5.

116. The approach to the release of safeguarded land set out in Policy GB6 is inconsistent with national policy. For consistency with paragraph 85 of the NPPF, the word ‘replacement’ of the plan in Policy GB6 should be replaced with ‘review’ for which MM113 is necessary. MM114 is necessary to clarify that the development of safeguarded land will be assessed against normal planning considerations. The NPPF does not provide for the development of safeguarded land in ‘exceptional circumstances’ as indicated in the supporting text to Policy GB6 and for soundness, MM115 secures its deletion.

117. The table of safeguarded land accompanying Policy GB6 should be updated and MM112 achieves that.

Conclusion on Issue 4

118. Subject to the MMs outlined, I conclude that there is a compelling case in principle for the release of land from the Green Belt to meet the objectively assessed need for employment and housing and for additional safeguarded land. This is, however, subject to exceptional circumstances being demonstrated for the alteration of Green Belt boundaries to justify the removal of specific sites from the Green Belt for development, a matter dealt with in Issue 5. Exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to add land to the Green Belt. In addition, the Green Belt boundary alterations to rectify anomalies, errors and reflect updated circumstances are appropriate and soundly based.
**Issue 5 - Are the employment, mixed use and housing allocations positively prepared, justified and effective and where necessary have exceptional circumstances been demonstrated to justify releasing land from the Green Belt for the uses proposed including safeguarded land?**

**Site Selection**

119. The development sites selected for assessment draw on robust evidence including the ELR, SHELAA and Green Belt review. A three stage assessment process was used taking account of a range of factors including the effect on infrastructure, landscape character, the historic environment, flood risk, infrastructure and deliverability. The employment and housing site selection methodologies are based on comprehensive, logical and robust criteria that are consistent with the SA objectives.

120. The process has been informed by relevant technical evidence, SA and the need to locate development in sustainable locations in accordance with the spatial strategy in Policy LG2. That there have been some challenges to the scoring of specific criteria for individual sites is inevitable given that an element of planning judgement is involved. However, I am satisfied that the reasons for selecting allocated sites and rejecting others are clear and the conclusions reached are reasonable ones.

121. Planning applications will be subject to assessment against all relevant plan policies. The site allocation policies identify specific constraints and requirements for mitigation to guide and inform plan users and development proposals. The larger sites require a ‘phased masterplan’ but without further details of what would be required from applicants. For effectiveness, MM11 is required to clarify what a masterplan framework should include and the requirement for public consultation. The latter point would include full public engagement and no further clarification is necessary on this point.

**Housing Density**

122. Policy H7 includes a density requirement of 40 dwellings per hectare. The overall net density of permissions granted since adoption of the CS has declined from 45 dwellings per hectare (dph) (2004 to 2012) to 33 dph (2004 – 2012) reflecting the more ‘risk averse’ forms of development proposed since the recession. However, 40 dph reflects the average density achieved over the longer time frame. It is a realistic figure to work towards and will help secure sustainable patterns of development within Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns.

123. As submitted, Policy H7 is not sufficiently flexible to accommodate circumstances where lower densities may be appropriate to reflect form and character nor does it provide any guidance for development in villages and the use of the word ‘about’ 40 dph creates uncertainty. These matters would be addressed through MM77 which is also necessary to clarify that the figure relates to net densities and will ensure that Policy H7 is justified and deliverable.
Employment Allocations

124. As submitted, Policy E3 does not provide any useful guidance on the employment allocations. MM17 is necessary to delete it and update the supporting text to confirm that Site MU1 contributes to the employment land supply.

Urban Barnsley

125. Site UB1 – As an expansion of the existing Birthwaite Business Park, no additional infrastructure or mitigation measures are required. Birthwaite Hall is a Grade 2 listed building and as a designated heritage asset its setting should be safeguarded as part of any layout. So that the site policy will be effective in this regard, MM18 is necessary.

126. Site UB7 – The site is a resultant parcel within General Area DOD3 which the Green Belt review concluded was moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes. I concur with its findings that Higham Lane, the M1 and existing built form of Capitol Park would form permanent and defensible boundaries to the Green Belt and would check the unrestricted sprawl of Dodworth. Development would be viewed in conjunction with the existing buildings at Capitol Park. Representations from the site promoter indicate good prospects for delivery.

127. Alternative sites have been assessed and discounted. The employment OAN cannot be accommodated without release of land from the Green Belt and the exceptional circumstances exist to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary to remove the site for development.

128. Site UB16 – This UDP employment allocation was carried forward into the submitted plan. The NPPF at paragraph 22 indicates that policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use. Based on the findings of the ELR and the Barnsley Employment Land Report\(^{11}\) (2016) I am satisfied that there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for employment. The site is not required to meet the employment OAN and there is a current outline planning application for housing. To ensure that the plan is deliverable and consistent with national policy, MM19 is necessary to delete UB16 for employment. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 57).

Principal Towns

129. Sites HOY1, HOY3 & HOY5, Hoyland – These sites are resultant parcels within General Areas HN4, HN6 and HN11 all of which were concluded to be moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes within the Green Belt review. They are within a cluster of employment sites around M1 Junction 36 and Hoyland which will be supported by the SCRIFF. I concur with the conclusions of the Green Belt review that the presence of surrounding development and road infrastructure results in a high level of containment and the areas relate closely to the existing built up area of Hoyland. Having regard to my

\(^{11}\) Barnsley Local Plan Evidence Employment Land (April 2016) Mott McDonald and Colliers International
conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary to remove these sites for development.

130. The employment and housing sites in Hoyland should be developed in a co-ordinated and comprehensive manner through production of a masterplan framework to address cumulative infrastructure and other requirements. So that the site policies have been positively prepared, MM21, MM22 and MM25 are necessary to update the requirements for Sites HOY1, HOY2 and HOY5 including landscaping on site boundaries and an amendment to the site boundary of HOY1 to enable part of the existing Sports Club to be retained and the re-location of sports facilities within the site boundary to a location within Hoyland Principal Town. Modification of the Policies Map to clarify the site boundaries of HOY1 and HOY5 has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Changes 32 and 50).

131. Sites HOY3 and HOY4 lie to the north of the Dearne Valley Parkway and will be developed separately from the larger sites in Hoyland. A masterplan framework is not justified for these smaller sites and MM23 and MM24 are necessary to remove this requirement from the respective site policies.

132. Site RSV1, Goldthorpe – The site falls within General Area DE6 which the Green Belt review concluded to have a fundamental role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and protecting an essential gap between Goldthorpe and Darfield and the Dearne Towns and Wath upon Dearne. No resultant parcels were identified. My interim findings concluded that in the absence of any further evidence, the exceptional circumstances to justify the alteration of the Green Belt boundary to remove the site from the Green Belt had not been demonstrated and its identification as a ‘reserve’ employment site was not soundly based. I have seen no further evidence to justify coming to a different conclusion.

133. Site D1 will provide additional employment land to the east of the Borough and site RSV1 is not required to meet the employment OAN. Future needs would be addressed through a plan review, including mitigation measures to address local impacts. Site RSV1 should be deleted from the plan for which MM30 is necessary. Modification of the Policies Map to show this alteration has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 59).

134. Policy E4 sets out the circumstances under which site RSV1 would be considered for development and is no longer relevant. MM29 is necessary to delete it.

135. Site D1, Goldthorpe – The site is a smaller area within General Area DE6 and the Green Belt review findings are outlined above. Its location to the west of the built up area of Goldthorpe and adjacent to the existing ALDI distribution depot relates closely to the existing built up area. The western boundary of the site would be approximately 1.1 km from the A6195 and with the deletion of site RSV1, there would be an adequate separation between development on the site and the A6195 to prevent the coalescence of the built up areas of Goldthorpe and Darfield.

136. The site is within the Priority Growth Area in the SCR LEP where economic indicators support the need for jobs growth and its allocation will ensure a
distribution of employment sites in accordance with the spatial strategy. The existing UDP employment allocations in Goldthorpe are limited in size and no other additional suitable sites were identified through the site selection methodology. Having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary to remove the site for development.

137. A number of site specific impacts have been raised in representations including the cumulative impact of additional traffic on the A635 in terms of highway capacity and air quality. Although the Highway Authority is satisfied that a safe access onto the A635 can be achieved, the cross boundary impacts in terms of air quality and specific proposals for the A635 will continue to be addressed through the DtC. Transport assessments will be required in conjunction with any planning application for the site.

138. The proximity of Old Moor Nature Reserve which has been identified as a candidate SSSI has been raised in representations together with the importance of site D1 for habitat connectivity. The implications for habitat connectivity would be addressed through the application of Policy BIO1. Initial surveys conducted by the Council have not identified the presence of Golden Plover but a precautionary approach is required and the necessity for site surveys and mitigation should be identified within the site policy.

139. Billingley village lies approximately 0.5km to the north of site D1. Development proposals should have regard to the requirement to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Billingley Conservation Area including outward views of the open countryside to the south which contribute to its setting and thereby to its significance.

140. As submitted, site policy D1 is not positively prepared in respect of identifying and mitigating the site specific impacts outlined above. MM20 will address this by requiring a masterplan framework to deal with the matters outlined above.

141. Site P2, Penistone – Despite being within General Area PEN1 which the Green Belt review concluded was strongly fulfilling Green Belt purposes, the review concluded that the river Don would form a strong physical feature and that the area to the east of Kirkwood Beck could be considered for ‘consolidation’ for employment purposes.

142. The site relates closely to the built up area of Penistone and to existing employment sites to the south and north of Sheffield Road and would be contained by the road to the south, the river to the north and an area of woodland to the east. Other than existing employment sites, no other suitable employment sites in Penistone were identified through the site selection process. The employment OAN cannot be met on land outside the Green Belt. Having regard to my conclusion in Issue 4, the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the alteration of the Green Belt boundary to remove the site for employment development.

Other locations

143. Site N1, Tankersley – Planning permission has been granted for employment development on an area to the north-west of the park designated as green
space on the Policies Map. To ensure that the site policy has been positively prepared, **MM26** is necessary to increase the size of the site allocation to reflect the planning permission and to secure appropriate mitigation for the loss of greenspace. Modification of the Policies Map to show this change has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 29).

144. **Sites N2 and N5, Houghton** – Both sites are undeveloped parcels within existing employment areas. To ensure that the plan has been positively prepared, **MM27** and **MM28** are necessary to highlight flood risk within the wording of the site policy for N2 and require the retention of habitats of ecological value for site N5.

### Mixed use allocations

145. Policy Mixed Use Sites 1 does not provide any useful guidance to plan users on the mixed use allocations and is not effective. **MM82** is necessary to delete it from the plan.

146. **Site MU1** - The site covers approximately 122 hectares and is allocated for 1700 dwellings, 43 hectares of employment land, community facilities including a primary school and new road - the Claycliffe road link. Although much of the area is now farmland, historically it accommodated four opencast coal mines. It forms a resultant parcel (UB2a) within the Green Belt review. The SA and employment and housing site selection methodologies which I have found to be robust have also informed the allocation of Site MU1.

147. The conclusion of the Green Belt review that General Area UB2 is weakly fulfilling Green Belt purposes and the score attributed to it are disputed in representations. It is clear that the area maintains not only the physical separation between former mining settlements but their identity as different communities. As acknowledged in the Green Belt review, the area contains a PROW network, contributes to visual amenity and supports biodiversity assets.

148. Views from within and towards the site are strongly influenced by the edges of the built up areas of Higham and Barugh Green to the west and Gawber and Pogmoor to the east. Whilst in a cutting, the M1 is a substantial man made feature which together with the commercial development around Junction 37 contributes to the sense of being within an urban area. Based on this, I concur with the findings of the Green Belt review that the area has a strong functional relationship with the existing built form of Urban Barnsley and that the M1 and railway line would create strong boundaries to prevent further encroachment of the built up area to the west.

149. The site selection methodology resulted in a lower score for site MU1 compared with other sites in Urban Barnsley. However, the need for employment land in strategic locations throughout the Borough to accommodate the sectors identified in the Jobs and Business Plan is clearly demonstrated in the ELR and Barnsley Employment Land Report. The site is in a sustainable location on the edge of Urban Barnsley and services and facilities including public transport and the location of employment uses alongside new housing offer sustainability benefits in terms of reducing the need to travel. The need for employment and housing land to meet objectively assessed needs cannot be met without the release of land from
the Green Belt. Exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the alteration of the Green Belt boundary to remove the site for development.

150. The scale and nature of the ‘other uses’ referred to in site policy MU1 in the submitted plan is unclear. Town centre uses would be subject to the sequential test but for clarity and effectiveness, the site policy should state that other retail uses will be restricted to small scale convenience retailing in line with Policy TC5 of the plan and MM83 achieves that. Community facilities are those that will serve residents and employees of the development and for clarity, MM83 is also necessary to make that clear within the supporting text to site policy MU1.

151. Details of the activities associated with the former mining use have been submitted in representations. Building construction will require piled foundations. To ensure that the site policy will be effective, MM83 is necessary to strengthen its requirements to deal with ground conditions and contamination and the necessary works should be secured through a phasing plan which will form part of the masterplan framework.

152. Whilst the biodiversity value of the site is clearly appreciated by local residents, there are no national or local biodiversity designations and the Council’s assessments did not identify habitats or species of high biodiversity value. The site policy appropriately includes reference to avoiding impacts on Redbrook Pastures Local Wildlife Site to the east. Policy BIO1 would require any development proposals to conserve and enhance biodiversity and the site policy includes a requirement to create and retain existing wildlife corridors and retain existing features including hedgerows, the watercourse and woodland. These features would need to be incorporated into any masterplan framework and I consider this is a satisfactory approach.

153. Residents have expressed concerns about noise and disturbance arising from the location of employment uses in proximity to existing housing and the potential for harm to living conditions during the construction and operational phases. The masterplan framework and determination of planning applications in accordance with Policy GD1 would ensure that the impact of the proposed uses on living conditions is assessed as part of any planning application. Subject to an adequate separation between the commercial and residential uses and appropriate mitigation measures, I see no reason why a suitable layout could not be achieved to avoid significant harm to living conditions.

154. The existing PROWs across the site which connect different communities are a distinctive feature and an important beneficial use of the Green Belt and should be incorporated within the layout of development for Site MU1. The general requirements for masterplan frameworks as set out in MM11 include the protection of existing PROWs. Whilst acknowledging that ground alterations will provide challenges to the alignment of PROW routes across site MU1, I see no justification to alter the specific requirement identified in the site policy. The provision of publicly accessible open space which could form part of the green infrastructure network should feature within the site policy as a specific requirement and MM83 achieves that.

155. Delivery timescales have been adjusted through the examination process and the projected start date of 2020/21 and yield of 1500 dwellings in the plan
period represent a realistic assessment. It is anticipated that the employment land would be developed in full by the end of the plan period. There is nothing to indicate that the additional costs associated with remediation and piling would undermine viability, particularly in this stronger market location.

156. The highway impacts of site MU1 have been modelled. The site policy includes a requirement for a link road connecting Higham Common Road to the A635 Barugh Green Road in the vicinity of Claycliffe Business Park. The road would fulfil a strategic and local function, providing an alternative route between M1 Junction 37 and the employment areas at Claycliffe and serving new development on site MU1. Subject to careful design and landscaping to facilitate accessibility by walking and cycling, I see no reason why the link road could not be successfully assimilated into the site layout.

157. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan to 2033 (IDP) identifies the off-site junctions on the local road network where further mitigation measures will be necessary. The timing of funding bids to the SCRF has also lead to concerns about pre determination, including in relation to the Claycliffe Road link and Dodworth Road/Pogmoor Road junction improvement and roundabout. The scheme was identified in the IDP to deal with existing congestion as well as providing capacity for future growth and detailed design work has progressed during the course of the examination. A planning application for the scheme has been made by the Highway Authority and will be subject to a formal process of public consultation and scrutiny.

158. The provision of a primary school, employment and local facilities would reduce the need to travel and facilitate sustainable modes of transport including walking and cycling. The capacity of local roads to accommodate development prior to the construction of the link road is a matter for more detailed assessment as part of the masterplan framework and any planning application. Overall, having regard to the site policy requirements and highway improvements identified in the IDP, I conclude that the impact on the strategic and local highway network would not be severe. In coming to that view I have had regard to the views of Highways England that subject to mitigation and/or localised capacity improvements, development proposed in the plan can be accommodated without adverse impact on the strategic road network.

159. The plan provides the appropriate framework for the more detailed masterplan to be prepared and for the development of planning applications. At a plan level, I am satisfied that sufficient information has been demonstrated to establish that the site allocation is soundly based.

160. Drawing matters together, I conclude that the exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the alteration of the Green Belt boundary in this location to remove the site and allocate it for the uses proposed. The site policy incorporates a number of important requirements which will be detailed in the subsequent masterplan framework and planning applications. Accordingly subject to the various modifications in MM83 outlined above, the allocation of site MU1 is soundly based.

161. Site AC12 – The site is a resultant parcel (UB8a) within General Area UB8 which was found to be moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes in the Green Belt review. The parcel is enclosed by the Manor Bakery factory to the north,
Fish Dam Lane to the west and the Transpennine Trail on the former railway line to the east which would provide a strong boundary to assist in safeguarding the countryside to the east from encroachment and would maintain the separation between Carlton and Cudworth.

162. In order to achieve a safe access onto the local highway network, the main access road will pass through Wharncliffe Woodmoor which is located to the west of site AC12. To ensure that any potential losses of green space are mitigated and retain beneficial uses, **MM84** is required to indicate within the site policy that compensatory provision will be required.

163. **MM84** is also necessary to list the areas of important habitat that are required to be retained. Any proposal would be assessed against Policy BIO1 of the plan and whilst concerns have been expressed about the effect on habitat connectivity and biodiversity, I conclude that the site policy as proposed to be modified provides a suitable framework to secure the necessary mitigation including appropriate buffers to watercourses. Deculverting Carlton Beck and other watercourses would be a significant additional infrastructure requirement and in the absence of further details of cost and implications for the site is not justified.

164. The site policy represents an appropriate framework to address the mitigation necessary through a more detailed masterplan framework, work on which has been commissioned by the Council. Whilst this indicates good prospects for delivery, Site H44 lies immediately to the south east of AC12 and the sites should be combined as one allocation so that the trajectory is based on a realistic and achievable rate of delivery. So that the plan has been positively prepared, **MM38** is necessary to delete site policy H44 and **MM84** secures the necessary modifications to site policy AC12 including an increase in site capacity to approximately 1683 dwellings. The projected start date of 2021/22 is realistic. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 30). Finally, for consistency with national policy development should be avoided within flood zones 2 and 3 and **MM84** rectifies that omission within the site policy.

165. The other mixed use site policies AC11 and AC16 in Urban Barnsley and AC40 in Wombwell include appropriate criteria and mitigation to secure a satisfactory form of development and are soundly based.

166. The site policies make clear where provision towards primary education is required and Policy ED1 and the duplicated education policies are superfluous and not justified. For effectiveness, **MM85** secures their deletion and minor changes to the retained explanatory text.

**Housing allocations**

167. The submitted plan includes over 90 housing site allocations. At stage 4 of the examination, additional housing sites were proposed by the Council to meet the increased housing requirement and address the identified shortfall in delivery on some sites and subject to public consultation. My conclusions on the soundness of those sites are outlined below but in summary, ten additional housing are included as MMs in the Appendix.
168. For the avoidance of doubt, I have considered further only those allocations which raise specific issues in respect of soundness including sites proposed to be released from the Green Belt, those where MMs are necessary to ensure soundness and sites that are proposed to be altered or deleted. I have considered all the representations made at the Regulation 19 stage and at the hearing sessions and where no reference is made I am satisfied that the site allocations are soundly based.

169. Policy GD1 sets out the criteria that will be used to assess development proposals including those submitted on allocated sites. For effectiveness, reference to all surface water bodies should be included in Policy GD1 and MM10 achieves that. For clarity and effectiveness, MM9 is necessary to explain that proposals will be assessed against all other relevant policies in the plan. With the addition of this supporting text, Policy H3 becomes superfluous and for clarity MM33 secures its deletion.

170. Policy H4 outlines how other uses on allocated sites would be assessed but the use of the term ‘will be developed mainly for housing’ (my emphasis) creates uncertainty. For clarity, MM75 is necessary to delete the word ‘mainly’ together with other minor clarifications.

**Urban Barnsley**

171. **Site H83** – The site is a resultant parcel (MPW3a) within General Area MPW3 which was found to be moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes in the Green Belt review. I concur with its findings that Bloomhouse Lane and Woolley Colliery Road would create strong permanent boundaries to the Green Belt to assist in safeguarding the more open and undulating countryside to the north from encroachment.

172. The development would relate closely to the existing built up area of Darton and Mapplewell and would be viewed in conjunction with development on the adjoining site allocation (H20). The site policy sets out appropriate mitigation measures. On this basis, and having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove this site from the Green Belt.

173. **Site AC1** – The site is part of a resultant parcel (MPW3b) comprising two areas of land separated by an area of greenspace within General Area MPW3 which was found to be moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes in the Green Belt Review. I concur with its findings that Bloomhouse Lane and Woolley Colliery Road would create strong and permanent boundaries to the Green Belt and removing areas of previously developed land within MPW3b would facilitate the recycling of derelict land.

174. The development would reduce the separation between Darton/Mapplewell and Woolley Colliery Grange which is in Wakefield Borough but would be on previously developed land and would be viewed in conjunction with new housing at the Woolley Colliery site. The site policy sets out appropriate mitigation measures and having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove this site from the Green Belt.

175. **Site AC2** – The site is a resultant parcel (MPW6a) within General Area MPW6 which was found to be moderately fulfilling the purposes of the Green Belt. When viewed from Darton Lane, the area between road and the trees and
vegetation along the PROW on the former railway line to the south is well contained and relates closely to the existing built up area. This accords with the findings of the Green Belt review that the former railway line would provide a stronger more defensible boundary to prevent the extension of the built up area into the river valley which is an important open space separating different settlements within Urban Barnsley. On this basis, and having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove this site from the Green Belt.

176. **Site H13** – Concerns have been raised about the effects on biodiversity, including on the Littleworth Park Nature Reserve which is a candidate Local Wildlife Site and the potential impact on bats. There are no national or local designations on the site itself or survey results which lead me to conclude that the development would have a significant adverse effect on wildlife. Any proposed development would be required by Policy BIO1 of the plan to conserve biodiversity and drainage and contamination would be addressed under Policies GD1, CC1 and CL1. **MM35** is necessary to confirm access arrangements within the site policy and secure a wildlife buffer strip on the common boundary with Littleworth Park as part of any development. I consider that this is a satisfactory approach.

177. **Site H19** – The site lies immediately to the west of the M1 and partly within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The site policy includes appropriate mitigation measures to address noise and disturbance and the net site area and yield take account of the need to avoid development within the AQMA. However, for effectiveness the site policy should make clear that development should be avoided on that part of the site within the AQMA and **MM36** achieves that.

178. **Site H28** – Part of the site is a former school. So that the plan has been positively prepared, **MM37** is necessary to ensure that existing habitats are retained or compensatory measures are provided for any losses.

179. **Site H57** is in proximity to Monk Bretton Cross and to ensure that its setting will be conserved in line with the NPPF’s approach to designated heritage assets, **MM39** is required.

180. **Site H72** – The site is within a resultant parcel (UB14a) within General Area UB14 which the Green Belt review concluded was moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes.

181. The submitted plan proposed 77 dwellings on the site but it occupies a steep hillside and due to the cost of ground works, viability would be significantly compromised. It is therefore not deliverable in the terms of paragraph 47, footnote 11 of the NPPF. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify alterations to the Green Belt boundary in this location and the site will remain within the Green Belt. **MM40** is necessary to delete site H72 for housing. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 31).

182. **Site H73** – The submitted plan proposed 154 dwellings on this site which comprises small field parcels between Mount Vernon Road and Upper Sheffield Road. When viewed from the PROW which runs through the site, the ongoing agricultural use creates a striking and attractive contrast with the built up
areas around it. Whilst a ‘buffer’ area was identified on the Policies Map to safeguard the designated heritage assets of Elmhirst Farmhouse and Darley Hall, due to the extent of the site area the proposed development would still encroach upon their setting and would be harmful to their significance as designated heritage assets.

183. I conclude that the exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify altering the Green Belt boundary to remove the whole of the site from the Green Belt as shown on the submitted Policies Map. However, the boundary to the south of Mount Vernon Crescent would create a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary to check any further encroachment of the built up area to the south and safeguard the setting of designated heritage assets and would enable a smaller area to be removed for development.

184. For consistency with national policy and deliverability, MM41 is necessary to allocate a reduced site area for approximately 42 dwellings and to include reference within the site policy for the need to safeguard all nearby designated heritage assets together with retention of the distinctive roadside wall. Whilst representations support the retention of the site within the Green Belt, exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to alter the boundary and the reduced site allocation is soundly based. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 23).

Cudworth

185. Sites H74 & H75 – Both sites are within a resultant parcel (CUD2b) within General Area CUD2 which the Green Belt review concluded was moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes. I concur with its findings that the A628 Cudworth bypass would create a strong and defensible boundary to the Green Belt to prevent encroachment of the built up area of Cudworth into the countryside to the north. Areas of green space and the cemetery which are existing beneficial uses would be retained.

186. The development of both sites would relate closely to the existing built up area of Cudworth and would be adjacent to Site H87. The site policies appropriately require a masterplan to ensure a comprehensive form of development and to ensure that the plan will be effective. MM45, MM46 and MM47 are necessary to clarify the scope of the masterplan and cross reference it within the requirements for site H87. Having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove this site from the Green Belt.

187. Site H76 - The site is a resultant parcel (CUD2c) within General Area CUD2 which the Green Belt review concluded was moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes. I concur with its findings that the A628 Cudworth bypass would create a strong and defensible boundary to the Green Belt to contain the built up area of Cudworth and maintain the separation between it and Weetshaw to the north-west. The site policy sets out appropriate mitigation measures. Having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove this site from the Green Belt.

188. Site H39 is in Cudworth and so that the site policy will be effective, MM44 is necessary to indicate that development should avoid areas of flood risk.
Goldthorpe

189. **Site H84** - The site forms a resultant parcel (DE1a) within General Area DE1 which the Green Belt review concluded was moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes. I concur with its findings that the disused railway line would create a strong and defensible boundary to check any further extension of the built up area of Thurnscoe to the south. Whilst there would be some reduction in the separation between Thurnscoe and Goldthorpe, the site relates closely to the built up area of Thurnscoe and with appropriate layout and landscaping a sympathetic form of development can be achieved. The site policy appropriately requires a masterplan and to ensure that this will be comprehensive in approach, **MM50** is necessary. On this basis, and having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove this site from the Green Belt.

190. **Site AC26** is to the east of Bolton upon Dearne and forms the later phase of an existing development. To secure effective mitigation for adjoining habitats and designated heritage assets **MM48** is required and will ensure that the plan is effective. So that the plan will be effective and deliverable, **MM49** is required to reduce the indicative yield of Site H67 to the west of Bolton upon Dearne to enable areas of biodiversity to be retained and confirm access arrangements via site D1.

Hoyland (including Elsecar)

191. A number of sites are proposed for housing development in Hoyland and for ease of reference the sites are grouped together.

192. **Sites H77 and AC29** - These sites form part of a resultant parcel (HN11a) which comprises General Area HN11 which the Green Belt review concluded was moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes. Although within the Dearne Valley Green Heart Nature Improvement Area which creates amenity value, when viewed from the A6195 the parcel is highly contained by existing development to the west and by the Dearne Valley Parkway and proposed housing allocation H16 to the south. The remainder of the resultant parcel is proposed as employment site HOY5 and green space and urban fabric reflecting its existing functions.

193. So that the requirement for a masterplan framework for sites H77 and AC29 in conjunction with site H16 is clear, **MM51** and **MM59** are required. To safeguard the rural setting of the listed Hoyland Lowe Stand, dwelling heights at the eastern edge of the site should be restricted to single storey and the area identified as ‘undevelopable due to heritage’ should be expanded. **MM59** achieves that and will ensure that the site policy is effective. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 24).

194. I have had regard to representations that dwelling heights and the limits of the undevelopable area should be determined through the detailed layout for the site, but the site allocation as proposed to be modified provides greater clarity on deliverability. I have amended **MM59** to remove the requirement for the improvement and maintenance of Hoyland Lowe Stand which is outside the site boundary.
195. For consistency and effectiveness, the requirement for a masterplan framework should be included within the site policy for site H16 and duplicated text within the policy should be deleted and MM57 is required. The boundary between site H16 and HOY5 should be clarified and modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 32). Having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove these sites from the Green Belt.

196. Sites AC30 and AC31 – The Green Belt Review concluded that General Area HN4 was moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes. Site AC30 falls within a resultant parcel (HN4b) which is contained by the M1 to the west and by the A6135 Sheffield Road to the north-east. Site AC31 is a resultant parcel (HN4c) which is contained by existing development to the north. The operational railway line to the south-east would provide a strong and permanent Green Belt boundary to maintain the separation between Hoyland and the small settlement of Harley to the south-east (within Rotherham Borough).

197. For effectiveness, MM52 and MM53 are necessary to clarify the requirement for a masterplan framework for the development of sites AC30 and AC31 in conjunction with sites H7, H8 and H45. Skiers Wood Local Wildlife Site is in close proximity to sites AC31 and H45 and in response to representations I have amended site policies AC31 and H45 to require a suitable buffer to this area. For consistency and effectiveness, the requirement for a masterplan framework should also be included in site policies H7, H8 and H45 and MM55, MM56 and MM58 achieve that. Having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove these sites from the Green Belt.

198. Site 877 is adjacent to the M1 and to ensure that the plan has been positively prepared, MM61 is necessary to confirm that development should not be located in the AQMA.

199. Site H2 – Based on the findings of the Historic Area Assessment\(^{12}\) (2017), the site falls within a larger area that makes a significant contribution to the understanding of Elsecar as a planned industrial village within the wider Wentworth Estate and to the understanding of the early coal mining and iron working industry in the area. As the development of Site H2 in its entirety could prejudice further investigation of the surviving buildings and buried remains, the allocation is not soundly based and MM54 is necessary to delete it.

200. The site should be designated as urban fabric with the extent of the heritage constraint identified and any future proposals would be assessed having regard to Policy HE1 in the plan which seeks to safeguard heritage assets.

201. The proposed alteration of the Green Belt boundary to follow the rear of the existing development to the south of Foundry Street together with the

\(^{12}\) Historic Area Assessment: Land to the west of Elsecar Historic England Project 7532, ArcHeritage 2017
watercourse and wooded area to the west would provide a logical and defensible boundary to prevent encroachment into open countryside. Modification of the Policies Map to show these alterations has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 25).

202. Whilst representations support the allocation of additional land in Hoyland, sufficient sites have been identified to meet objectively assessed needs for employment and housing together with areas of safeguarded land.

Penistone

203. Site AC34 - The site falls within a resultant parcel PEN8a within General Area PEN8 found to be moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes in the Green Belt review. I concur with its findings that Huddersfield Road, Halifax Road and the operational railway line would form strong and permanent boundaries to the Green Belt to the north of Penistone.

204. Part of Site AC34 has planning permission for 11 dwellings and MM63 is necessary to reduce the site yield to 32 dwellings to reflect the capacity of the remaining undeveloped area. So that the plan will be deliverable, MM63 is also required to ensure that development is not located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove this site from the Green Belt.

205. Sites H81 and H82 – Also within resultant parcel PEN8a, the west, north and east boundaries of the sites correspond with the revised Green Belt boundary as described above. Representations indicate a number of concerns in relation to development on these sites including the impact on landscape character. The sites form a transition between the main built up area and the open moorland landscape rising to the north and new development will represent a significant change. However, I see no reason why a sensitively designed development with appropriate landscaping could not be achieved and this would ensure that the landscape setting and character of Penistone is safeguarded. The site policy includes appropriate mitigation measures in this regard.

206. Westhorpe Works located between Sites H81 and H82 is subject to a buffer zone and development within prescribed distances of the site is not permitted in accordance with the license granted by the Health and Safety Executive. This has been accounted for in the yield of both sites and further detailed consideration of the position of roads and buildings in relation to the buffer zone will be undertaken through the planning application process. So that site H81 will be deliverable and consistent with H82, I have amended MM64 so that the site policy includes reference to the need for an appropriate buffer around Westhorpe Works. That site is designated as urban fabric on the Policies Map and any future development proposals would be assessed in accordance with Policy H6.

207. Through the HRA, sites H81 and H82 were screened in as having a likelihood of a significant effect in terms of their potential for providing over wintering feeding ground for Golden Plover. Through the AA, mitigation measures were identified to ensure that the proposals would not result in an adverse effect on the integrity of protected species and MM64 and MM65 are also required to ensure that the appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated within both
Having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove these sites from the Green Belt.

**Wombwell/Darfield**

208. **Site AC39** - The Green Belt review concluded that General Area DAR3 was moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes and resultant parcel DAR3a is contained by the existing built up area to the north, a wooded area to the west and Netherwood Road/Pitt Street to the south. Site AC39 is a smaller portion of DAR3a and its capacity reflects access constraints. When viewed from Pitt Street, development would relate closely to the built up area and would be contained by a defined field boundary to the west. The designation of part of the remaining parcel for green space reflects its use as allotments. The rest of the area is identified as safeguarded land (AC41) to meet longer term development needs, subject to consideration of access issues.

209. In order to ensure that the plan will be effective and is consistent with national policy, development should not take place on those parts of site AC39 within flood zones 2 and 3 and **MM67** is required to clarify that within the site policy. Having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove this site from the Green Belt.

**Royston**

210. **Site H11** – part of the site has planning permission. So that the allocation is deliverable, **MM66** is required to reflect the dwelling capacity of the remaining undeveloped area and clarify the development requirements which include provision of a primary school, the site for which will be determined through a planning application. Modification of the Policies Map to delete the area identified for the primary school and incorporate it within the site area and to show the site as a mixed use site has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 5).

**Additional housing sites**

211. The SA Site Assessment Addendum of the additional sites has been criticised in representations with particular reference to the significant positive effect attributed to Objective SP4 (Housing) and minor positive effect for Objective SP8 (Community). Although supported by relevant technical evidence, the assessments involve planning judgement. Reasonable conclusions have been reached and the SA acknowledges where residual minor negative effects exist including in relation to the delivery of objective EP16 (landscape character) and that each of the sites generate at least one minor negative effect on the SA objectives. The effects identified in the SA have resulted in specific mitigation measures being incorporated within the site policies and the SA work undertaken to inform the identification of additional sites is adequate. HRA of the additional sites was also undertaken and the findings for site EC8 are reported below.

**Urban Barnsley**

212. **Site 460** – This is a brownfield site within a sustainable location in Urban Barnsley and occupied by a former hospital and could accommodate approximately 74 dwellings. This additional site is necessary to ensure that
the plan has been positively prepared and MM42 is required to allocate the site and include appropriate measures to retain existing vegetation and safeguard the setting of nearby designated heritage assets. Modification of the Policies Map to show this change has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 35).

213. Site UB16 – The site is proposed to be deleted as an employment site in MM19. It is close to existing services and facilities and public transport corridors and would therefore be a sustainable location for new housing. It would make use of under used land and the submission of an outline planning application for 230 dwellings demonstrates a good prospect for delivery.

214. In order that the plan has been positively prepared and is consistent with national policy, MM34 is necessary to allocate the site for housing instead of employment, delete the first bullet of site policy UB16 which is no longer relevant and ensure reference is made to safeguarding nearby designated heritage assets. Modification of the Policies Map to show these changes has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 57). The indicative site yield reflects the current planning application and having regard to site constraints and necessary mitigation, there is no justification to increase the indicative yield to approximately 300 dwellings.

**Cudworth**

215. Site EC3 - The site was within the Green Belt on the submitted Policies Map. It is within a resultant parcel (CUD11a) within General Area CUD11 which was found to be moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes in the Green Belt review. The disused railway line would form a strong and defensible boundary to the east and north which would assist in preventing encroachment of the built up area of Shafton into the more open and undulating countryside to the north. The site could be developed in conjunction with the adjoining site H22 and relates closely to the built up area of Shafton. Having regard to my conclusions in relation to Issue 4, exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to alter the Green Belt boundary to remove the site from the Green Belt. The existing allotments would be retained and designated as green space. The yield of site H22 should be reduced to reflect infrastructure constraints including pylons which run across the site.

216. Allocation of this additional site is necessary to ensure that the plan has been positively prepared and MM43 is required to allocate and incorporate site EC3 within site H22 and include appropriate measures to retain existing vegetation and features. The identification of the remainder of CUD11a as safeguarded land (EC4) to meet longer term development needs is justified and would be achieved through MM112. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 37).

**Hoyland**

217. Site EC5 – The site was proposed as safeguarded land in the submitted plan (SAF7). It is a resultant parcel (HN4a) within General Area HN4 which was found to be moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes in the Green Belt review. The A635 Sheffield Road and disused tip to the south would create a strong and permanent boundary to the Green Belt to prevent any further encroachment of the built up area of Hoyland to the south and west.
218. The identification of the remainder of parcel HN4a as green space and safeguarded land is justified based on its existing function and the need to meet longer term development needs. Having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove the site from the Green Belt. **MM62** is necessary to allocate site EC5 and ensure that the plan has been positively prepared. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 38).

219. **Site H79** – The site was proposed to be removed from the Green Belt for safeguarded land (H79) in the submitted plan. It falls within a resultant parcel (HN8a) within General Area HN8 which was found to be moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes in the Green Belt Review. The A6195 Dearne Valley Parkway and Wood Walk would form strong and permanent boundaries to the Green Belt preventing encroachment into the countryside beyond and maintaining the separation between Hoyland and Jump. Having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove the site from the Green Belt.

220. Allocation of this additional site is necessary to ensure that the plan has been positively prepared and **MM60** is necessary. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 26).

**Oxspring**

221. **Site EC8** could accommodate approximately 22 dwellings which would be seen in conjunction with existing development to the north. Although it is partly occupied by existing buildings and woodland/vegetation and unlikely to be attractive as winter feeding ground for Golden Plover, due to its location within the within the SPA/SAC buffer zone further surveys would be required as part of any planning application. Representations indicate that the existing buildings could be of historic interest but this would be addressed through the assessment of any planning application against Policy HE1. Subject to securing satisfactory mitigation in relation to trees, biodiversity and archaeology as set out in the site policy, I consider that this additional site allocation is soundly based and would be achieved through **MM68**. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 40).

**Great Houghton**

222. **Site EC10** - The site forms part of a larger area allocated as safeguarded land in the submitted plan (SAF20) and could accommodate approximately 67 dwellings which would be viewed in conjunction with existing development to the west and south. The Highway Authority is satisfied that a satisfactory access could be provided off the High Street and a transport assessment accompanying a planning application would address impacts on the local highway network. Subject to the retention of the existing hedge on the northern boundary and securing the necessary mitigation as set out in the site policy, I consider that this additional site allocation is soundly based and would be achieved through **MM69**. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 43). The housing trajectory includes sufficient sites to meet the housing requirement and there is no justification for an increase in the allocated area.
Thurgoland

223. **Site SAF22** – The site could accommodate approximately 19 dwellings and is the subject of a current outline planning application indicating reasonable prospects for delivery. Although concerns have been expressed about access off the A629, there is nothing in the evidence to suggest that a satisfactory and safe access could not be achieved. Allocation of this additional site is necessary to ensure that the plan has been positively prepared and **MM71** is required. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 49).

224. **Site EC12** – The site forms part of an area of safeguarded land in the UDP. Although further away from the village ‘core’, development on this site would be viewed in conjunction with the existing development on Cote Lane. It could accommodate approximately 22 dwellings. Allocation of this additional site is necessary to ensure that the plan has been positively prepared and **MM70** is required. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 45).

225. Site SAF22 is also safeguarded land in the UDP and I acknowledge the representations about the timing of the planning application for the site in relation to the plan examination. However, it has been made in the context of the current housing land supply and the policies in the CS, matters which have been the subject of further assessment during the course of the examination. The Council has a statutory duty to process duly made planning applications. Based on the evidence before me, the site allocation is soundly based.

Tankersley

226. **Site 476** - The site comprises previously developed land occupied by a former office building and associated areas of hard surfacing. It is well located in relation to the facilities and services in Tankersley and adjoining an existing housing development and I consider that its allocation for approximately 26 dwellings would be soundly based. Allocation of this additional site is necessary to ensure that the plan has been positively prepared and **MM72** is required. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 46).

Broomhill

227. **Site EC13** is located between the frontage development along Everill Gate Lane and Highgate and relates closely to the existing built up area. The retention of the existing pond and wetland habitat on the site is an important requirement and has been identified in the site policy. Allocation of this additional site is necessary to ensure that the plan has been positively prepared and **MM73** is required. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 47).

Brierley

228. **Site 957** is located to the south of new development in the grounds of Brierley Hall and within Brierley Conservation Area. An appropriate reduction to the site yield has been made to account for the presence of veteran trees and
boundary hedges. Development of the site would result in the loss of green space albeit that there is no public access to the site and contributions towards new facilities to mitigate that loss would be sought through Policy GS1. Allocation of this additional site is necessary to ensure that the plan has been positively prepared and MM74 is required. Modification of the Policies Map has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 48).

Additional sites not taken forward

229. Following the Stage 4 hearings, I concluded that four of the additional housing sites proposed by the Council would not be soundly based and should not be taken forward as MMs. However, in the interests of fairness I sought views on that position as part of the MMs consultation.

230. The Council’s decision not to proceed with site EC6 at Oxspring prior to the Stage 4 hearings due to the potential for harm to the significance of Willow Bridge, Packhorse Bridge as a designated heritage asset is justified and the site should remain within the Green Belt.

231. Development on Site EC9 at Cawthorne would be harmful to the distinctive linear form of the village, extending the built up area into the open countryside to the north. The absence of any features on the northern boundary of the site would create a stark and harsh edge to the built up area which would be harmful to its existing form and character. For these reasons the proposed allocation for housing would not be soundly based. The site will remain as safeguarded land and any future development would be considered as part of a plan review.

232. Site EC11 at Silkstone Common is a resultant parcel (SC2a) within a General Area (SC2) identified as moderately fulfilling Green Belt purposes in the Green Belt review. It is argued that the landscape has greater capacity for change than identified in the Barnsley Landscape Character Assessment (2016) and that the Transpennine Trail creates a high degree of containment.

233. When viewed from Moorend Lane, the allotments and development to the west of the lane to Moorend Houses provide a clear demarcation between the built up area and the countryside to the east which contributes to the rural setting of the village. The loss of the undeveloped gap which forms a transition between the main built up area of the village and the more dispersed development within the open countryside to the south of the Transpennine Trail would be harmful to the existing compact form and character of the village.

234. Notwithstanding that a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary could be maintained, there would be harm to character and appearance at a site level and the exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt for housing have not been demonstrated. The site will remain within the Green Belt.

235. Site EC1 at Staincross is part of a larger area proposed to be released from the Green Belt for safeguarded land (SAF5) in the submitted plan and was proposed as an additional site for 669 dwellings. In the absence of a Transport Assessment, the cumulative effect of additional traffic from this and nearby development sites at Royston and Mapplewell on the highway network
is uncertain and secondary school capacity at Darton College would also need to be addressed. In short, the capacity of local infrastructure to support the scale of development proposed has not been adequately detailed, together with the specific requirements to mitigate its impact. The exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt for housing have not been demonstrated.

236. Whilst representors consider that the site should remain within the Green Belt and should not be identified as safeguarded land, it forms part of a resultant parcel (MWP2a). It is adjacent to the existing built up area and in a sustainable location to meet longer term development needs. In accordance with Policy GB6 as proposed to be modified by MM113, any future development would be assessed through a plan review which would address matters including the impact of development on landscape character, settlement pattern and infrastructure capacity. The identification of the site as safeguarded land is justified.

Other Safeguarded land

237. SAF6 forms part of resultant parcel UB3a in the Green Belt review and I concur with its findings that Cawthorne Lane and the M1 would create a permanent and durable boundary to prevent further encroachment of the built up area to the north and west. AC33 is part of resultant parcel HN6a and Hay Green Lane would redefine a permanent and defensible Green Belt boundary to the north of Hoyland.

238. AC42 in Wombwell forms part of resultant parcel WOM2a which relates closely to the existing built up area of Wombwell and would be defined by the railway line to the west and Summer Lane and would assist in maintaining the separation between Wombwell and Urban Barnsley. H85 is resultant parcel WOM5a and is located to the south of the A6195 Dearne Valley Parkway which would provide a strong and durable boundary to maintain the separation between Hemingfield and Wombwell. Having regard to my conclusions in Issue 4, exceptional circumstances exist to remove these sites from the Green Belt for additional safeguarded land.

Conclusion on Issue 5

239. The plan’s site allocations are based on a logical and appropriate set of criteria and assessment methodology, SA and HRA. Subject to the MMs, the employment, mixed use and housing allocations are soundly based. Where necessary, exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify alterations to the Green Belt boundary and the removal of land from the Green Belt to meet the objectively assessed need for employment, housing and identify areas of safeguarded land.

Issue 6 – Will a 5 year supply of deliverable sites be available on adoption and are there reasonable prospects that this can be maintained over the plan period?

240. The housing requirement figure as proposed to be modified by MM31 is 21,546 or 1134 dwellings per year. This represents a step change from previous rates of delivery in Barnsley. These have varied considerably over the period 2006/07 to 2016/17, from 556 per year in 2009/10 to 1140 in
2007/08 with an average of 796 per year over that period. However, 1000 dwellings were expected to be completed in 2017/18 and an up-to-date plan will provide a positive framework to support delivery on a wider range of sites.

241. The revised housing trajectory for the MMs consultation (MC9) indicates that completions, current commitments and the site allocations would provide approximately 21,772 dwellings during the plan period. Whilst the ‘headroom’ between the requirement and total supply is limited, I consider that there are sufficient ‘contingencies’ to ensure that delivery will not be put at risk.

242. The trajectory includes 566 completions on windfall sites within the supply for the first five years and a further 200 completions within villages over the entire plan period. This represents a cautious approach having regard to evidence in the SHELAA that windfalls contributed an average of 142 dwellings per year from 2006 – 2016 or 15% of total completions. The greater certainty afforded by allocated sites in an up to date plan could mean that there is less incentive to bring forward windfall site, but Policies H5 and H6 will support development on specified unallocated sites, including in villages.

243. The Council has robust monitoring arrangements in place and takes a proactive and partnership approach to addressing the barriers to stalled sites. Housing delivery will be carefully monitored and if necessary the plan may need to be reviewed to ensure that housing need to 2033 is delivered. Whilst some representors consider that additional sites should be allocated to bolster supply particularly in stronger market areas, that would be likely to require the deletion of further land from the Green Belt and further delay to plan adoption.

244. Turning to the five year requirement, from 2008 to 2014 against a CS requirement of 7170, 4640 dwellings were delivered. This represents persistent under delivery and in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF a 20% buffer should be applied to the five year housing requirement figure. The shortfall in delivery since the start of the plan period (2014 – 2018) is 1352 dwellings. The Council’s preferred approach has been to deal with shortfall within the first five years from adoption - the Sedgefield method. Applying the necessary 20% buffer, the five year requirement from 2018/19 to 2022/23 would be 8425 dwellings or 1685 per year. Based on past rates of delivery, this is neither realistic nor sustainable.

245. The ‘Liverpool’ approach in which past shortfall is addressed over the plan period is not ruled out by the PPG and I consider that the approach is justified for two main reasons. Firstly, some housing delivery depends on larger mixed use sites with longer lead in times for delivery. Secondly, the shortfall in delivery has not translated to acute problems of affordability, suggesting that there is no significant ‘pent up’ demand that needs to be addressed in the short term. Based on the Liverpool approach, the five year requirement would be 7345 dwellings or 1469 per year.

246. Sites with planning permission will contribute to housing land supply and they have been identified in the trajectory. In terms of the contribution of small sites (9 units or less) to the five year supply, an appropriate reduction has been made to reflect non implementation rates based on evidence in the Five
Year Deliverable Housing Land Supply report. The contribution of large sites (10 or more dwellings) to the five year supply has been assessed on a case by case basis.

247. During the examination the Council reviewed and revised the sites within the trajectory in response to representations. Whilst some representors maintain that the trajectory is still unrealistic, it reflects more realistic lead in times, start dates and rates of delivery. It is also based on the Council’s discussions with representors, developers and landowners.

248. Assessing the precise level of 5 year supply and anticipated rates of delivery is not an exact science. It involves making assumptions about a large number of sites and various factors including likely start rates and annual rates of building which could be subject to change. In broad terms I am satisfied that most of the sites that the Council has identified within the five year supply from 2018/19 to 2022/23 have a realistic prospect of being delivered over the next 5 years. Additional sites are not required to meet the housing requirement.

249. The updated trajectory (MC9) indicates a current supply of 7522 dwellings in the relevant five year period. Based on the Liverpool approach, on adoption of the plan there would be a deliverable supply exceeding the five year requirement. MM126 is necessary to replace the submitted plan’s housing trajectory with the most up-to-date position. As explained in Issue 10, this will be supported by the detailed trajectory published in the Annual Monitoring Report and the Five Year Deliverable Housing Land Supply report.

Conclusion on Issue 6

250. In conclusion and subject to the above MM, there is a reasonable prospect that on adoption of the plan there will be a supply of deliverable housing land exceeding the five year requirement and that this situation will be maintained throughout the plan period.

Issue 7 – Will the plan contribute to the vitality and viability of Barnsley town centre and the District and Local Centres and are the relevant policies positively prepared, justified and effective?

251. The town centre and retail policies are informed by a Town Centre Regeneration Plan (2016) and the Barnsley Town Centre Retail Study (2014) which concludes that following the completion of the ‘The Glassworks’ site there is some limited capacity for new convenience floorspace but little for comparison floorspace.

252. Consistent with the NPPF, Policy TC1 directs new retail and town centre development to the town centre and the six District Centres serving the Principal Towns. Smaller Local Centres will be the focus for shops and services serving more localised catchments. This is a soundly based and sustainable approach, focusing retail and other town centre development to support the vitality and viability of existing locations that are served by public transport and with the potential for the redevelopment of previously developed land.
253. Also consistent with the NPPF, Policy TC1 requires that proposals for new retail and town centre uses outside the catchment areas of the identified centres will be subject to the sequential approach set out in national policy. An impact test will also be required for proposals above the size thresholds specified in Policy TC3 where they are located outside the town centre and District Centre Primary Shopping Areas and outside the Local Centre catchment areas. The thresholds in Policy TC3 are justified by the findings of the Smaller Centres Study and Addendum (2010 and 2011). For clarity and effectiveness, MM92 is necessary to confirm how Policy TC3 will be applied to town centre proposals and to expand its supporting text to provide more guidance to plan users.

254. The extent of the primary and secondary shopping frontages identified in the town centre and District Centres is justified based on the findings of the Barnsley Town Centre Study (2014) and the Smaller Centres Study. However, Policy TC2 is unclear in its approach - whilst on the face of it supporting a concentration of retail (A1) uses within primary shopping frontages, it also indicates that A2 – A5 uses will be acceptable. MM91 is required to ensure greater clarity in terms of the operation of various aspects of Policy TC2, including that A1 uses remain the predominant use at ground floor within the primary shopping frontages.

255. Policy TC4 applies to proposals for new development at the two existing retail warehouse parks at Stairfoot, Wombwell Lane and the Peel Centre. Both are in out of centre locations where Policy TC1 would trigger the sequential approach to assessing proposals for main town centre uses. This is justified to safeguard the vitality and viability of the town centre and District Centres. Consents have been granted to relax planning conditions which restricted the range of goods sold from some units, resulting in a wider range of goods than just bulky goods being sold at both retail parks. Consequently, MM93 is necessary to set out how such proposals would be assessed and to clarify the minimum size of any new units permitted.

256. Notwithstanding the Peel Centre’s proximity to the town centre, there is no justification to identify it as the most sequentially preferable out of centre location for new retail and other related development. Based on the findings of the Barnsley Town Centre Retail Study, the extension of the Peel Centre onto adjoining land is also not justified.

257. Small local shops have an important role in meeting daily needs and could include a wider range of retail uses than just ‘convenience’ shops as currently referred to in Policy TC5. So that the plan is justified and will be effective, MM94 is necessary to remove the reference to ‘convenience’, to clarify that proposals for small local shops should relate to meeting daily shopping needs and to outline the position in relation to the sequential approach.

The town centre

258. Policy BTC2 seeks to focus late night uses within the Wellington Street/Peel Street/Market Hill and Graham’s Orchard area within the town centre. As submitted, the wording of the policy is ambiguous and in the interests of clarity and effectiveness, MM95 is required to ensure that Policy BTC2 is clear and will be effective.
259. ‘The Glassworks’ site includes redevelopment of Barnsley market, a new library/community, retail and leisure facilities and public realm improvements. Nine District areas are identified within the town centre with specific policies for their future development. As submitted, the negatively worded format of Policies BTC12, BTC14, BTC15 and BTC23 does not represent a positive approach to bringing forward proposals in the District areas. MM96, MM97, MM98 and MM104 are necessary to ensure that these policies have been positively prepared.

260. Policy BTC12 is unnecessarily restrictive in relation to residential uses at ground floor within the Markets District area. So that the policy has been positively prepared, MM96 is necessary and will ensure that the potential for residential uses is captured within Policy BTC12, subject to consideration of the vitality and viability of the town centre.

261. As worded, Policies BTC19, BTC20 and BTC22 are also inconsistent with the statutory test to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas and MM100, MM101 and MM103 rectify this. As submitted, Policy BTC21 duplicates national policy and MM102 is required to secure the deletion of the superfluous text.

262. Within the District areas, four development sites are identified for a variety of town centre uses. Whilst the respective site policies have generally been positively prepared, food and drink uses could be accommodated on Development Site 2 to reflect recent permissions on part of the site and MM99 is necessary to ensure that Policy BTC16 is sound in this regard.

263. So that the plan has been positively prepared, MM101 is also necessary to reflect the potential for a wider range of food and drink uses within The Lanes District area. I have amended MM101 so that Policy BTC20 refers to ‘food and drink’ for consistency with other site policies. To ensure that Policy BTC24 which deals with Development Site 4 is positively worded and soundly based, MM105 is necessary.

Conclusion on Issue 7

264. Subject to the proposed MMs, the plan’s retail and other policies for Barnsley town centre and the District and Local Centres represent a positively prepared strategy which will contribute to their vitality and viability.

Issue 8 - Does the plan set out a soundly based strategy to safeguard and enhance landscape character, the natural and built environment and reduce the causes of climate change?

265. The Barnsley Landscape Character Assessment assesses the Borough’s distinctive landscape character based on the National Character Areas produced by Natural England. Whilst it has been criticised in representations, I have no reason to dispute the accuracy of its assessment. Many of the allocated sites are beyond existing built up areas and will result in a degree of landscape harm. The site selection process considered the sensitivity and capacity of the landscape for change based on the Landscape Character Assessment and Policy LC1 will be used to assess the impact of development proposals on landscape character and the requirement for sensitive layouts and landscaping.
266. Policy LC1 and its supporting text set out how proposals close to the National Park boundary will be assessed. So that the policy includes reference to the National Park’s special qualities and to ensure that cross boundary liaison will be effective, **MM107** is necessary.

267. Consistent with the NPPF’s stance on good design, Policy D1 sets out the requirements for new development. However, as submitted the policy does not refer to the Borough’s distinctive landscape character which makes an important contribution to the setting of settlements in the plan area, nor does it refer to the need for inclusive design as required by paragraph 57 of the NPPF. In addition, the requirement to complement and enhance the character of distinctive areas should apply to all parts of the plan area, not just the specific locations currently listed in Policy D1. As submitted, Policy D1 is unsound and **MM90** secures changes to the policy and its supporting text to ensure that it is positively prepared, consistent with national policy, effective and that due regard has been paid to the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty.

268. Informed by the Council’s Greenspace Register, the Policies Map identifies greenspace and requirements for additional green space will be assessed against Policy GS1. So that Policy GS1 has been positively prepared, the requirement for equivalent or better provision in cases where the loss of greenspace is justified should be strengthened and the process for assessing the quality and value of existing greenspace should be made clear. For effectiveness, Policy GS1 should indicate how the amount of open space needed for new development will be assessed and **MM106** achieves that. Temporary buildings are permitted on playing fields under Policy GD2 and **MM12** will ensure that any loss of greenspace is addressed.

269. The plan recognises the important role of the Barnsley and Dearne and Dove Canals in contributing to the green infrastructure network. The sections which are in water, have a green infrastructure function or where the towpath has been retained are safeguarded from other forms of development in accordance with Policy GI2. Feasibility studies for a connection from the River Calder to the River Don date from 2006 and I have not been presented with any up to date evidence of progress including funding. Policy GI2 would not preclude the reinstatement of sections of the canal should such a proposal come forward. Overall, I conclude that the approach in Policy GI2 is justified.

270. New development proposed in the plan will increase greenhouse gas emissions and it has been argued that the plan will exacerbate climate change and air pollution through increased greenhouse gas emissions generated by new development and associated traffic. Policy CC1 sets out an overarching approach to reducing the causes of and adapting to the impact of climate change, but as submitted is unsound in indicating that such measures will be subject to considerations of viability, which is a matter that should be assessed in relation to the effects of the plan’s policies as a whole. The policy also includes reference to sustainable design and construction techniques which would be more effective as a standalone policy.

271. **MM116** is necessary to ensure that Policy CC1 sets out a robust approach to tackling climate change and is consistent with national policy. Its approach to ‘give preference to the development of previously developed land in
sustainable locations’ is consistent with the approach to larger windfall sites as set out in Policy H6 as proposed to be modified in MM76. For effectiveness and consistency with national policy, MM117 and MM118 are necessary to introduce a new ‘standalone’ policy (CC2) dealing with sustainable design and construction and outlining how proposals will be assessed in moving towards a low carbon future as envisaged in paragraph 95 of the NPPF.

272. Barnsley has six AQMAs within the Borough. The Council’s Air Quality Action Plan was recently revised (2017) and contains actions to reduce exhaust emissions and improve air quality. Modal shift away from the car will be sought through practical measures including cycling and walking campaigns and the requirement for Travel Plans which will be sought through a Sustainable Travel SPD.

273. Policy REAC1 deals with onshore wind proposals and indicative Areas of Search for Wind Turbines are identified on the Policies Map. Precise boundaries would be identified in a future SPD. Whilst the policy has been prepared having regard to the ‘South Pennines Wind Energy Landscape Study’, that document pre-dates the Written Ministerial Statement of 18 June 2015 (WMS) and the PPG which set out the specific circumstances in which proposals for wind turbines may be permitted. In addition, it is not clear how proposals for wind turbines outside the Areas of Search as shown on the Policies Map would be assessed. Having regard to the likelihood that the SPD would reduce the geographical extent of the Areas of Search, it would in effect be establishing policy rather than building upon and providing more detailed guidance on the adopted LP policies. This would also be contrary to the guidance in the PPG. The approach to onshore wind proposals as set out in Policy RE AC1 does not meet the requirements set out in the WMS and PPG and is unsound.

274. For consistency with national policy, MM121 is necessary to delete Policy REAC1 and its supporting text from the plan. Modification of the Policies Map to remove Inset Map 6 has been prepared and consulted on by the Council. Additional supporting text would be necessary to explain that proposals for wind turbines will be considered against the PPG and WMS.

275. Policy RE1 sets out the general principles that will apply to low carbon and renewable energy developments but as submitted includes reference to wind turbines. In order that it is consistent with national policy, MM120 is necessary to delete the reference to wind turbines within the policy and supporting text and make clear that such proposals will be considered against the PPG and WMS. It is unclear how ‘significant’ harm referenced in Policy RE1 would be defined and MM120 is required to remove this reference and re-word the policy so that it is clear and will be effective.

276. The wording of Policy CC3 implies that a development would have to be at unacceptable risk of flooding from all sources before a decision would be made not to permit it. In the interests of clarity and effectiveness, MM119 is necessary to replace ‘all’ with ‘any’. So that it is consistent with national policy, Policy CC3 should set out the specific types of development that will be allowed in Flood Zone 3b and MM119 secures the necessary change.
277. Whilst it does not include reference to the approach of ‘biodiversity net gain’, Policy BIO1 seeks to maximise biodiversity in conjunction with new development and the Council intends to produce an SPD outlining how this will be secured. The plan’s objectives include securing net gains for biodiversity and allocated sites have been subject to robust ecological assessments. Where necessary and justified, measures to conserve and enhance biodiversity have been incorporated into the site policies. My conclusion is that the lack of reference to a ‘biodiversity net gain’ approach within Policy BIO1 does not make the plan unsound.

278. The approach in Policy MIN1 indicating that proposals for the exploration and production of shale gas via hydraulic fracturing will ‘generally be supported’ is inconsistent with national policy as set out in the WMS of 17 May 2018 which indicates that local planning authorities should ‘give great weight to the benefits of mineral extraction including to the economy’. The plan is being assessed in accordance with the 2012 NPPF and in that context, MM122 is necessary to make clear how proposals for the exploration, appraisal and production of shale gas will be assessed, having regard to relevant policies in the plan and national policy. MM122 will also secure flexibility for stone extraction for repairs to heritage assets. Modification of the Policies Map to show the petroleum exploration and development licences has been prepared and consulted on by the Council (Map Change 22).

Conclusion on Issue 8

279. Subject to the proposed MMs, I conclude that the plan provides a soundly based approach to safeguard and enhance landscape character, the natural and built environment and to reduce the causes of climate change.

Issue 9 – Does the plan make adequate provision for infrastructure including transport and would development be viable having regard to infrastructure and policy requirements?

280. Ongoing dialogue between the Council and key infrastructure providers in plan preparation is evidenced in the IDP which provides an up to date and comprehensive assessment of existing and future capacity across the key infrastructure items and services needed to support the plan’s proposals. The delivery programme makes clear the requirements including in relation to transport, education, utilities, telecommunications, flood risk and drainage, climate change and renewables, green infrastructure, leisure, sports and community facilities and health services.

281. During the examination it was confirmed that only a short section of the HS2 route would pass through the Borough to the east of Brierley with no requirement for a station and MM7 is necessary to update the Key Diagram. However, there are a number of other strategic transport initiatives underway which if supported to delivery would progress the Borough’s accessibility priorities including the South Transpennine road and rail tunnel connections, the Barnsley Rail Vision and Transport for the North Freight and Logistics Study. For effectiveness, MM89 is necessary to update initiatives relating to freight as the South Yorkshire Freight Quality Partnership no longer meets.

282. The SCR SEP identifies three key growth areas within the Borough at M1 Junctions 36 and 37 and Goldthorpe with support for infrastructure funding
through the SCRIF. The deliverability and viability of the plan depend on realistic prospects of funding being identified from a range of sources including the SCRIF. The allocation of sites at those growth areas has been part of the separate process of plan preparation and with the exception of site RSV1, I have found that the site allocations are soundly based.

283. Better connectivity, affordable and inclusive travel including walking and cycling, a cleaner environment and a healthier population are the key outcomes sought through the Barnsley Transport Strategy. The plan’s spatial strategy focuses development in locations with good access to public transport or where networks can be easily extended. The Accessibility Improvement Zone in the east of the Borough is a focus for transport investment to improve connectivity and support economic growth.

284. The Barnsley Transport Model has tested the cumulative impacts of the plan’s proposals and those in adjoining authorities on the capacity and operation of the strategic and local road network. The findings have informed more detailed modelling for specific junctions. With full plan delivery and no mitigation, congestion was focused adjacent to M1 Junction 36 and the A6195 corridor, M1 Junction 37 and the A628/A635 corridors, Dearne Valley Parkway/A635 Cathill roundabout and the A635/A633 Stairfoot roundabout. More localised improvements have been identified in the IDP. In the interests of effectiveness, **MM89** is necessary to update the references to strategic highway routes in the plan.

285. Effective liaison with Highways England and adjoining local highway authorities has occurred through the DtC. Improvements to M1 Junctions 36 and 37 have been completed and supported by SCRIF funding. Further investigation of capacity and the need for mitigation measures on the highway network will be required through Policies T3 and T4 which require the submission of transport assessments and necessary highway improvements in conjunction with planning applications. So that Policy T3 is consistent with national policy and will be effective, **MM86** is necessary to remove references to maximum parking standards, refer to cross boundary matters and to remove references to extant national guidance. I have amended **MM86** to replace references to ‘liaison’ with ‘impacts’ in response to representations. **MM87** and **MM88** will ensure that safe and convenient highway access is provided for all users in conjunction with new development.

286. Additional primary and secondary school places will be needed to support housing growth in the plan period. Specific requirements for four new primary schools are identified in the site policies. Secondary school premises in the Borough have already undergone significant change through the Building Schools for the Future Programme and additional provision will be funded through developer contributions sought through Policy I1. To ensure effective provision of community facilities as part of Policy I2 and make clear what they include, **MM124** is necessary.

287. The Barnsley Hospital Foundation Trust indicates that the plan’s proposals will impact on acute services and necessitate an expansion of service provision. This will be considered as part of the Hospital Services Review which is ongoing.
288. The IDP delivery programme is an important implementation mechanism for new and improved infrastructure and in the interests of effectiveness it should be included within the plan for which MM125 is necessary.

Plan viability

289. The plan has been informed by a Viability Study prepared to inform the Council’s approach to the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The Council’s decision on whether or not to adopt CIL will be taken having regard to the results of a national level review and following the preparation of SPDs detailing various requirements to support plan implementation. In the interim, developer contributions will continue to be sought in accordance with Policy I1. For clarity and flexibility, MM123 is necessary to replace references to CIL with ‘infrastructure funding’ in the supporting text to Policy I1 pending future arrangements.

290. The Local Plan Viability Study provides a ‘high level’ overview of all development types that are likely to come forward in the plan period together with an assessment of the plan’s policy requirements. It concluded that almost all of the employment allocations were viable. A cluster of sites which are more marginal are subject to SCRIF funding. Viability has also informed the site selection process for employment sites as one of the criteria used in the scoring process.

291. The viability of housing sites is primarily affected by their distribution within different housing sub-markets across the Borough which is also reflected in the different requirements for affordable housing set out in Policy H8. The policy is sufficiently flexible to deal with circumstances where viability is more marginal.

Conclusion on Issue 9

292. Subject to the MMs outlined, the plan is based on a robust assessment of the necessary infrastructure requirements and there is a realistic prospect that they can be delivered over the plan period and that policy requirements can be supported.

Issue 10 – Are the arrangements for monitoring and delivery robust and will the plan be flexible to respond to changing circumstances?

293. The plan includes a monitoring framework that will provide an effective means of monitoring plan implementation and policy outcomes and will be reported through the Annual Monitoring Report. The housing trajectory graph in Appendix 2 of the plan is supported by a more detailed trajectory table of sites that has been updated during the examination to reflect updated lead in times and delivery rates. This will be published and monitored through the Annual Monitoring Report and the ‘Barnsley Five Year Deliverable Housing Land Supply Report’ published annually.

294. The plan does not contain any commitment to an early review. Having regard to the requirement in the PPG that plans should be reviewed every five years, I do not consider that a specific policy is necessary. The monitoring processes set out above will provide an effective mechanism to assess whether the plan is meeting its objectives and intended outcomes.
Conclusion on Issue 10

295. The monitoring framework and arrangements will provide an effective means of assessing whether or not the implementation of plan policies is delivering the plan’s vision and objectives.

Public Sector Equality Duty

296. In conducting the examination, I have had due regard to the aims expressed in Section 149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. This includes consideration of matters including the accommodation needs of gypsies and travellers and the need for accessible design.

Assessment of Legal Compliance

297. For the reasons set out in Issue 8, I am satisfied that the plan complies with Section 19(1A) of the 2004 Act which requires that development plan documents (taken as a whole) must include policies to ensure that the development and use of land contributes to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change.

298. My examination of the compliance of the plan with the legal requirements is summarised in the table below. Subject to MM3 and MM127 which would secure compliance with Regulation 8(5) of the 2012 Regulations, I conclude that the plan meets them all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGAL REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Development Scheme (LDS)</td>
<td>The Local Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Council’s LDS (including the latest version adopted in June 2017). Although the adoption date will be later than anticipated (Spring 2018), the delay is not significant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and relevant regulations</td>
<td>The SCI was adopted in September 2015. Consultation on the Local Plan and the MMs has complied with its requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Appraisal (SA)</td>
<td>SA has been carried out and is adequate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)</td>
<td>The Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report sets out that the plan may have some likely significant effects. A full HRA including appropriate assessment was undertaken to accompany the submission plan in December 2016 together with an HRA Addendum in January 2018. On submission of the plan, Natural England support this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Policy</td>
<td>The Local Plan complies with national policy except where indicated and MMs are recommended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Act (as amended) and 2012 Regulations.</td>
<td>The Local Plan complies with the Act and subject to MM3 and MM127 complies with the Regulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

299. The Plan has a number of deficiencies in respect of soundness and one in respect of legal compliance for the reasons set out above, which means that I recommend non-adoption of it as submitted, in accordance with Section 20(7A) of the 2004 Act. These deficiencies have been explored in the main issues set out above.

300. The Council has requested that I recommend MM to make the Plan sound and legally compliant and capable of adoption. I conclude that with the recommended MM set out in the Appendix the Barnsley Local Plan satisfies the requirements of Section 20(5) of the 2004 Act and meets the criteria for soundness in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR

This report is accompanied by an Appendix containing the Main Modifications.
## Schedule of Main Modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM 1                        | Foreword paragraph 1.7         | The Local Plan objectives seek to improve the economic prosperity and quality of life for all its residents and those who work here. The Local Plan will have 3 key roles in accordance with the Government's Framework (NPPF 2012) namely economic, social and environmental, and will deliver sustainable development. In order to support Barnsley’s ambitions and vision the Local Plan objectives are:  
- Provide opportunities for the creation of new jobs and protection of existing jobs  
- Improve the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure  
- Widen the choice of high quality homes  
- Improve the design of development  
- Achieve net gains in biodiversity | The Local Plan objectives seek to improve the economic prosperity and quality of life for all its residents and those who work here. The Local Plan will have 3 key roles in accordance with the Government's Framework (NPPF 2012) namely economic, social and environmental, and will deliver sustainable development. In order to support Barnsley's ambitions and vision the Local Plan objectives are:  
- Provide opportunities for the creation of new jobs and protection of existing jobs  
- Improve the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure  
- Widen the choice of high quality homes  
- Improve the design of development  
- **Protect and enhance Barnsley’s environmental assets and** achieve net gains in biodiversity |
| MM 2                        | Vision and Objectives          | 2.1 There is clear intention to enhance Barnsley as a location to do business and a place that will improve the quality of life for residents.  
“Working together for a brighter future, a better Barnsley.”  
2.2 To achieve this Barnsley’s Local Plan will provide the spatial framework within which we can deliver substantial and sustainable economic growth for the borough, as well as Leeds and Sheffield City Regions and the Northern Powerhouse, that also respects the needs of local communities. The Local Plan objectives seek to improve the economic prosperity and quality of life for all its residents and those who work here. In order to support Barnsley’s ambitions and vision the Local Plan objectives are:  
- Provide opportunities for the creation of new jobs and protection of existing jobs  
- Improve the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure  
- Widen the choice of high quality homes  
- Improve the design of development  
- Achieve net gains in biodiversity  
2.3 To be achieved by:  
- Providing the opportunity to grow the economy by 33,000 jobs, including 17,500 additional jobs over the next 20 years  
- Encouraging significant inward investment to generate this additional employment  
- Providing the space to allow existing businesses to grow  
- Creating a vibrant and attractive Town Centre  
- Enabling the delivery of at least 20,330 homes that provide housing for all, including affordable housing, and maintaining at least a rolling 5 year deliverable supply of new housing  
- Enabling the provision of critical infrastructure to support sustainable communities | 2.1 There is clear intention to enhance Barnsley as a location to do business and a place that will improve the quality of life for residents.  
“Working together for a brighter future, a better Barnsley.”  
2.2 To achieve this Barnsley’s Local Plan will provide the spatial framework within which we can deliver substantial and sustainable economic growth for the borough, as well as Leeds and Sheffield City Regions and the Northern Powerhouse, that also respects the needs of local communities. The Local Plan objectives seek to improve the economic prosperity and quality of life for all its residents and those who work here. In order to support Barnsley's ambitions and vision the Local Plan objectives are:  
- Provide opportunities for the creation of new jobs and protection of existing jobs  
- Improve the conditions in which people live, work, travel and take leisure  
- Widen the choice of high quality homes  
- Improve the design of development  
- **Protect and enhance Barnsley’s environmental assets and** achieve net gains in biodiversity  
2.3 To be achieved by:  
- Providing the opportunity to grow the economy by **33,000 28,840** jobs  
- Encouraging significant inward investment to generate this additional employment  
- Providing the space to allow existing businesses to grow  
- Creating a vibrant and attractive Town Centre  
- Enabling the delivery of at least **20,330 21,546** homes that provide housing for all, including affordable housing, and maintaining at least a rolling 5 year deliverable supply of new housing  
- Enabling the provision of critical infrastructure to support sustainable communities  
- Protecting and enhancing the natural, built and historic environment  
- Respecting the cultural identity and local character of Barnsley |
This hierarchy takes into account the Babtie Settlement Assessment 2003 and subsequent Jacobs update in 2007 together with the changes made through adoption of the Core Strategy in 2011. Add the following paragraph below the table:

The Policies Map shows settlement boundaries for Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns, which illustrate their geographical areas as ‘places’. These are not intended to be interpreted as defining development limits as in some cases there are areas of Green belt between localities. For villages the extent of the settlement will be a matter of interpretation on a case by case basis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM 5      | Spatial Strategy
Paragraph 5.44                  | The Elsecar Heritage Centre is an important tourism and cultural asset in this area that the Local Plan will safeguard and promote. The Plan will also protect those areas around the Heritage Centre that contribute to the wider understanding of the early coal and ironworking industries of this part of Barnsley. | The Elsecar Heritage Centre is an important tourism and cultural asset in this area that the Local Plan will safeguard and promote. The Plan will also protect those areas around the Heritage Centre that contribute to the wider understanding of the early coal and ironworking industries of this part of Barnsley. |
| MM 6      | Paragraph 5.59 and 5.60       | 5.59 Villages are those settlements with a population below 3000. (5) They vary in size from larger villages to small hamlets but are generally characterised by a limited range of services and relatively poor public transport. Some are close to nearby towns, others are in the Green Belt. 5.60 This Local Plan does not promote significant development in these villages. Development will be supported where it is necessary for the viability of the settlement and to meet local needs. | 5.59 Villages are those settlements with a population below 3000. (5) They vary in size from larger villages to small hamlets but are generally characterised by a limited range of services and relatively poor public transport. Some are close to nearby towns, others are in the Green Belt. 5.60 This Local Plan does not promote significant development in these villages. Development will be supported where it is necessary for the viability of the settlement and to meet local needs. |
| MM 7      | Key Diagram                   | Delete reference to HS2 consultation route Add all villages to key diagram | Delete reference to HS2 consultation route Add all villages to key diagram |
| MM 8      | Policy SD1
Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Paragraph 5.61 | When considering development proposals we will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. We will work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area. Planning applications that accord with other relevant policies will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise taking into account whether: • Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or • Specific policies in that framework indicate that development should be restricted. | When considering development proposals we will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development1 contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. We will work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that proposals can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area. Planning applications that accord with other relevant policies will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise taking into account whether: • Any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole; or • Specific policies in that framework indicate that development should be restricted. 6.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which is to be seen as a ‘golden thread’ that runs through plan-making and decision taking. In respect of making planning decisions, development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay unless there are adverse impacts of granting permission that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework, taken as a whole or specific policies in that framework, indicate that development should be restricted. 1Paragraph 7 of the NPPF sets out the three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. The paragraph goes on to set out the roles that the planning system needs to perform in respect of each dimension. |
| MM 9      | Section 6
‘Policies and Proposals’
Paragraph 6.5 | The policy below will be applied to all development. This policy will be the starting point for making decisions on all proposals including those shown on the Proposals Maps as Urban Fabric (shown as light grey areas with the notation of no specific allocation). Other policies of the Local Plan and Joint Waste Plan will be applied as appropriate. | Development proposals will be assessed against all relevant policies in the Local Plan and Joint Waste Plan. The Policy GD1 below will be applied to all development. This policy will be the starting point for making decisions on all proposals including those within the areas shown on the Policies Maps as Urban Fabric (shown as light grey areas with the notation of no specific allocation). Other policies of the Local Plan and Joint Waste Plan will be applied as appropriate. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM10</td>
<td>Policy GD1 General Development</td>
<td>Proposals for development will be approved if:</td>
<td>Proposals for development will be approved if:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• there will be no significant adverse effect on the living conditions and residential amenity of existing and future residents</td>
<td>• There will be no significant adverse effect on the living conditions and residential amenity of existing and future residents;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• they are compatible with neighbouring land and will not significantly prejudice the current or future use of the neighbouring land</td>
<td>• They are compatible with neighbouring land and will not significantly prejudice the current or future use of the neighbouring land;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• they will not adversely affect the potential development of a wider area of land which could otherwise be available for development and safeguards access to adjacent land</td>
<td>• They will not adversely affect the potential development of a wider area of land which could otherwise be available for development and safeguards access to adjacent land;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• they include landscaping to provide a high quality setting for buildings, incorporating existing landscape features and ensuring that plant species and the way they are planted, hard surfaces, boundary treatments and other features appropriately reflect, protect and improve the character of the local landscape.</td>
<td>• They include landscaping to provide a high quality setting for buildings, incorporating existing landscape features and ensuring that plant species and the way they are planted, hard surfaces, boundary treatments and other features appropriately reflect, protect and improve the character of the local landscape;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• any adverse impact on the environment, natural resources, waste and pollution is minimised and mitigated</td>
<td>• Any adverse impact on the environment, natural resources, waste and pollution is minimised and mitigated;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• adequate access and internal road layouts are provided to allow the complete development of the entire site for residential purposes, and to provide appropriate vehicular and pedestrian links throughout the site and into adjacent areas.</td>
<td>• Adequate access and internal road layouts are provided to allow the complete development of the entire site for residential purposes, and to provide appropriate vehicular and pedestrian links throughout the site and into adjacent areas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• any drains and culverts are considered</td>
<td>• Any drains and culverts and other surface water bodies that may cross the site are considered;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• appropriate landscaped boundaries are provided where sites are adjacent to open countryside.</td>
<td>• Appropriate landscaped boundaries are provided where sites are adjacent to open countryside;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• any pylons are considered in the layout</td>
<td>• Any pylons are considered in the layout;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• existing trees that are to remain on site are considered in the layout in order to avoid overshadowing</td>
<td>• Existing trees that are to remain on site are considered in the layout in order to avoid overshadowing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MM 11**

Insert new paragraph after paragraph 6.10 on Masterplan Frameworks

Where Masterplan Frameworks are being sought, they shall contain the following:

Planning policy summary, site location and description, land ownership, a summary of the existing evidence, site evaluation (opportunities and constraints), land use framework, sustainable movement framework, protection of existing public rights of way routes and their incorporation within new development layouts, vehicular movement framework, green and blue infrastructure framework, place-making framework (including design guides for character and neighbourhood areas where applicable), sustainability and energy use, health and wellbeing, design evolution, conceptual masterplan, infrastructure and delivery phasing.

Masterplan Frameworks shall be subject to public consultation and be approved by the Council prior to the determination of any planning applications on the affected sites.

Each Masterplan will be bespoke and therefore will be considered on a case by case basis.

**MM 12**

Temporary Buildings and Uses supporting text

New paragraphs after paragraph 6.14

There is an expectation that any temporary building on playing field land will need to meet policy GS1 and the playing field land be reinstated to the same or better quality once the building is removed. Also for any temporary building located on a playing field there will be measures taken to protect any glazing from projectiles including balls, emanating from the playing field.
### Barnsley’s Jobs and Business Plan 2014

#### Priority will be given to development in the following locations:

1. Urban Barnsley
2. Principal Towns of Cudworth, Wombwell, Hoyland, Goldthorpe (Dearne Towns), Penistone and Royston
3. Villages

Urban Barnsley will be expected to accommodate significantly more growth than any individual Principal Town and the Principal Towns will be expected to accommodate significantly more growth than the villages, to accord with their place in the settlement hierarchy.

Development will be allowed in villages if it is consistent with Green Belt policy and is necessary for the viability of the settlement and to meet local needs.

This approach to the location of development is advocated to encourage development in specific locations to ensure the spatial strategy for the borough is achieved. Urban Barnsley, in support of Barnsley Town Centre, will be the main focus for housing, employment, shopping, health, leisure, business and public services in the region. Individual Principal Towns will be the main local focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities. There will be a slower pace and scale of growth in villages and rural areas.

This spatial strategy takes into account the findings of the Barnsley Settlement Assessment (2003 and 2007), which covers all Barnsley’s towns with a population over 3000, along with a sample of villages and hamlets with a population under 3000. It assesses each settlement in terms of: existing sustainability (the schools, shops, employment, public transport and other services available in the settlement) potential benefits of growth; and physical and environmental issues that might influence levels of growth.

Barnsley’s settlement hierarchy and settlement roles are set out in the Spatial Strategy Section 6.

The Jobs and Business Plan identifies the following sectors as being capable of delivering the Borough’s job and economic growth aspirations and as such they are regarded as priority sectors:

- Advanced Manufacturing
- Construction
- Visitor Economy
- Logistics
- Business Services

In addition, to the priority sectors, two enabling sectors, which are not seen as being capable of delivering significant economic growth, but that can facilitate the growth of the priority sectors are also identified:

- Business Services
- Visitor Economy
being capable of delivering significant economic growth, but that can facilitate the growth of the priority sectors are also identified:

- Creative and Digital Industries
- Low Carbon

8.7 Based on the above assumptions Barnsley’s objectively assessed employment land requirement is around 291ha. This includes an allowance of 30% for flexibility to provide the market with choice. The total amount of employment land we propose to allocate is around 309 ha of new employment land.

8.7 Based on the above assumptions Barnsley’s objectively assessed employment land requirement is around 291ha. This includes an allowance of 30% for flexibility to provide the market with choice. The total amount of new employment land we propose to allocate is 297.5 hectares.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Employment land (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Barnsley</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudworth including Grimethorpe</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldthorpe (Dearne Towns)</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyland</td>
<td>116.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penistone</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royston</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wombwell</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>309.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.9 Barnsley town centre has a key role in providing opportunities for office development and modern employment sectors such as Creative Digital Industries (CDI).

8.10 The proposed employment land allocations above are considered to provide a strong economic offer both to inward investors and to indigenous companies seeking to expand.

8.9 Barnsley town centre has a key role in providing opportunities for office development and modern employment sectors such as Creative Digital Industries (CDI).

8.10 The proposed employment land allocations above are considered to provide Barnsley with an appropriate mix of large and small sites. The employment supply includes a 43ha contribution from mixed use site MU1 which is listed in Chapter 10 Mixed Use Sites. This will put Barnsley in the best position possible to provide a strong economic offer both to inward investors and to indigenous companies seeking to expand.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Urban Barnsley</strong></th>
<th><strong>Site UB1 Birthwaite Business Park</strong></th>
<th><strong>Site UB1 Birthwaite Business Park 3.5 ha</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site UB16 Bleachcroft Way</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site UB16 Bleachcroft Way Industrial Estate 9.3 ha</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site UB16 Bleachcroft Way Industrial Estate 9.3 ha</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM 17</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policy E3 Employment Site Policies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policy E3 Employment Site Policies</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | & paragraph 8.18 | All developments will be expected to comply with policy GD1 General Development Planning permission will be expected to be granted if details are provided in accordance with the following site specific policies. Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.  
8.18 Below is a list of proposed employment land allocations. The employment supply includes a 43ha contribution from mixed use site MU1 which is listed in Chapter 10 Mixed Use Sites. Where there are specific issues site specific policies are provided. Where there are no site specific details any subsequent planning application will be determined in accordance with the Local Plan. | All developments will be expected to comply with policy GD1 General Development Planning permission will be expected to be granted if details are provided in accordance with the following site specific policies. 
Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
### Dearne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site D1</td>
<td>Site D1 Land South of Dearne Valley Parkway 72.9 ha</td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
<td>Site D1 Land South of Dearne Valley Parkway 72.9 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 20</td>
<td>An assessment of the significance of the remains</td>
<td>undertake ground stability and contamination investigations prior to development and complete necessary remedial works</td>
<td>The development will be subject to the production of a phased Masterplan Framework and will be expected to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
<td>consider possible impacts on the Golden Plover population and on the nearby Old Moor RSPB reserve</td>
<td>consider possible impacts on the Golden Plover population and on the nearby Old Moor RSPB reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>include the creation of a habitat corridor (at least 8m in width) along Carr Dike and a sustainable drainage scheme to ensure that rainwater falling on the site is still able to drain into the Dike aiming to improve water quality. The sustainable drainage system should be planned and implemented in a strategic manner to serve both RSV1 and D1 with a wetland habitat at the lowest point in RSV1 site forming biodiversity mitigation as well as part of the drainage project</td>
<td>Protect and enhance biodiversity value including Taking account of possible impacts on the Golden Plover population and on the nearby Old Moor RSPB reserve and ensure that the development avoids impacts or incorporates effective mitigation measures. Any impact on the golden plover habitat will be expected to be mitigated by either a) on-site creation of optimal agricultural conditions for fields to be retained or b) creating suitable compensation habitat for the species off-site but nearby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>retain the existing woodland and hedgerows on the site periphery; retain the section of hedgerow remaining in the northwestern corner of the site; avoid locating any built development in Flood zones 2 and 3; give consideration to Carr Dike and the connecting unnamed ordinary watercourse which run through the site</td>
<td>Provide a contribution towards improvements to biodiversity within the Dearne Valley Green Heart Nature Improvement Area;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological remains are known to be present on this site. The site area has been reduced to allow flexibility in the development to ensure the remains can be preserved in situ if necessary.</td>
<td>Include the creation of a habitat corridor (at least 8m in width) along Carr Dike and a sustainable drainage scheme to ensure that rainwater falling on the site is still able to drain into the Dike aiming to improve water quality. The sustainable drainage system should be planned and implemented in a strategic manner to serve both RSV1 and D1 with a wetland habitat at the lowest point in RSV1 site forming biodiversity mitigation as well as part of the drainage project.</td>
<td>Provide an air quality assessment to assess the impacts of traffic emissions within air quality management areas along the A635 and other strategic road links to the A1/M and M1 motorways:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improve the highway network to mitigate the impact of additional traffic generated by the development on surrounding roads; provide appropriate access to housing site reference H67</td>
<td>Provide appropriate access to housing site reference H67 from Billingley View through the south east corner of the site:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reta in the existing woodland and hedgerows on the site periphery; retain the section of hedgerow remaining in the north-west corner of the site; Avoid locating any built development in Flood zones 2 and 3; Safeguard the setting of the Billingley Conservation Area; Give consideration to Carr Dike and the connecting unnamed ordinary watercourse which run through the site;</td>
<td>Provide an air quality assessment to assess the impacts of traffic emissions within air quality management areas along the A635 and other strategic road links to the A1/M and M1 motorways. Any adverse impacts on air quality should be mitigated in accordance with policy AQ1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Archaeological remains are known to be present on this site. The site area has been reduced to allow flexibility in the development to ensure the remains can be preserved in situ if necessary.

Add supporting text to read:

*Currently strategic highway links to the motorways experience high traffic levels; phasing of development may be needed to avoid unacceptable impacts. Longer term proposals along the A635 corridor in Doncaster may provide increased capacity and Barnsley will work jointly with Doncaster to bring such a scheme forward.*

*A detailed air quality assessment is necessary to quantify the impact of any development together with robust mitigation proposals to off-set impacts. Any decision will be subject to consultation with*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoyland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council given potential effects within its boundary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM 21                       | Site HOY1 Land West of Sheffield Road | Site HOY1 Land West of Sheffield Road 52.3 ha | The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan including housing site reference AC30. The development will be expected to:  
• undertake ground stability and contamination investigations prior to development and complete necessary remedial works  
• provide a link road between new Birdwell roundabout linking to Tankersley Lane and from there to Sheffield Road  
• Rockingham Sports Club field is relocated to an appropriate location within the cluster of sites proposed at Junction 36. The replacement sports ground and facilities must be constructed and available for use before development on the existing sports ground site commences  
• consider impact on residential amenity and include appropriate mitigation where necessary  
• retain the mature trees and hedgerows exclude from the development a strip of land of at least 10m in width from the development along the site’s boundary with the M1.  
• ensure that development respects the landscape and wider countryside, and  
where appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated to address impacts on the adjacent Green Belt and countryside  
• undertake necessary drainage works.  
• provide air quality assessments in accordance with policy Poll 1  
• archaeological remains are known/expected to be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
• information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains  
• an assessment of the significance of the remains  
• consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
| MM 22                       | Site HOY2                       | Site HOY2 Rockingham 8.9 ha      | The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H16; H77; AC29; AC30; AC31 and employment site references: HOY2; HOY3, HOY4 and HOY5.  
The development will be expected to:  
• provide appropriate access to employment site HOYS and housing site H16  
account for the reduction in developable area which is potentially reduced by 2.11ha to accommodate 'planned' roundabout improvements.  
• consider the impact on residential amenity and include appropriate mitigation where necessary.  
• consider the potential impact on the nearby Shortwood and Hay Green Local Wildlife Sites and include appropriate mitigation where necessary.  
• retain the hedgerow along the north edge. |
| Site HOY1 Land West of Sheffield Road 52.3 ha | The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan Masterplan Framework including housing site reference AC30. The development will be expected to:  
• undertake ground stability and contamination investigations prior to development and complete necessary remedial works  
• Provide a link road between the new Birdwell roundabout linking to Tankersley Lane and from there to Sheffield Road;  
• Relocate the area of Rockingham Sports Ground. Rockingham Sports Club field is relocated to an appropriate location within the cluster of sites proposed at Junction 36. That falls within the site boundary to an appropriate location within Hoyland Principal Town. The replacement sports ground pitch and associated facilities must be constructed and available for use before development on the existing sports ground site commences;  
• Consider impact on residential amenity and include appropriate mitigation where necessary;  
• Retain the mature trees and hedgerows;  
• Provide a buffer strip at least 10 metres wide along the common boundary with the M1;  
• Ensure that development respects the landscape and wider countryside, and incorporates appropriate mitigation measures to address impacts on the adjacent Green Belt and countryside; including the planting of a substantial tree belt at the southern boundary in order to define the new Green Belt boundary;  
• Undertake necessary drainage works; and  
• Provide air quality assessments in accordance with policy Poll 1  
Archaeological remains are known/expected to be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
• Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
• An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
• Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 23 Site HOY3 Shortwood Extension</td>
<td>Site HOY3 Shortwood Extension 11.8 ha</td>
<td>The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H16; H77; AC29; AC30; AC31 and employment site references: HOY2; HOY3, HOY4 and HOY5. The development will be expected to: - undertake ground stability and contamination investigations prior to development and complete necessary remedial works - Divert or relocate Public Rights of Way within the site as appropriate - Undertake necessary drainage works - ensure that development does not impair the visual amenity of the landscape (wider countryside). Potential mitigation measures include restrictions on building heights, landscaping and structural planting; - consider the potential impact on the nearby Shortwood and Hay Green Local Wildlife Sites and include appropriate mitigation where necessary. - Retain the mature trees present on site - Undertake ground stability and contamination investigations prior to development and complete necessary remedial works - Divert or relocate Public Rights of Way within the site as appropriate - Undertake necessary drainage works; - Ensure that development does not impair the visual amenity of the landscape (wider countryside). Potential mitigation measures include restrictions on building heights, landscaping and structural planting; - Consider the potential impact on the nearby Shortwood and Hay Green Local Wildlife Sites and include appropriate mitigation where necessary; - Retain the valuable habitats in the south-western corner of the site and exclude them from the scope of any development proposals. The site has potential as a habitat for newts, so it is recommended that this possibility is investigated prior to any development; - Protect the routes of the Green way and Public Footpath that cross the site, and make provision for these as part of any proposal; - archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following: - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains; - An assessment of the significance of the remains; - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
<td>Site HOY3 Shortwood Extension 11.8 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 24 Site HOY4 Shortwood Business Park</td>
<td>Site HOY4 Shortwood Business Park 3.8 ha</td>
<td>The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H16; H77; AC29; AC30; AC31 and employment site references: HOY2; HOY3, HOY4 and HOY5. The site is part of the Sheffield City Region Enterprise Zone. The development will be expected to: - undertake contamination investigations and complete necessary remedial works - consider the potential impact on the adjacent Shortwood and Hay Green Local Wildlife Sites and include appropriate mitigation where necessary; - Retain the mature trees present on site Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following: - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains; - An assessment of the significance of the remains; - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
<td>Site HOY4 Shortwood Business Park 3.8 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification Reference</td>
<td>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</td>
<td>Original Text (where applicable)</td>
<td>Main Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM 25 | Site HOY5 Land South of Dearne Valley Parkway | The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H16; H77; AC29; and employment site references: HOY2; HOY3; HOY4 and HOY5. The development will be expected to:-  
- undertake ground stability and contamination investigations prior to development and complete necessary remedial works  
- provide appropriate access housing site references H16, H77 and AC29; protect and retain the areas of woodland, species-rich neutral grassland, pond and stretches of older hedgerow. The site has potential as a habitat for newts, so it is recommended that this possibility is investigated prior to any development;  
- consider and minimise the impact on the setting of listed buildings through appropriate design and landscaping;  
- ensure that development respects the landscape and wider countryside, and where appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated to address impacts on the adjacent Green Belt and countryside; and  
- protect and retain the Green way, Public Footpaths and Bridleways, cutting through and along the periphery of the site, and make provision for them in the design of the layout  
- consider the potential impact on the near by Edderthorpe Ings Local Wildlife Site and include appropriate mitigation measures to address impacts on the adjacent Green Belt and countryside; and  
- Protect and retain the grassland on the western section of the site  
- Provide appropriate access to housing site references H16, H77 and AC29;  
- Protect and retain the areas of woodland, species-rich neutral grassland, pond and stretches of older hedgerow. The site has potential as a habitat for newts, so it is recommended that this possibility is investigated prior to any development;  
- Consider and minimise the impact on the setting of listed buildings through appropriate design and landscaping;  
- Ensure that development respects the landscape and wider countryside, and where appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated to address impacts on the adjacent Green Belt and countryside; and  
- Protect and retain the Green way, Public Rights of Way and Bridleways cutting through and along the periphery of the site, and make provision for them in the design of the layout. | Site HOY5 Land South of Dearne Valley Parkway 28.6 ha  
The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H16; H77; AC29; and employment site references: HOY2; HOY3; HOY4 and HOY5. The development will be expected to:-  
- undertake ground stability and contamination investigations prior to development and complete necessary remedial works  
- Provide appropriate access to housing site references H16, H77 and AC29;  
- Protect and retain the areas of woodland, species-rich neutral grassland, pond and stretches of older hedgerow. The site has potential as a habitat for newts, so it is recommended that this possibility is investigated prior to any development;  
- Consider and minimise the impact on the setting of listed buildings through appropriate design and landscaping;  
- Ensure that development respects the landscape and wider countryside, and where appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated to address impacts on the adjacent Green Belt and countryside; and  
- Protect and retain the grassland on the western section of the site  
- Provide appropriate access to housing site references H16, H77 and AC29;  
- Protect and retain the areas of woodland, species-rich neutral grassland, pond and stretches of older hedgerow. The site has potential as a habitat for newts, so it is recommended that this possibility is investigated prior to any development;  
- Consider and minimise the impact on the setting of listed buildings through appropriate design and landscaping;  
- Ensure that development respects the landscape and wider countryside, and where appropriate mitigation measures are incorporated to address impacts on the adjacent Green Belt and countryside; and  
- Protect and retain the Green way, Public Rights of Way and Bridleways cutting through and along the periphery of the site, and make provision for them in the design of the layout. |
| Outside Urban Barnsley and Principal Towns | Site N1 Wentworth Industrial Park, Tankersley 1.2 ha | The development will be expected to:-  
- Consider the potential impact on the adjacent West Wood and Sowell Pond Local Wildlife Sites and include appropriate mitigation where necessary.  
- Protect and retain the site’s woodlands  
- Retain the grassland on the western section of the site  
- Consider exclusion of the two natural areas from the site boundary or provide compensation for their loss.  
- Archaeological remains are known/expected to be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:-  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains.  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. | Site N1 Wentworth Industrial Park, Tankersley 1.2 ha 4.3 ha  
The development will be expected to:-  
- Consider the potential impact on the adjacent West Wood and Sowell Pond Local Wildlife Sites and include appropriate mitigation where necessary;  
- Protect and retain the site’s woodlands;  
- Retain the grassland on the western section of the site  
- Consider exclusion of the two natural areas from the site boundary or provide compensation for their loss; and  
- Ensure a wildlife corridor is either retained or created along the northern boundary of the parcel of land north of Maple Court.  
Archaeological remains are known/expected to be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:-  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
| MM 26 | Site Policy N2 Site N2 Park Springs, Houghton 3.4 ha | The development will be expected to:-  
- consider the potential impact on the nearby Edderthorpe Ings Local Wildlife Site and include appropriate mitigation where necessary. | Site N2 Park Springs, Houghton 3.4 ha  
The development will be expected to:-  
- Consider the potential impact on the nearby Edderthorpe Ings Local Wildlife Site and include appropriate mitigation where necessary; |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 28</td>
<td>Site N5 Land South or Park Springs</td>
<td>Site N5 Land South of Park Springs 8.3 ha</td>
<td>Site N5 Land South of Park Springs 8.3 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy E4 Land Reserved for employment and supporting text</td>
<td>Policy E4 Land reserved for employment</td>
<td>Should a need for an employment use be proven, land released should be occupied within 5 years. Where a need is proven, planning permission will be expected to be granted if details are provided in accordance with the site specific policy below. Related text at paragraph 8.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 29</td>
<td>Policy E4 Land Reserved for employment and supporting text And related text at paragraph 8.22</td>
<td>Policy E4 Land reserved for employment Prior to the release of land shown on the policies map as reserved for employment (RSV1), a need must be demonstrated to the Local Planning Authority for its use for employment purposes. Until such need is demonstrated existing uses shall remain. Should a need for an employment use be proven, land released should be occupied within 5 years. Where a need is proven, planning permission will be expected to be granted if details are provided in accordance with the site specific policy below. Related text at paragraph 8.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 30</td>
<td>Site RSV1 Land reserved for employment, South of Dearne Valley Parkway</td>
<td>Site RSV1 Land reserved for employment, South of Dearne Valley Parkway The development will be expected to:- undertake ground stability and contamination investigations prior to development and complete necessary remedial works include the creation of a functional habitat and blue corridor (at least 8m in width) along Carr Dike and a sustainable, preferably surface based, drainage scheme to ensure that rainwater falling on the site is still able to drain into the Dike aiming to improve water quality. The sustainable drainage system should be planned and implemented in a strategic manner to serve both RSV1 and D1 with a wetland habitat at the lowest point in RSV1 site forming biodiversity mitigation as well as part of the drainage project retain the existing woodland and hedgerows on the site periphery retain the section of hedgerow remaining in the north western corner of the site provide a significant contribution for the recycling of derelict and other urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy H1 The Number of New Homes to be Built

We will seek to achieve the completion of at least 21,546 net additional homes during the period 2014 to 2033. A minimum five year supply of deliverable sites will be maintained.

9.1 This figure gives an indicative annualised figure of around 1100 per annum (20,900 over the plan period). The objectively assessed housing need figure expressed in the Strategic Housing Market assessment is ‘around’ 1,100 dwellings per annum. This has been arrived at by using the various scenarios in the forecasting work in the Edge Analytics report, and tempering these by applying evidence on issues such as market signals and past delivery rates. It is considered that the 1,100 figure represents an ambitious and aspirational figure which addresses housing needs and supports economic growth ambitions, and would still require a step up in delivery.

9.2 This figure will continue to evolve up until the Local Plan is submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination.

Policy H2 The Distribution of New Homes

The distribution of new homes for the period 2014 to 2033 will be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Number of homes</th>
<th>Planning Permissions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Overall Supply **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>6427</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>9327</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The development will be expected to:

- accord with the following site specific policies.
- Planning permission will be expected to be granted if details are provided in accordance with the following site specific policies.
- All developments will be expected to comply with policy LG1 regarding the location of growth.
- The methodology used to calculate indicative dwellings that could be achieved on allocations that do not have planning permission is laid out in the background paper for housing.

A further 476 dwellings will be added to the overall total supply as a windfall allowance. The methodology for calculating this allowance is set out in the background paper for housing.

** Percentages are rounded and as a result may not total 100% overall.

9.5 The location of housing development accords with the settlement hierarchy and Policy LG1 regarding the location of growth.

9.6 Sites are allocated for housing in accordance with policy H1 of this Local Plan. The sites are shown on the Policies Maps and set out in the site policies below and the site policies in section 10 Mixed Use. All these sites have been assessed at an indicative density of 40 dwellings per hectare. The site areas quoted are gross. A gross to net ratio has been applied to take account of on site infrastructure requirements.

* includes 4295 dwellings proposed as part of mixed use sites. Please see site policies in Chapter 10 for further details.

** Percentages are rounded and as a result may not total 100% overall.

9.5 The location of housing development accords with the settlement hierarchy and Policy LG2 regarding the location of growth.

9.6 Sites are allocated for housing in accordance with policy H1 of this Local Plan. The sites are shown on the Policies Maps and set out in the site policies below and the site policies in section 10 Mixed Use. All these sites within Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns have been assessed at an indicative density of 40 dwellings per hectare and sites in villages at 30 dwellings per hectare. The site areas quoted are gross. A gross to net ratio has been applied to take account of on site infrastructure requirements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM 35                       | H13 Land East of Burton Road, Monk Bretton | Site H13 Land east of Burton Road, Monk Bretton Indicative number of dwellings 218 | - Retain the grasslands at the south-west and north-east of the site plus the woodland/stream corridor at its east; and  
- Safeguard the setting of the Listed Buildings at Swaithe Hall and Ardsley Cemetery  
Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
| MM 35                       | H13 Land East of Burton Road, Monk Bretton | Site H13 Land east of Burton Road, Monk Bretton Indicative number of dwellings 218 | The development will be expected to:  
- Ensure that no vehicular access shall be taken from Littleworth Lane; and  
- Provide a wildlife buffer strip between the site and Littleworth Park green space to the east.  
Archaeological remains are known to be present on this site. The developable site area has been reduced to allow flexibility in the development to ensure the remains can be preserved in situ if necessary. |
| MM 36                       | H19 Land North of Keresforth Road, Dodworth | Site H19 Land North of Keresforth Road, Dodworth Indicative number of dwellings 231 | Site H19 Land North of Keresforth Road, Dodworth Indicative number of dwellings 231-175  
The development will be expected to:  
- Retain woodland, stream habitat and hedgerows;  
- Avoid development in the Air Quality Management Area affected by the M1 and satisfy the requirements of Local Plan Policy AQ1 Development in Air Quality Management Areas;  
- Provide pedestrian links through the development to the footbridge across the M1 Motorway;  
- Provide appropriate vehicular access;  
- Provide appropriate acoustic treatment to mitigate against traffic noise; and  
- Provide compensation for the loss of any trees  
Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
| MM 37                       | Site H28 Former Priory School/ Land off Rotherham Road, Cundy | Site H28 Former Priory School/ Land off Rotherham Road, Cundy Cross Indicative number of dwellings 51 | Site H28 Former Priory School/ Land off Rotherham Road, Cundy Cross Indicative number of dwellings 51  
Part of the site has planning permission for 197 dwellings. The figure indicates the capacity of the remainder of the site.  
The development will be expected to:  
- Provide appropriate vehicular access;  
- Provide pedestrian links through the development to the footbridge across the M1 Motorway;  
- Provide appropriate acoustic treatment to mitigate against traffic noise; and  
- Provide compensation for the loss of any trees  
Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by a suitable archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 38</td>
<td>Cross</td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
<td>• Secure access from the site with planning permission to the remainder of the site;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• undertake an ecology report and retain any areas of significant value; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Either retain and manage the small area of species-rich grassland in the south-east and the plantation woodland or provide mitigation for these biodiversity losses within any development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H44 Land to the north of West Green Way, West Green</td>
<td>Site H44 Land to the North of West Green Way, West Green Indicative number of dwellings 477</td>
<td>The development will be subject to the production of a phased masterplan covering the entire site and including mixed use site AC12, which ensures that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development will be subject to the production of a phased masterplan covering the entire site and including mixed use site AC12, which ensures that:</td>
<td>• areas identified as having considerable wildlife value are protected from development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Any planning application must include a detailed ecological assessment of these areas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• along with proposals to buffer and preserve them. These areas include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the western and eastern boundaries of the site including the stream and woodland;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• the stream corridor that crosses the north western section of the site;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• off site highway works are provided;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• small scale convenience retail and community facilities are provided in compliance with Local Plan policy TCS Small Local Shops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 39</td>
<td>H57 Monk Bretton Reservoir and land to the east of Cross Street</td>
<td>Site H57 Monk Bretton Reservoir and land to the east of Cross Street Indicative number of dwellings 82</td>
<td>Part of the site has planning permission for 95 dwellings. The indicative number of dwellings above relates to the remainder of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Respect the historic setting of the adjacent listed buildings associated with Manor Farm immediately to the East and the setting of Monk Bretton Cross Scheduled Ancient Monument by use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting, appropriate scaling, massing, details and materials; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure that no development takes place around the access road to the cricket ground in order to protect the setting of Monk Bretton Cross Scheduled Ancient Monument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological remains are known/expected to be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:</td>
<td>Archaeological remains are known/expected to be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;</td>
<td>• Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An assessment of the significance of the remains;</td>
<td>• An assessment of the significance of the remains; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
<td>• Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 40</td>
<td>H72</td>
<td>Site H72 Land north of Kingwell Road Indicative number of dwellings 77</td>
<td>Delete allocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site H72 Land north of Kingwell Road Indicative number of dwellings 77</td>
<td>Site H72 Land north of Kingwell Road Indicative number of dwellings 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H73</td>
<td>Site H73 Land between Mount Vernon Road and Upper Sheffield Road Indicative number of dwellings 154</td>
<td>Site H73 Land between Mount Vernon Road and Upper Sheffield Road Indicative number of dwellings 154</td>
<td>Site H73 Land between Mount Vernon Road and Upper Sheffield Road Indicative number of dwellings 154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 41</td>
<td>number of dwellings 154</td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- retain the mature woodland along Kingwell Road &amp; Pinfold Hill plus the hedgerows and scattered mature trees across site which should be buffered and managed which would remove approximately 15% of the developable area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- protect the historic setting of the listed Darley Cliffe Hall, its ancillary listed buildings and Elmhirst Farm. Development shall be limited to the area shown on the Policies Map. Development shall respect the historic setting of these listed buildings by the use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting, appropriate scaling, massing, details and materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. An assessment of the significance of the remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- retain and enhance boundary wall fronting Mount Vernon road or rebuild at the back of wider footway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 42</td>
<td>Site 460 Land off Mount Vernon Road, Worsbrough, Barnsley</td>
<td>Add site policy:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site H22 Land north of Blacker Lane, Shafton</td>
<td>Site 460 Land off Mount Vernon Road, Worsbrough, Barnsley Indicative number of dwellings 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicative number of dwellings 160</td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Retain and maintain the strip of semi-natural broadleaf woodland in the south of the site; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Respect the historic setting of the listed building at Elmhirst Farm and Cottage opposite this site by the use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects their setting, scaling, massing, details and materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. An assessment of the significance of the remains; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudworth</td>
<td>H22 Land North of Blacker Lane, Shafton</td>
<td>Site H22 Land north of Blacker Lane, Shafton Indicative number of dwellings 160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 43</td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
<td>Site H22 Land north of Blacker Lane, Shafton Indicative number of dwellings 160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- provide a masterplan demonstrating how the site can be developed for residential purposes. This should consider access issues and, if necessary, the redevelopment of the area occupied by the farm and industrial buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- provide off site highway safety enhancements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- retain and manage the hedgerows, mature trees and pond, plus a buffer strip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- provide a masterplan demonstrating how the site can be developed for residential purposes. This should consider access issues and, if necessary, the redevelopment of the area occupied by the farm and industrial buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- provide off site highway safety enhancements; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- retain and manage the hedgerows, mature trees and pond, plus a buffer strip against the disused railway line.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</td>
<td>Original Text (where applicable)</td>
<td>Main Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM 44     | H39 Land at Weetshaw Lane, Cudworth | Site H39 Land at Weetshaw Lane, Cudworth Indicative number of dwellings 144 | The development will be expected to:  
- Retain, buffer and manage the existing hedgerows and woodland blocks  
- Be accessed through the adjacent housing allocation H76  
- Provide appropriate acoustic treatment to mitigate against road noise  
- Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
  - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains  
  - An assessment of the significance of the remains  
  - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. | Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
| MM 45     | H74 Land North of Sidcop Road, Cudworth | Site H74 Land north of Sidcop Road, Cudworth Indicative number of dwellings 18 | The development will be subject to a masterplan covering the entire site and including sites H75 and H87  
- Provide appropriate junction improvements at Pontefract Road  
- Retain, buffer and manage the trees at the southern boundary  
- Provide appropriate acoustic treatment to mitigate against road noise  
- Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
  - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains  
  - An assessment of the significance of the remains  
  - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. | Site H74 Land north of Sidcop Road, Cudworth Indicative number of dwellings 18  
- Retain, buffer and manage the existing hedgerows and woodland blocks;  
- Be accessed through the adjacent housing allocation H76;  
- Provide appropriate acoustic treatment to mitigate against road noise; and  
- Avoid locating any built development in Flood Zone 2 and 3  
- A demonstration that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area. |
| MM 46     | H75 Land off Cudworth Bypass | Site H75 Land off Cudworth Bypass Indicative number of dwellings 192 | The development will be subject to a masterplan covering the entire site and including sites H74 and H87  
- Provide appropriate junction improvements at Pontefract Road  
- Retain, buffer and manage hedgerows and trees at the north-east side of the site.  
- Provide appropriate acoustic treatment to mitigate against road noise  
- Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
  - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
  - An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
  - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. | Site H75 Land off Cudworth Bypass Indicative number of dwellings 192  
- Retain, buffer and manage the existing hedgerows and woodland blocks;  
- Be accessed through the adjacent housing allocation H76;  
- Provide appropriate acoustic treatment to mitigate against road noise; and  
- Avoid locating any built development in Flood Zone 2 and 3  
- A demonstration that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 47</td>
<td>H87 Land north of Oak Tree Avenue</td>
<td>Site H87 Land north of Oak Tree Avenue Indicative number of dwellings 38 The development will be subject to a masterplan covering the entire site and including sites H74 and H75 provide appropriate junction improvements at Pontefract Road archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following: Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains An assessment of the significance of the remains Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
<td>Site H87 Land north of Oak Tree Avenue Indicative number of dwellings 38 The development will be subject to a masterplan covering the entire site including sites H74 and H75 demonstrating that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area. The development will be expected to provide appropriate junction improvements at Pontefract Road. Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following: Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains; An assessment of the significance of the remains; and Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 48</td>
<td>Site AC26 Land south of Lowfield Road, Bolton on Dearne</td>
<td>Site AC26 Land south of Lowfield Road, Bolton on Dearne Indicative number of dwellings 86 The development will be expected to: provide traffic signals at the railway bridge on Lowfield Road provide an odour report and incorporate any appropriate mitigation measures including a landscaped buffer</td>
<td>Site AC26 Land south of Lowfield Road, Bolton on Dearne Indicative number of dwellings 86 The development will be expected to: Provide traffic signals at the railway bridge on Lowfield Road; Provide an odour report and incorporate any appropriate mitigation measures including a landscaped buffer; Be designed, managed and mitigated to ensure that there are no adverse impacts on the neighbouring Adwick Washlands nature reserve (to the east of the site) which is of significant ecological interest; and Be accompanied by details for the improvement, protection and maintenance of the adjacent Scheduled Ancient Monument known as Heavy Anti-aircraft gunsite 330m south east of Lowfield Farm (Entry 1019872) and its setting. Planning conditions will be used to ensure that details for the improvement, protection and maintenance of the monument have been submitted to and approved by the Council before development commences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 49</td>
<td>H67 Site to the West of Broadwater Estate</td>
<td>Site H67 Site to the east of Broadwater Estate Indicative number of dwellings 333 The development will be expected to: retain the southern quarter of the site which has high ecological value archaeological remains are known to be present on this site. The site area has been reduced to allow flexibility in the development to ensure the remains can be preserved in situ if necessary.</td>
<td>Site H67 Site to the east west of Broadwater Estate Indicative number of dwellings 333 Demonstrate that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area. The development will be expected to: Retain the southern quarter of the site which has high ecological value. The developable site area has been reduced to account for retention of this area; and Provide appropriate access to housing site reference H67 from Billingley View through the south east corner of site D1. Archaeological remains are known to be present on this site. The developable site area has been reduced to...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification Reference</td>
<td>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</td>
<td>Original Text (where applicable)</td>
<td>Main Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM 50                      | H84 Land West of Thurnscoe Bridge Lane and South of Derry Grove Thurnscoe | Site H84 Land west of Thurnscoe Bridge Lane and south of Derry Grove, Thurnscoe Indicative number of dwellings 308 The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering the entire site which will ensure that:  
  - Trees and hedgerows around the periphery of the site, in particular on the southern boundary are retained  
  - off site highway enhancements are provided  
  - archaeological remains are known to be present on this site. The site area has been reduced to allow flexibility in the development to ensure the remains can be preserved in situ if necessary. | Site H84 Land west of Thurnscoe Bridge Lane and south of Derry Grove, Thurnscoe Indicative number of dwellings 308 The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering the entire site to ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner which will ensure that:  
  - Ensure that the trees and hedgerows around the periphery of the site, in particular on the southern boundary are retained; and  
  - provide off site highway enhancements are provided. Archaeological remains are known to be present on this site. The developable site area has been reduced to allow flexibility in the development to ensure the remains can be preserved in situ if necessary. |
| MM 51                      | AC29 Land off Shortwood Roundabout, Hoyland | Site AC29 Land off Shortwood Roundabout, Hoyland Indicative number of dwellings 80 The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H16; H77 and employment site references: HOY2; HOY3; and HOY5. The development will be expected to:  
  - retain, enhance and manage the hedgerow on the east side.  
  - provide appropriate acoustic measures to mitigate against noise from the road; and  
  - provide appropriate access.  
  - archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
    - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
    - An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
    - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. | Site AC29 Land off Shortwood Roundabout, Hoyland Indicative number of dwellings 80 The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H16; H77; AC29 and employment site references: HOY2; HOY3; and HOY5. The Masterplan Framework should demonstrate that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area and ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner. The development will be expected to:  
  - Retain, enhance and manage the hedgerow on the east side;  
  - Provide appropriate acoustic measures to mitigate against noise from the road; and  
  - Provide appropriate access. Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
    - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
    - An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
    - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
| MM 52                      | AC30 Land at Tankersley Lane | Site AC30 Land at Tankersley Lane Indicative number of dwellings 118 The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering the entire site and employment site reference HOY1 The development will be expected to:  
  - provide a landscape buffer between this site and the employment site HOY1;  
  - produce a detailed ecology report in support of any development proposal; and  
  - archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
    - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
    - An assessment of the significance of the remains. | Site AC30 Land at Tankersley Lane Indicative number of dwellings 118-101 The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering the entire site and employment site reference HOY1. The Masterplan Framework should demonstrate that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area and ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner. The development will be expected to:  
  - Ensure any layout takes account of the relationship between the new development and existing buildings that are not available for redevelopment;  
  - Provide a buffer between the site and Skiers Wood Local Wildlife Site;  
  - Provide a landscape buffer between this site and the employment site HOY1; and  
  - Produce a detailed ecology report in support of any development proposal. Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 53</td>
<td>AC31 Land at Broad Carr Road, Hoyland</td>
<td>Site AC31 Land at Broad Carr Road, Hoyland Indicative number of dwellings 131</td>
<td>The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H7; H8; H45; AC31. The Masterplan Framework should demonstrate that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area and ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
<td>archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• provide a coal mining risk assessment setting out how the mining legacy issues will be addressed as the site is in a coal mining referral area</td>
<td>• Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• retain the double, species-rich hedgerow on the north-eastern boundary and the areas of broadleaf woodland</td>
<td>• An assessment of the significance of the remains; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• provide appropriate access to site H8</td>
<td>• Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• provide small scale convenience retail and community facilities in compliance with Local Plan policy TC5 Small Local Shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• archaeological remains are known/expected to be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• of the remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• An assessment of the significance of the remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 54</td>
<td>Site H2 Land west of Fitzwilliam Street, Elsecar</td>
<td>Site H2 Land west of Fitzwilliam Street, Elsecar Indicative number of dwellings 77</td>
<td>The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H7; H8; H45; AC31. The Masterplan Framework should demonstrate that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area and ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
<td>archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• retain and manage the woodland strip through the centre of the site plus the vegetation at the north alongside the railway line.</td>
<td>• Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• respect the historic setting and the group character of the adjacent Elsecar Conservation Area as detailed in the Conservation Area Appraisal, by the use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting, scaling, massing, details and materials.</td>
<td>• An assessment of the significance of the remains; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Masterplan Framework should include the</td>
<td>• Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• An assessment of the significance of the remains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 55</td>
<td>Site H7 Land off Clough Fields Road, Hoyland Common</td>
<td>Site H7 Land off Clough Fields Road, Hoyland Common Indicative number of dwellings 74</td>
<td>The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H7; H8; H45; AC31 and EC5. The Masterplan Framework should demonstrate that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area and ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
<td>archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Retain and manage the woodland at the south and east of the site;</td>
<td>• Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide appropriate access to site H45; and</td>
<td>• An assessment of the significance of the remains; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide small scale convenience retail and community facilities in compliance with Local Plan policy TC5 Small Local Shops.</td>
<td>• Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.

Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM 56     |                               | Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following: | Site H8 Land off Meadowfield Drive Indicative dwelling number 74 The development will be subject to the production of a Masterplan Framework covering a number of sites including housing site references: H7; H8; H45; AC31 and EC5. The Masterplan Framework should demonstrate that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area and ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner. The development will be expected to:  
- Retain and manage the woodland belt at the west of the site; and  
- Provide small scale convenience retail and community facilities in compliance with Local Plan policy TC5 Small Local Shops. Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.  |
| H8 Land off Meadowfield Drive | Site H8 Land off Meadowfield Drive Indicative dwelling number 74 | The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H7; H8; H45; AC31 and EC5. The Masterplan Framework should demonstrate that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area and ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner. The development will be expected to:  
- Retain and manage the woodland belt at the west of the site; and  
- Provide small scale convenience retail and community facilities in compliance with Local Plan policy TC5 Small Local Shops. Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.  |
| H16 Land North of Hoyland Road, Hoyland Common | Site H16 Land North of Hoyland Road, Hoyland Common Indicative number of dwellings 603 | The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H16; H77; AC29 and employment site references: HOY2; HOY3; HOY4 and HOY5. The Masterplan Framework should demonstrate that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area and ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner. The development will be expected to:  
- Retain and manage the woodland belt at the west of the site; and  
- Provide small scale convenience retail and community facilities in compliance with Local Plan policy TC5 Small Local Shops. Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM 58                       | H45 Land North of Stead Lane, Hoyland | The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H7; H8; H45; AC31. The development will be expected to:  
- Retain, buffer and manage the woodland at the north and east, plus all hedgerows on site and the pond at the south-west. These should be managed.  
- Provide appropriate access to sites H7, H8 and AC31.  
- Provide small scale convenience retail and community facilities in compliance with Local Plan policy TC5 Small Local Shops.  
- Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
  * Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains  
  * An assessment of the significance of the remains  
  * Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.  | Site H45 Land North of Stead Lane, Hoyland Indicative number of dwellings 696 - 600  
The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H7; H8; H45; AC31 and EC5. The Masterplan Framework should demonstrate that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area and ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner.  
The development will be expected to:  
- Retain buffer and manage the woodland at the north and east, plus all hedgerows on site and the pond at the south-west. These should be managed.  
- Provide appropriate access to sites H7, H8 and AC31; and  
- Provide small scale convenience retail and community facilities in compliance with Local Plan policy TC5 Small Local Shops.  
Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.  |
| MM 59                       | H77 Land West of Upper Hoyland Road | The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H16 H77; AC29 and employment site references: HOY2; HOY3; HOY4 and HOY5. The development will be expected to:  
- Ensure access to the site is taken through the adjacent housing allocation H16. Access infrastructure must be capable of allowing development of the whole site.  
- Retain, enhance and manage the species-rich hedgerows and plantation woodland at the north, plus create a wildlife corridor along the site.  
- Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
  * Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains  
  * An assessment of the significance of the remains  
  * Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.  | Site H77 Land west of Upper Hoyland Road Indicative number of dwellings 70  
The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering a number of sites including housing site references: H16; H77; AC29 and employment site references: HOY2; HOY3; HOY4 and HOY5. The Masterplan Framework should demonstrate that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area and ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner.  
The development will be expected to:  
- Ensure access to the site is taken through the adjacent housing allocation H16. Access infrastructure must be capable of allowing development of the whole site.  
- Retain, enhance and manage the species-rich hedgerows and plantation woodland at the north, plus create a wildlife corridor along the site; and  
- Protect the setting of Hoyland Lowe Stand immediately to the east by:  
  * Limiting development on the site to the area shown on the Policies Map;  
  * Restricting the height of dwellings to two storeys at the eastern margin of the developable area;  
  * Providing appropriate site layout and sympathetic design that reflects the setting, scaling, massing, details and materials; and  
  * The use of planning conditions to ensure that details of the improvement, protection and maintenance of the monument have been submitted to and approved by the Council before development commences.  
Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM 60                       | Site H79                       | Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. | Site H79 Land north of Wood Walk, Hoyland Indicative number of dwellings 112. The development will be expected to:  
  - Retain the broadleaved plantation in the east of the site and the strip of dense scrub with scattered trees towards the west of the site;  
  - Retain and maintain the large ash tree near the centre of the site; and  
  - Fully evaluate any hedgerows which are proposed for removal against all criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation of necessary) that must include the following:  
  - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
  - An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
  - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
| MM 61                       | 877 Land at Sheffield Road, Birdwell | The development will be expected to:  
  - respect the historic and listed status of the Mine Rescue Station immediately adjacent by the use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting, appropriate scaling, massing, details and materials. | Site 877 Land at Sheffield Road, Birdwell Indicative number of dwellings 29. The development will be expected to:  
  - Respect the historic and listed status of the Mine Rescue Station immediately adjacent by the use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting, appropriate scaling, massing, details and materials; and  
  - Avoid development in the Air Quality Management Area affected by the M1 and satisfy the requirements of Local Plan Policy AQ1 Development in Air Quality Management Areas. |
| MM 62                       | Site EC5 Land between Stead Lane and Sheffield Road, Hoyland Common | Add site policy:  
  - Site EC5 Land between Stead Lane and Sheffield Road, Hoyland Common Indicative number of dwellings 237. The development will be subject to the production of a Masterplan Framework covering a number of sites including housing site references: H7; H8; H45; AC31 and EC5. The Masterplan Framework should demonstrate that proposals will positively support and complement the comprehensive wider development of the area and ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner. The development will be expected to:  
  - Retain and maintain the species-rich hedgerow along the north-east boundary. The other hedgerows should be retained. If they are proposed for removal their importance should first be assessed against the Hedgerow Regulations 1997;  
  - Retain the two mature oak trees on the north-east boundary; and  
  - Include measures for the protection and retention of the listed milepost on Sheffield Road which is approximately 100m to the north of the driveway to Bell Ground House and its immediate setting. |
| MM 63                       | AC34 Land to North of Barnsley Road | The development will be expected to:  
  - Part of the site has planning permission for 11 dwellings. The indicative number of dwellings above relates to the remainder of the site. | Site AC34 Land to north of Barnsley Road, Penistone Indicative number of dwellings 48. The development will be expected to:  
  - Part of the site has planning permission for 11 dwellings. The indicative number of dwellings above relates to the remainder of the site. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Penistone                  |                               | • respect the setting of the listed complex of buildings a Nether Mill 60m to the West by the use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting, scaling, massing, details and materials.  
• archaeological remains are known/expected to be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
• Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains  
• An assessment of the significance of the remains  
• Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. | The development will be expected to:  
• Respect the setting of the listed complex of buildings at Nether Mill 60m to the West by the use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting, scaling, massing, details and materials; and  
• Avoid locating built development in parts of the site within flood zone 2 and 3.  
Archaeological remains are known/expected to be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
• Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
• An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
• Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
| MM 64                      | H81 Land South of Well House Lane, Penistone | Site H81 Land south of Well House Lane, Penistone Indicative number of dwellings 132  
The development will be expected to:  
• ensure the wider characteristic landscape setting and the setting of the Penistone Conservation Area is protected and enhanced by the use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting, scaling, massing, details and materials.  
• provide appropriate off site road safety enhancements  
• archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
• Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains  
• An assessment of the significance of the remains  
• Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. | Site H81 Land south of Well House Lane, Penistone Indicative number of dwellings 132  
The development will be expected to:  
• Ensure the wider characteristic landscape setting and the setting of the Penistone Conservation Area are protected and enhanced by the use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting, scaling, massing, details and materials;  
• Provide appropriate off site road safety enhancements;  
• Be designed to provide an appropriate buffer around Westhorpe Works in accordance with HSE standards;  
• Evaluate the site’s importance as overwintering feeding habitat for golden plovers and provide mitigation or compensation habitat as appropriate; and  
• Avoid locating built development in parts of the site within flood zones 2 and 3.  
Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
• Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
• An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
• Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
| MM 65                      | H82 Land South of Halifax Road, Penistone | Site H82 Land south of Halifax Road, Penistone Indicative number of dwellings 414  
The development will be expected to:  
• be designed to provide an appropriate buffer around Westhorpe Works in accordance with HSE standards  
• provide appropriate off site road safety enhancements  
• ensure the wider characteristic landscape setting and the setting of the Penistone Conservation Area is protected and enhanced by the use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting, scaling, massing, details and materials.  
• provide appropriate acoustic treatment to mitigate against road and railway noise  
archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following: | Site H82 Land south of Halifax Road, Penistone Indicative number of dwellings 414  
The development will be expected to:  
• Be designed to provide an appropriate buffer around Westhorpe Works in accordance with HSE standards;  
• Provide appropriate off site road safety enhancements;  
• Ensure the wider characteristic landscape setting and the setting of the Penistone Conservation Area are protected and enhanced by the use of appropriate site layout and sympathetic design that reflects their setting, scaling, massing, details and materials;  
• Provide appropriate acoustic treatment to mitigate against road and railway noise; and  
• Evaluate the site’s importance as overwintering feeding habitat for golden plovers and provide mitigation or compensation habitat as appropriate.  
Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM 66                      | H11 Land off Lee Lane, Royston | Site H11 Land off Lee Lane, Royston Indicative number of dwellings 770 Planning permission has been granted on this site for 202 dwellings. The indicative number of dwellings above relates to the remainder of the site. The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering the entire site which ensures that:  
  - Access is via the construction of a roundabout on Lee Lane which along with the road layouts will allow the development of the entire site  
  - a small scale convenience retail facility as part of the development that is in compliance with Local Plan policy TC5 Small Local Shops  
  - options are investigated for improving public transport access to the development and interventions included to encourage public transport use by residents.  
  - archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
    - information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains  
    - an assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
    - consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.  
  - Avoid locating built development in parts of the site within flood zones 2 and 3.  
  - An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
  - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. | Site H11 Land off Lee Lane, Royston Indicative number of dwellings 770. Planning permission has been granted on this site for 202 dwellings. The indicative number of dwellings above relates to the remainder of the site. The development will be subject to the production of a masterplan covering the entire site which ensures that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner. The development will be expected to:  
  - provide a primary school on site;  
  - ensure that access is via the construction of a roundabout on Lee Lane which along with the road layouts will allow the development of the entire site;  
  - provide a small scale convenience retail facility as part of the development that is in compliance with Local Plan policy TC5 Small Local Shops;  
  - investigate options for improving public transport access to the development and interventions to encourage public transport use by residents; and  
  - retain, buffer and manage ensure that hedgerows, the trees at the west side of the site and the strip adjacent to the disused railway line at the north of the site are retained, buffered and managed.  
  - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
  - an assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
  - consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
  - information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
  - an assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
  - consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
| MM 67                      | H70 Land East of Lundhill Road, Wombwell | Site H70 Land east of Lundhill Road, Wombwell Indicative number of dwellings 160 The development will be expected to:  
  - provide off site highway works  
  - retain, enhance and manage the species rich grassland at the west, the marshy grassland in the north, and the species-rich hedgerow in the north-east of the site  
  - archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
    - information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains  
    - an assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
    - consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.  
  - Avoid locating built development in parts of the site within flood zones 2 and 3.  
  - An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
  - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. | Site H70 Land east of Lundhill Road, Wombwell Indicative number of dwellings 160. The development will be expected to:  
  - provide off site highway works;  
  - retain, enhance and manage the species rich grassland at the west, the marshy grassland in the north, and the species-rich hedgerow in the north-east of the site; and  
  - Avoid locating built development in parts of the site within flood zones 2 and 3.  
  - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
  - an assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
  - consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
  - information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
  - an assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
  - consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
<p>| MM 68                      | Site EC8 Land off Roughbirchworth Lane, Oxspring | Site EC8, Land off Roughbirchworth Lane, Oxspring Indicative number of dwellings 22. Add site policy: | Add site policy: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orth Lane, Oxspring Map change 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fully evaluate existing woodland trees for their biodiversity value and retain mature trees;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Retain or create a buffer of trees/woody vegetation adjacent to the Trans Pennine Trail (to the north-east) to reinforce the wildlife corridor;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluate existing farm buildings for their bat roost and nesting bird value;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluate the site’s importance as overwintering feeding habitat for golden plovers and provide mitigation or compensation habitat as appropriate; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure the impacts/effects on the landscape are appropriately minimised and mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is a further protected species issue which affects the northern portion of this site. Any applicant/developer should contact Barnsley Council’s Planning Policy team for details which would need to be addressed within any proposals for a planning application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• An assessment of the significance of the remains; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 69</td>
<td>Site EC10 Land off High Street, Great Houghton</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add site policy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site EC10 Land off High Street, Great Houghton Indicative number of dwellings 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fully evaluate any hedgerows which are proposed for removal against all the criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997. Valuable hedgerows must be retained within any development. The hedgerow at the north of the site should be retained and maintained;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess mature trees for their ecological value with any valuable or veteran trees being retained; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure the impacts/effects on the landscape are appropriately minimised and mitigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological remains are known/expected to be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• An assessment of the significance of the remains; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 70</td>
<td>Site EC12 Land off Cote Lane, Thurgoland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Add site policy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site EC12 Land off Cote Lane, Thurgoland Indicative number of dwellings 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey the vegetation in the south and east half of the site, and retain high ecological value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification Reference</td>
<td>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</td>
<td>Original Text (where applicable)</td>
<td>Main Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM 71                       | Site SAF22 north of Halifax Road, Thurgoland | Add site policy: Site SAF22 Land north of Halifax Road, Thurgoland  Indicative number of dwellings 19 | The development will be expected to:  
- Retain the hedgerows on the southern and eastern boundaries. If it is proposed to remove any of these sections of hedgerow they should first be fully evaluated against all the criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997; and  
- Ensure the impacts/ effects on the landscape are appropriately minimised and mitigated.  
Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation of necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
| MM 72                       | Site 476 Land off New Road, Tankersley | Add site policy: Site 476 Land off New Road, Tankersley  Indicative number of dwellings 26 | The development will be expected to:  
- Retain the mature boundary trees and the hedgerow at the south of the site. If proposed for removal the trees should be assessed for their ecological value and the hedgerow evaluated against all the criteria of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997; and  
- Create a buffer strip of native tree planting at the boundary where the site abuts a Local Nature Reserve woodland to the south-west, which is an England Priority Woodland Habitat.  
Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation of necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development. |
<p>| MM 73                       | Site EC13 Everill Gate | Add site policy: | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site EC13 Everill Gate Farm, Broomhill Indicative number of dwellings 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Retain the pond and associated wetland-related habitat around it; maintain and improve its biodiversity value; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensure the impacts/ effects on the landscape are appropriately minimised and mitigated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological remains are known / expected to be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation of necessary) that must include the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 74</td>
<td>Site 957 Land at Hall Farm Church Street, Barnsley</td>
<td>Add site policy:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site 957 Land at Hall Farm, Church Street, Brierley Indicative number of dwellings 29</td>
<td>The development will be expected to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Retain the mature on-site trees and protect them by any development;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Retain and manage the intact hedgerow forming the north-west and north-east boundaries; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Respect the historic setting of the Brierley Conservation Area which it lies within as well as the setting of Brierley Hall to the south west by the use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting and the historic vernacular, appropriate scaling, massing, details and materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation of necessary) that must include the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- An assessment of the significance of the remains; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 75</td>
<td>Policy H4 Uses on Allocated Housing Sites</td>
<td>Amend policy to read:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The sites shown as housing sites on the Policies Maps will be developed mainly for residential purposes. We will only allow other uses on these sites where:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- They are small scale and ancillary to the housing elements; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- They provide a service or other facility mainly for local residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The sites shown as housing sites on the Policies Maps will be developed mainly for residential purposes. We will only allow other uses on these sites will only be allowed where:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- They are small scale and ancillary to the housing elements; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- They provide a service or other facility mainly for local residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 76</td>
<td>Policy H6 Residential development on large non allocated</td>
<td>Policy H6 Residential Development on Large Non-allocated Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposals for residential development on sites above 0.4 hectares which are not shown as housing sites on the Policies Maps will be given priority where they are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | Proposals for residential development on sites above 0.4 hectares which are not shown as housing sites on the Policies Maps will be given priority supported where they:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sites And supporting text paragraph 9.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Located on previously developed land.</td>
<td>• Are located on previously or part previously developed land; Located within Urban Barnsley or the Principal Towns as shown on the Proposal Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Located within Urban Barnsley or the Principal Towns as shown on the Proposal Maps</td>
<td>If the above criteria are satisfied residential development will be allowed where it can be demonstrated that the site:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the above criteria are satisfied residential development will be allowed where it can be demonstrated that the site:</td>
<td>• Are is located within the built up area of Urban Barnsley, the Principal Towns and Villages;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Is located within the built up area. Sites on the edge of settlements will need to provide acceptable mitigation of their impact on the countryside or they will not be considered to be acceptable locations for residential development; and</td>
<td>• Are is accessible by public transport; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Is accessible by public transport; and</td>
<td>• Has Have good access to a range of shops and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Has good access to a range of shops and services.</td>
<td>Sites on the edge of settlements will need to provide acceptable mitigation of their impact on the countryside or they will not be considered to be acceptable locations for residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.13 To ensure sustainable development and to comply with the settlement hierarchy it is important that large housing developments are located in larger settlements as defined in the settlement hierarchy. These are Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns of Cudworth, Goldthorpe (The Deame Towns), Hoyland, Penistone, Royston and Wombwell.</td>
<td>9.13 To ensure sustainable development and to comply with the settlement hierarchy it is important that large housing developments are located in larger settlements as defined in the settlement hierarchy. These are Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns of Cudworth, Goldthorpe (The Deame Towns), Hoyland, Penistone, Royston and Wombwell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 77</td>
<td>Policy H7 Housing Mix and Efficient Use of Land</td>
<td>Policy H7 Housing Mix and Efficient Use of Land</td>
<td>Policy H7 Housing Mix and Efficient Use of Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing proposals will be expected to include a broad mix of house size, type and tenure to help create mixed and balanced communities. Homes must be suitable for different types of households and be capable of being adapted to meet the changing needs of the population.</td>
<td>Housing proposals will be expected to include a broad mix of house size, type and tenure to help create mixed and balanced communities. Homes must be suitable for different types of households and be capable of being adapted to meet the changing needs of the population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposals to change the size and type of existing housing stock must maintain an appropriate mix of homes to meet local needs.</td>
<td>Proposals to change the size and type of existing housing stock must maintain an appropriate mix of homes to meet local needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A density of about 40 dwellings per hectare will be expected.</td>
<td>A density of about 40 dwellings per hectare net will be expected in Urban Barnsley and Principal Towns and 30 dwellings per hectare net in the villages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower densities will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they are necessary for need, viability or sustainable design reasons.</td>
<td>Lower densities will be supported where it can be demonstrated that they are necessary for character and appearance, need, viability or sustainable design reasons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.20 A density of about 40 dwellings per hectare is expected. We recognise that it is important that the density of development is appropriate to the site. Lower densities will be supported if there is robust supporting evidence to outweigh the objective of making the most efficient use of land. The mix of housing on a site should also be appropriate to the scale and context of the development and the character of the area.</td>
<td>9.20 A density of about 40 dwellings per hectare net is expected in Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns and 30 dwellings per hectare net in villages. We recognise that it is important that the density of development is appropriate to the site. Lower densities will be supported if there is robust supporting evidence to outweigh the objective of making the most efficient use of land. The mix of housing on a site should also be appropriate to the scale and context of the development and the character of the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 78</td>
<td>Policy H8 Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Policy H8 Affordable Housing</td>
<td>Policy H8 Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing developments of 15 or more dwellings will be expected to provide affordable housing.</td>
<td>Housing developments of 15 or more dwellings will be expected to provide affordable housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30% affordable housing will be expected in Penistone and Dodworth and Rural West, 20% in Darton and Barugh; 10% in Bolton, Goldthorpe, Thornesco, Hoyland, Wombwell, Darfield, North Barnsley and Royston, South Barnsley and Worsbrough and Rural East.</td>
<td>30% affordable housing will be expected in Penistone and Dodworth and Rural West, 20% in Darton and Barugh; 10% in Bolton, Goldthorpe, Thornesco, Hoyland, Wombwell, Darfield, North Barnsley and Royston, South Barnsley and Worsbrough and Rural East.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These percentages will be sought unless it can be demonstrated through a viability assessment that the required figure would render the scheme unviable.</td>
<td>These percentages will be sought unless it can be demonstrated through a viability assessment that the required figure would render the scheme unviable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The developer must show that arrangements have been put in place to keep the new homes affordable.</td>
<td>The developer must show that arrangements have been put in place to keep the new homes affordable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification Reference</td>
<td>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</td>
<td>Original Text (where applicable)</td>
<td>Main Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>Policy H8 Housing Regeneration Areas</td>
<td>We recognise the importance of providing affordable homes in rural settlements that are constrained by or washed over by Green Belt. Policy H8 makes provision for rural exception sites to be considered specifically for affordable housing where market value homes would not be allowed. These may in some instances be on the edge of the settlement. We will require a planning obligation to make sure the homes remain affordable.</td>
<td>Limited affordable housing to meet community needs may be allowed in Green Belt or on the edge of villages. 9.30 We recognise the importance of providing affordable homes in rural settlements that are constrained by or washed over by Green Belt. Policy H8 makes provision for rural exception sites to be considered specifically for affordable housing where market value homes would not be allowed. These may in some instances be on the edge of the settlement. We will require a planning obligation to make sure the homes remain affordable. If provision of some market housing is necessary to make the affordable housing viable, this would be considered and would be subject to an open book viability appraisal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 79</td>
<td>Policy GT1 Sites for Travellers and Travelling Showpeople</td>
<td>Sites will be allocated to meet the shortfall in provision of permanent sites. The following criteria will be used in allocating sites and in determining planning applications: In terms of their broad location sites will: • have good access to facilities</td>
<td>Policy GT1 Sites for Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Sites will be allocated to meet the shortfall in provision of permanent sites. The following criteria will be used in allocating sites and in determining planning applications: In terms of their broad location sites will: • Have good access to facilities; and • Be primarily located within urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification Reference</td>
<td>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</td>
<td>Original Text (where applicable)</td>
<td>Main Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM 81                        | Site Policy GT2 Sites for Travellers: TRAV013A Land at Carlton Industrial Estate | • be primarily located within urban areas  
• In terms of their specific location the sites will:  
  • not be in an area of high flood risk  
  • not be affected by contamination, unless the site can be adequately remediated  
  • have adequate vehicular and pedestrian access from the highway  
  • provide a good safe living environment with appropriate standards of residential amenity  
  • have the ability to be developed in accordance with the CLG Gypsy and Traveller Site Design Guide (May 2008)  
  • have no other restrictive development constraints  
Self sought provision will be positively considered where it accords with this policy and other relevant policies in the Local Plan.  
Temporary Stopping Places:  
Sites for temporary stopping places should provide safe and convenient access to road networks and be located so as to cause minimum disruption to surrounding communities. Land contamination, flood risk issues and any health and safety risks that may arise for occupants from adjoining land uses, must also be considered (especially in regard to children). | In terms of their specific location the sites will:  
  • not be in an area of high flood risk  
  • not be affected by contamination, unless the site can be adequately remediated  
  • have the ability to be developed in accordance with the CLG Gypsy and Traveller Site Design Guide (May 2008)  
  • have no other restrictive development constraints  
Self sought provision will be positively considered where it accords with this policy and other relevant policies in the Local Plan.  
Temporary Stopping Places:  
Sites for Temporary Stopping Places Transit Sites should provide safe and convenient access to road networks and be located so as to cause minimum disruption to surrounding communities. Land contamination, flood risk issues and any health and safety risks that may arise for occupants from adjoining land uses, must also be considered (especially in regard to children). |
| MM 82                        | Policy Mixed Use Sites 1 | | |
| Urban Barnsley               | Site MU1 Land south of Barugh Green Road | The site is proposed for mixed use predominantly for housing and employment. The indicative number of dwellings proposed on this site is 1700. These are included in the housing numbers for Urban Barnsley in the housing chapter.  
43 ha of employment land is proposed on the site and is included in the employment land figures in the Urban Barnsley section of the Economy chapter. | The site is proposed for mixed use predominantly for housing and employment. The indicative number of dwellings proposed on this site is 1700. These are included in the housing numbers for Urban Barnsley in the housing chapter.  
43 ha of employment land is proposed on the site and is included in the employment land figures in the Urban Barnsley section of the Economy chapter. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM 84                       | Site AC12 Land off Shaw Lane Carlton | A primary school and other community infrastructure will be included. The development will be subject to the production of a phased masterplan covering the entire site which seeks to ensure that other uses come forward before completion of the housing.  
- A primary school is provided on the site  
- Ground stability and contamination investigations are undertaken prior to development and necessary remedial works completed  
- On and off site highways infrastructure works are carried out, including a link road (Claycliffe Link) and improvements at Junction 37 as necessary  
- Small scale convenience retail and community facilities are provided in compliance with Local Plan policy TCS Small Local Shops  
- Retain, buffer and manage the watercourse, grassland and woodland north-east of Hermit Lane;  
- Retain, buffer and manage the species-rich hedgerows and boundary features. Where this is not possible transplant hedgerows including root balls and associated soils. A method statement for this should be provided and agreed prior to works commencing;  
- Create/retain wildlife corridors through/across the site  
- Any sustainable drainage system incorporating above-ground habitats must be designed from the outset to serve the whole site;  
- Give consideration to the drain/ culvert that runs through the site  
- Include measures for the protection and retention of the listed milepost on Barugh Green Road 500m west of the junction with Claycliffe Road and its immediate setting;  
-Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
- Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains;  
- An assessment of the significance of the remains;  
- Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.  
- The development will be expected to:  
  - Provide a primary school on the site;  
  - Ensure that ground stability and contamination investigations are undertaken prior to development commencing and necessary remedial works completed  
  - Provide on and off site highway infrastructure works are carried out, including a link road (Claycliffe Link) and improvements at Junction 37 as necessary;  
  - Provide small scale convenience retail and community facilities are provided in compliance with Local Plan policy TCS Small Local Shops;  
  - Retain, buffer and manage the watercourse, grassland and woodland north-east of Hermit Lane;  
  - Retain, buffer and manage the species-rich hedgerows and boundary features. Where this is not possible transplant hedgerows including root balls and associated soils. A method statement for this should be provided and agreed prior to works commencing;  
  - Create/retain wildlife corridors through/across the site;  
  - Provide accessible public open space;  
  - Ensure that any sustainable drainage system incorporating above-ground habitats is designed from the outset to serve the whole site;  
  - Give consideration to the drain/culvert that runs through the site  
  - Include measures for the protection and retention of the listed milepost on Barugh Green Road 500m west of the junction with Claycliffe Road and its immediate setting;  
  - Protect the routes of the Public Rights of Way Footpaths that cross the site, and make provision for these as part of any proposal.  
- Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:  
  - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains  
  - An assessment of the significance of the remains  
  - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development  
<p>| Site AC12 Land off Shaw Lane Carlton | Site AC12 Land off Shaw Lane Carlton | This site is proposed for mixed use for housing and green space. The indicative number of dwellings proposed for this site is 1206. These are included in the housing figures for Urban Barnsley in the housing chapter. The green space known as Wharncliffe Woodmoor will be retained. | This site is proposed for mixed use for housing and green space. The indicative number of dwellings proposed for this site is 1206-1683. These are included in the housing figures for Urban Barnsley in the housing chapter. The green space known as Wharncliffe Woodmoor will be retained. |
| Site AC12 Land off Shaw Lane Carlton | Site AC12 Land off Shaw Lane Carlton | This site is proposed for mixed use for housing and green space. The indicative number of dwellings proposed for this site is 1206. These are included in the housing figures for Urban Barnsley in the housing chapter. The green space known as Wharncliffe Woodmoor will be retained. | This site is proposed for mixed use for housing and green space. The indicative number of dwellings proposed for this site is 1206-1683. These are included in the housing figures for Urban Barnsley in the housing chapter. The green space known as Wharncliffe Woodmoor will be retained. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| H44                         |                                | The development will be subject to the production of a phased masterplan covering the entire site and including housing site H44, which ensures that:  
  - housing development is to the north of Wharncliffe Woodmoor green space  
  - access is provided from Far Field Lane roundabout  
  - off site highway works are provided  
  - the southern part of the site has high ecological value based primarily on its woodland blocks and a road should be taken through as sensitively through as possible to facilitate the housing development, with appropriate mitigation provided  
  - vegetation in the southern part of the site is retained, together with the watercourses in the centre of the site with a buffer. The grassland just south of Shaw Lane, near the centre of the site should be retained  
  - Boundary vegetation in the northern portion of the site should be retained together with the grassland in the very north-east. A wildlife corridor running down the eastern side of the site should be retained.  
  - appropriate acoustic treatment to mitigate against noise from Manor Bakeries and Boulder Bridge is provided  
  - small scale convenience retail and community facilities are provided in compliance with Local Plan policy TC5 Small Local Shops | The development will be subject to the production of a phased masterplan Masterplan Framework covering the entire site and including housing site H44 which ensures that to ensure that development is brought forward in a comprehensive manner.  
**The development will be expected to:**  
  - Housing development is to the north of Wharncliffe Woodmoor green space  
  - Retain areas of woodland, not affected by the road. Should any part of the existing Wharncliffe Woodmoor green space be developed, an area of compensatory biodiversity-value green space of equivalent size should be created on the land within site AC12 to the east of the existing Wharncliffe Woodmoor green space. Compensatory areas will need to be linked to Wharncliffe Woodmoor by wildlife corridors;  
  - Provide access is provided from Far Field Lane roundabout;  
  - Provide off site highway works; are provided  
  - Retain the higher ecological value habitats in the southern part of Wharncliffe Woodmoor green space, together with the water courses in the centre of the site with a buffer;  
  - The southern part of the site has high ecological value based primarily on its woodland blocks and a road should be taken through as sensitively through as possible to facilitate the housing development, with appropriate mitigation provided  
  - vegetation in the southern part of the site is retained, together with the watercourses in the centre of the site with a buffer. The grassland just south of Shaw Lane, near the centre of the site should be retained.  
  - Boundary vegetation in the northern portion of the site should be retained together with the grassland in the very north-east. A wildlife corridor running down the eastern side of the site should be retained.  
  - Provide robust measures to mitigate ecological impact where the construction of the access road impacts upon the southern part of the site which has high ecological value and in particular woodland blocks;  
  - Provide robust mitigation measures to mitigate against noise, odour and other potential impacts arising from the existing industrial operations at Manor Bakeries and Boulder Bridge; appropriate acoustic treatment to mitigate against noise from Manor Bakeries and Boulder Bridge is provided  
  - Provide, small scale convenience retail and community facilities are provided in compliance with Local Plan policy TC5 Small Local Shops; and  
  - Avoid locating built development in parts of the site within flood zone 2 and 3. | Add the following as supporting text:  
**The following areas of higher ecological value habitats are of particular importance; and should be retained:**  
  - The grassland just South of Shaw Lane, near the centre of the site;  
  - Boundary vegetation in the northern portion of the site;  
  - Grassland in the very north east;  
  - Retain a Wildlife corridor running down the eastern side of the site; and  
  - Buffer and preserve the habitats of higher ecological value in the part of the site to the east of the existing Wharncliffe Woodmoor POS. These areas include:  
    - The western and eastern boundaries of this part of the site including the stream and woodland; and  
    - The stream corridor that crosses the north western section of this part of the site. |
particularly in Barnsley Town Centre, Wombwell and North East areas of the borough. The Local Plan proposes to allocate the following sites for the future development of primary schools. Some are part of Mixed Use proposals.

11.3 Further information is provided in the infrastructure delivery plan.

Policy ED1 Primary School Site Policies

All developments will be expected to comply with policy GD1 General Development

Planning permission will be expected to be granted if details are provided in accordance with the following site specific policies.

11.4 Below is a list of proposed primary school sites. Where there are specific issues site specific policies are provided. Where there are no site specific details any subsequent planning application will be determined in accordance with the Local Plan.

Urban Barnsley

Site AC11 Land between Fish Dam Lane and Carlton Road

This is proposed for mixed use for housing and a primary school.

The indicative number of dwellings proposed for this site is 294. These have been included in the housing figures for Urban Barnsley in the housing chapter.

The development will be expected to:

- respect the setting of the listed Manor Farmhouse and the Carlton Conservation Area immediately adjacent to the East by the use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting, scaling, massing, details and materials.
- retain the woodland and grassland to the north west of Manor Street
- retain existing vegetation on the wildlife corridor adjacent the stream at the south and west of site.
- Archaeological remains are known/expected to be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:
  - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains
  - An assessment of the significance of the remains
  - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.

Site MU1 Land south of Barugh Green Road

The site is proposed for mixed use predominantly for housing and employment. The indicative number of dwellings proposed on this site is 1700. These are included in the housing numbers for Urban Barnsley in the housing chapter.

11.2 This work has indicated pressures in the capacity of Primary Schools, particularly in Barnsley Town Centre, Wombwell and North East areas of the borough. The Local Plan proposes to allocate the following sites for the future development of primary schools as part of mixed use allocations. Some are part of Mixed Use proposals.

Please see the site specific policies in the 'Mixed Use Sites' chapter.

AC11 Land between Fish Dam Lane and Carlton Road
MU1 Land south of Barugh Green Road
H1 Land off Lee Lane Royston
AC40 Former Wombwell High School, Wombwell

11.3 Further information is provided in the infrastructure delivery plan.

Policy ED1 Primary School Site Policies

All developments will be expected to comply with policy GD1 General Development

Planning permission will be expected to be granted if details are provided in accordance with the following site specific policies.

11.4 Below is a list of proposed primary school sites. Where there are specific issues site specific policies are provided. Where there are no site specific details any subsequent planning application will be determined in accordance with the Local Plan.

Urban Barnsley

Site AC11 Land between Fish Dam Lane and Carlton Road

This site is proposed for mixed use for housing and a primary school.

The indicative number of dwellings proposed for this site is 294. These have been included in the housing figures for Urban Barnsley in the housing chapter.

The development will be expected to:

- respect the setting of the listed Manor Farmhouse and the Carlton Conservation Area immediately adjacent to the East by the use of appropriate site layout, sympathetic design that reflects the setting, scaling, massing, details and materials.
- retain the woodland and grassland to the north west of Manor Street
- retain existing vegetation on the wildlife corridor adjacent the stream at the south and west of site.
- Archaeological remains are known/expected to be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:
  - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains
  - An assessment of the significance of the remains
  - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.

Site MU1 Land south of Barugh Green Road

The site is proposed for mixed use predominantly for housing and employment. The indicative number of dwellings proposed on this site is 1700. These are included in the housing numbers for Urban Barnsley in the housing chapter.

43 ha of employment land is proposed on the site and is included in the employment land figures in the Urban
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43 ha of employment land is proposed on the site and is included in the employment land figures in the Urban Barnsley section of the Economy chapter. A primary school and other community infrastructure will be included. The development will be subject to the production of a phased masterplan covering the entire site which seeks to ensure that other uses come forward before completion of the housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A primary school is provided on the site.
- Ground stability and contamination investigations are undertaken prior to development and necessary remedial works completed.
- On and off site highways infrastructure works are carried out, including a link road (Claycliffe Link) and improvements at Junction 37 as necessary.
- Small scale convenience retail and community facilities are provided in compliance with Local Plan policy TC5 Small Local Shops.
- Retain, buffer and manage the watercourse, grassland and woodland north-east of Hermit Lane.
- Retain, buffer and manage the species-rich hedgerows and boundary features. Where this is not possible transplant hedgerows including root balls and associated soils. A method statement for this should be provided and agreed prior to works commencing.
- Create/retain wildlife corridors through/across the site.
- Any sustainable drainage system incorporating above-ground habitats must be designed from the outset to serve the whole site.
- Give consideration to the drain/culvert that runs throughout the site.
- Include measures for the protection and retention of the listed milepost on Barugh Green Road 500m west of the junction with Claycliffe Road and its immediate setting.
- Archaeological remains may be present on this site therefore proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate archaeological assessment (including a field evaluation if necessary) that must include the following:
  - Information identifying the likely location and extent of the remains, and the nature of the remains.
  - An assessment of the significance of the remains.
  - Consideration of how the remains would be affected by the proposed development.

Royston Site 186 Land at Lee Lane, Royston

Wombwell Site H27 Former Wombwell High School, Wombwell

This site is proposed for mixed use for housing and a primary school. The indicative number of dwellings proposed for the site is 250. Two hectares of the site is proposed for a primary school. The development will be expected to:

- Provide a new access and any necessary highway interventions at Lund Hill Road and Park Street.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 86 Policy T3 and supporting text paragraphs 12.66 and 12.67</td>
<td>Policy T3 New Development and Sustainable Travel</td>
<td>New development will be expected to:</td>
<td>Policy T3 New Development and Sustainable Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• be located and designed to reduce the need to travel, be accessible to public transport and meet the needs of pedestrians and cyclists</td>
<td>New development will be expected to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• provide at least the minimum levels of parking for cycles, motorbikes, scooters, mopeds and disabled people, and should not provide more than the maximum number of car parking spaces set out in the relevant Supplementary Planning Document</td>
<td>• Be located and designed to reduce the need to travel, be accessible to public transport and meet the needs of pedestrians and cyclists;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• provide a transport statement or assessment in line with the thresholds and guidance set out in Department for Transport ‘Guidance on Transport Assessments’ as published March 2007 (or any subsequent version)</td>
<td>• Provide at least the minimum levels of parking for cycles, motorbikes, scooters, mopeds and disabled people set out in the relevant Supplementary Planning Document; and should not provide more than the maximum number of car parking spaces set out in the relevant Supplementary Planning Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where levels of accessibility through public transport, cycling and walking are unacceptable, we will expect developers to take action or make financial contributions in accordance with policy I1</td>
<td>• Provide a transport statement or assessment in line with guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework thresholds and guidance in Department for Transport ‘Guidance on Transport Assessments’ as published March 2007 (or any subsequent version), including where appropriate having regard for cross boundary local authority liaison impacts; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If it is not possible or appropriate for the minimum amount of parking for cycles motorbikes, scooters and mopeds to be met on site, the developer must provide, or contribute towards, off-site parking, or improve or provide other forms of travel.</td>
<td>• Provide a travel plan statement or a travel plan in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework Department for Transport ‘Good Practice Guidelines: Delivering Travel Plans through the Planning Process’ as published April 2009 (or any subsequent version). Travel plans will be secured through a planning obligation or a planning condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 87 Policy T4</td>
<td>Policy T4 New Development and Highway Improvement</td>
<td>New development will be expected to be designed and built to provide safe, secure and convenient access for all road users.</td>
<td>Policy T4 New Development and Highway Improvement: Transport Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If a development is not so suitably served by the existing highway, or would create or add to highway safety problems or the efficiency of the highway for all road users, we will expect developers to take mitigating action or to make a financial contribution to make sure the necessary improvements go ahead. Any contributions will be secured through a planning obligation or planning condition.</td>
<td>New development will be expected to be designed and built to provide all transport users within and surrounding the development with safe, secure and convenient access for all road users and movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 88 Paragraph 12.70</td>
<td>12.70 If a development is not suitably served by the existing highway, or would create or add to highway safety problems or the efficiency of the highway we will refuse planning permission, unless the developer agrees to take full responsibility for any necessary improvements or measures to upgrade the highway network to a suitable standard. Under the Highways Act, the developer may need to create and maintain new roads or improve existing ones.</td>
<td>12.70 If a development is not suitably served by the existing highway, or would create or add to highway safety problems (including at railway level crossings) or would adversely affect the efficiency of the highway we will refuse planning permission, unless the developer agrees to take full responsibility for any necessary improvements or measures to upgrade the highway network to a suitable standard. Under the Highways Act, the developer may need to create and maintain new roads or improve existing ones.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.79 In line with national and regional guidance we are working with our sub regional partners to implement a South Yorkshire Freight Quality Partnership to determine how to balance the needs of local businesses, minimise congestion and improve air quality. The partnership will involve the freight industry and will consider issues including journey times, routes, highway improvements to ease congestion, road safety, and the design of new development (especially retail proposals) to adequately accommodate delivery vehicles.

**The National Strategic Highway Network**

12.81 The M1 and A61(T) within the Barnsley borough generally have sufficient capacity for 2008 traffic demands. The Highways Agency has introduced ramp metering at M1 junctions 35 and 35A southbound on-slip roads as a means of regulating the flow of traffic onto the motorway at times of peak demand. Operational conditions on the strategic road and local highway networks and the potential implications of new developments will be kept under review and the most up to date information will inform decisions about proposals for development.

12.82 In January 2009 The Secretary of State for Transport announced managed motorway proposals for the M1 in South and West Yorkshire. It is proposed that the following sections of this route will be the subject of enhancements by the Highways Agency utilising controlled use of the hard shoulder (Hard Shoulder Running, HSR):

- in 2012 and 2013, M1 junction 32 to 35A east of Sheffield
- by 2015 M1 junction 39 to 42 Wakefield

12.83 Full details of these proposals can be seen on the Highways Agency website at www.highways.gov.uk

12.83 Full details of these proposals can be seen on the Highways Agency website at www.highways.gov.uk

12.83 These enhancements will increase capacity for strategic traffic and relieve existing traffic delays. Paragraph 18 of Circular 02/02013 states "capacity enhancements and infrastructure required to deliver strategic growth should be identified at the Local Plan stage, which provides the best opportunity to consider development aspirations alongside the associated infrastructure needs", "

**Policy D1 Design**

**Design Principles:**

High quality development will be expected to respect, take advantage of and reinforce the distinctive character and features of Barnsley, including:

- topography, Green Infrastructure assets, important habitats, woodlands and other natural features
- views and vistas to key buildings, landmarks, skylines and gateways
- heritage, townscape and landscape character including the scale, layout, building

Delete policy D1 and supporting text in its entirety and replace with the following text:

**Policy D1 High Quality Design and Place Making**

**Design Principles:**

Development is expected to be of high quality design and will be expected to respect, take advantage of and reinforce the distinctive, local character and features of Barnsley, including:

- Landscape character, topography, green Infrastructure assets, important habitats, woodlands and other natural features;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Views and vistas to key buildings, landmarks, skylines and gateways; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heritage and townscape character including the scale, layout, building styles and materials of the built form in the locality, particularly in and around:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Barnsley Town Centre</td>
<td>- Barnsley Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Penistone and the rural villages in the west of the borough</td>
<td>- Penistone and the rural villages in the west of the borough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>within and adjacent to Conservation Areas</td>
<td>within and adjacent to Conservation Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>This policy sets overarching design principles for the borough to ensure that development is appropriate to its context, and improves what needs improving, whilst protecting what is good about what we have. Design that reflects the character of areas will help to strengthen their distinctiveness, identity and people's sense of belonging to them. The policy also acknowledges the vital role that good design can play in supporting economic and physical regeneration and bringing about new forms of distinctiveness by making run down areas both physically and economically more attractive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Public Spaces Strategy and the Building Heights Study provide evidence for design decisions in Barnsley Town Centre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of design has reached a high position in the national consciousness and planning agenda. As the Local Planning Authority dealing with planning applications the council has a responsibility to bring about a better built environment. Setting a high design quality standard for new development will make Barnsley a more attractive place to live, work and enjoy leisure, and will help to underpin economic regeneration. Good design is also necessary to promote civic pride and reinforce a sense of identity and place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>The above policy will be applied to new developments, and where appropriate to the extension and conversion of existing buildings. Supplementary Planning Documents will be refreshed which provide further advice on the design of new housing development, house extensions, designing out crime, advertisements and shopfront design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Government has produced guidance and design through the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Planning Practice Guidance reinforces that the successful integration of all forms of new development with their surrounding context is an important design objective, whilst not preventing outstanding or innovative designs which help to raise the standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

13.1 This policy sets overarching design principles for the borough to ensure that development is appropriate to its context, and improves what needs improving, whilst protecting what is good about what we have. Design that reflects the character of areas will help to strengthen their distinctiveness, identity and people's sense of belonging to them. The policy also acknowledges the vital role that good design can play in supporting economic and physical regeneration and bringing about new forms of distinctiveness by making run down areas both physically and economically more attractive.

13.2 The Public Spaces Strategy and the Building Heights Study provide evidence for design decisions in Barnsley Town Centre.

13.3 Quality of design has reached a high position in the national consciousness and planning agenda. As the Local Planning Authority dealing with planning applications the council has a responsibility to bring about a better built environment. Setting a high design quality standard for new development will make Barnsley a more attractive place to live, work and enjoy leisure, and will help to underpin economic regeneration. Good design is also necessary to promote civic pride and reinforce a sense of identity and place.

13.4 The above policy will be applied to new developments, and where appropriate to the extension and conversion of existing buildings. Supplementary Planning Documents will be refreshed which provide further advice on the design of new housing development, house extensions, designing out crime, advertisements and shopfront design.

13.5 The Government has produced guidance and design through the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance.

13.6 The Planning Practice Guidance reinforces that the successful integration of all forms of new development with their surrounding context is an important design objective, whilst not preventing outstanding or innovative designs which help to raise the standards.
### Policy TC2 Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages

Within the primary and secondary shopping frontages in Barnsley Town Centre and the District Centres, ground floor uses should be predominantly retail in nature. Financial and professional services (class A2) and food and drink (classes A3 to A5) uses will also be acceptable. Proposals for retail (A1-A5) uses will be allowed on Primary and Secondary Shopping frontages in Barnsley Town Centre and the District Centres provided that:

- **Within each primary shopping frontage in Barnsley Town Centre and the District Centres, ground floor uses would remain predominantly retail (Class A1) in nature.**

- Other uses may be acceptable, especially where they diversify and improve provision in a centre, provided that it can be demonstrated that the vitality and viability of the primary shopping area concerned would not negatively affected and that ground floor uses on the Primary Shopping Frontages remain predominantly retail (Class A1) in nature.

Insert the following paragraph of supporting text before existing paragraph 15.20

For the purposes of policy TC2 we take the view that predominantly means ‘most’ and will apply a 51% threshold. The other uses referred to in policy TC2 are primarily envisaged to be the other main town centre uses defined by the NPPF. The onus will be on the applicant to demonstrate that any other (non A1-A5 use), will be acceptable.

### Policy TC3 Thresholds for Impact Assessments

Proposals for retail and leisure uses will be required to provide an impact assessment if they are:

- Located outside the Primary Shopping Area of Barnsley Town Centre and are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM 91 MM 92                 | Policy TC2 Primary and Secondary Shopping Frontages | Proposals for retail and leisure uses will be required to provide an impact assessment if they are: | **13.45** Development should take account of the following design standards and guidance (and any future updates of these) which will be used (but not exclusively) to help assess the quality of design:
  - Building for Life 12 (for residential developments of 10 or more dwellings)
  - Secured By Design/ Safer Places- the Planning System and Crime Prevention
  - Manual for Streets (for residential developments)
  - Manual for Streets 2: Wider Application of the Principles (which takes this guidance beyond just residential developments)
  - The South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 93</td>
<td>TC4 Retail Parks</td>
<td>Policy TC4 Retail Parks</td>
<td>Outside existing centres we will allow small convenience shops that meet the daily shopping needs of a local community if:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the retail parks identified on the Policies Map only retail warehouses will be allowed. Planning permissions on these retail parks will be subject to conditions to limit:</td>
<td>The shops are of a type and in a place that would meet the daily shopping needs of a local community if:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The minimum size of units to at least 1,000 square metres gross; and</td>
<td>• The minimum size of units to at least 1,000 square metres gross; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The type of goods which can be sold from the units to bulky comparison goods.</td>
<td>• The type of goods which can be sold from the units to bulky comparison goods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy TC4 Retail Parks</td>
<td>Policy TC4 Retail Parks</td>
<td>Uses other than retail warehouses will be allowed where the role, character and function of the retail park will not be adversely affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the retail parks identified on the Policies Map only retail warehouses will be allowed. Uses other than retail warehouses will be allowed where the role, character and function of the retail park will not be adversely affected.</td>
<td>Except where justified, planning permissions on these retail parks will be subject to conditions to limit:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The minimum size of units to at least 1,000 square metres gross; and</td>
<td>• The minimum size of units to at least 1,000 square metres gross; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The type of goods which can be sold from the units to bulky comparison goods.</td>
<td>• The type of goods which can be sold from the units to bulky comparison goods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 94</td>
<td>TC5 Small Local Shops</td>
<td>Policy TC5 Small Local Shops</td>
<td>Outside existing centres we will allow small convenience shops that meet the daily shopping needs of a local community if:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside existing centres we will allow small convenience shops that meet the daily shopping needs of a local community if:</td>
<td>The shops are of a type and in a place that would meet local daily shopping needs and this need is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The shops are of a type and in a place that would meet local daily shopping needs and this need is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we have concerns that a proposal below these floorspace thresholds may have a significantly adverse impact on a centre, we may require an impact assessment as part of a planning application.

15.23 A map is provided in the Smaller Centres Study (November 2010) which shows the catchments of the defined centres in the borough including the catchments of Local Centres which are defined as being an 800 metre radius around each Local Centre. An impact assessment should include assessment of the impact of the proposal on the existing, committed and planned public and private investment in the centre(s) which the proposal is in the catchment area of. The assessment should also include an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the vitality and viability of the centre, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made, unless the proposal is for a major scheme where the full impact will not be realised in five years, in which case the impact should be assessed for up to ten years from the time the application is made.

Proposals will only be allowed if they are not likely to have significant adverse impact on investment or on town centre vitality and viability.

The District and Local Centres have localised catchments within which the specified threshold for impact assessment set out in Policy TC3 will apply. The Barnsley Town Centre catchment threshold of 2,500 sq m for impact assessment will apply across the remainder of the authority area.

Policy TC3 refers to Thresholds for Impact Assessments whereas policy TC5 sets out circumstances where small local shops will not require a sequential test.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BTC12 The Markets Area District</td>
<td>Policy BTC12 The Markets Area District</td>
<td>Within The Markets District we will allow housing, offices and small scale shops and services. We will not allow developments that would be harmful to the liveliness and economic strength of the town centre.</td>
<td>Policy BTC12 The Markets Area District We will allow shops, offices, leisure developments, and food and drink uses within the Markets District. We will allow residential development on upper floors, but not at ground level if it would harm the vitality and character of the town centre. We may allow other uses if they would support the liveliness and economic strength of the town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 96</td>
<td>BTC14 The Yards District</td>
<td>Policy BTC14 The Yards District Within The Yards District we will allow housing, offices and small scale shops and services. We will not allow developments that would be harmful to the liveliness and economic strength of the town centre.</td>
<td>Policy BTC14 The Yards District Within The Yards District we will allow housing, offices and small scale shops and services. We will not allow developments that would be harmful to the liveliness and economic strength of the town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 97</td>
<td>BTC15 Southern Fringe</td>
<td></td>
<td>BTC15 Southern Fringe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.27 Local shops perform an important role in meeting the day-to-day needs of communities. They are a vital part of creating sustainable communities, reducing the need for people to travel. We will encourage small shops where it can be shown that they meet a local need. Proposals for small shops will not normally require a sequential test provided that they accord with the criteria set out in Policy TC5.

Proposals for late night uses in the town centre will also be subject to Policy AAP1 The daytime and evening economies. Proposals for late night uses in the above locations will be supported provided they:
- Add to the range and diversity of uses on offer and increase customer choice;
- Do not have a significant adverse effect on amenity including from increased noise, disturbance, or antisocial behaviour;
- Can be adequately accessed, serviced and ventilated; and
- Are designed with public safety, crime prevention and the reduction of anti-social behaviour in mind

All such uses should have regard to the principles and practices of ‘Secured by Design’ and planning applications must be supported by a design statement.

Late night uses will only be encouraged in the following locations within the town centre:
- Wellington Street
- Peel Street
- Market Street
- Market Hill
- Graham’s Orchard

Proposals for late night uses in the town centre will also be subject to Policy AAP1 The daytime and evening economies.

15.27 Local shops perform an important role in meeting the day-to-day needs of communities. They are a vital part of creating sustainable communities, reducing the need for people to travel. We will encourage small shops where it can be shown that they meet a local need.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 98</td>
<td>Southern Fringe</td>
<td>Within the Southern Fringe District we will allow housing, offices, employment and commercial uses. We will allow small scale shops and services along the Dodworth Road frontage. We will not allow developments that would be harmful to the liveliness and economic strength of the town centre.</td>
<td>Within the Southern Fringe District we will allow housing, offices, employment and commercial uses. We will allow small scale shops and services along the Dodworth Road frontage. Developing developments will be <strong>allowed</strong> that would <strong>support be harmful to</strong> the liveliness and economic strength of the town centre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MM 99     | Policy BTC16 Development Site 2 Heelis Street | Policy BTC16 Development Site 2 Heelis Street We will allow mixed use developments which could include:  
- Retail  
- Residential  
- Offices  
The development of the site must also:  
- Make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the New Street Gateway  
Provide improvements to pedestrian links and public spaces around and through the site. | Policy BTC16 Development Site 2 Heelis Street We will allow mixed use developments which could include:  
- Retail  
- Residential  
- Offices  
- **Food and drink**  
The development of the site must also:  
- Make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the New Street Gateway; and  
- Provide improvements to pedestrian links and public spaces around and through the site. |
| MM 100    | Policy BTC19 Market Hill District | Policy BTC19 Market Hill District Within the Market Hill District on the east side of Church Street and on either side of Market Hill, we will allow uses and development that provide an active frontage at ground-floor level and are sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area. Appropriate uses include the following:  
- Shops  
- Financial and professional services, for example, estate agents, employment agencies, and advice bureaux  
- Food and drink, for example, restaurants, cafés and bars  
- Non residential institutions, including museums, art galleries and exhibition space  
- Assembly and leisure facilities. | Policy BTC19 Market Hill District Within the Market Hill District on the east side of Church Street and on either side of Market Hill, we will allow uses and development that provide an active frontage at ground-floor level and are sympathetic to **conserve or enhance** the character and appearance of the area. Appropriate uses include the following:  
- Shops  
- Financial and professional services, for example, estate agents, employment agencies, and advice bureaux  
- Food and drink, for example, restaurants, cafés and bars  
- Non- residential institutions, including museums, art galleries and exhibition space  
- Assembly and leisure facilities. |
| MM 101    | Policy BTC20 The Lanes        | All new development within the Lanes District must have an active frontage at ground floor level. The following uses will normally be allowed at ground floor level:  
- Shops  
- Financial and professional services (for example, estate agents, employment agencies, and advice bureaux)  
- Restaurants and cafés  
- Non residential institutions including museums, art galleries and exhibition space  
New development must maintain and enhance the specialist nature of this area by being of a size, scale, quality and design appropriate to the character of the area. Mandela Gardens must be maintained as public open space and no development that would harm its function and quality will be allowed. | All new development within the Lanes District must have an active frontage at ground floor level. The following uses will normally be allowed at ground floor level:  
- Shops  
- Financial and professional services (for example, estate agents, employment agencies, and advice bureaux)  
- **Food and drink for example** restaurants, and cafés **and bars**  
- Non- residential institutions including museums, art galleries and exhibition space  
New development must **maintain conserve or and enhance** the specialist nature of this area by being of a size, scale, quality and design appropriate to the character of the area. Mandela Gardens must be maintained as public open space and no development that would harm its function and quality will be allowed. |
<p>| BTC21     | Policy BTC21 Courthouse Campus | Policy BTC21 Courthouse Campus | Policy BTC21 Courthouse Campus |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 102</td>
<td></td>
<td>We will allow the following types of development in the Courthouse Campus District.</td>
<td>We will allow the following types of development in the Courthouse Campus District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Education and community facilities</td>
<td>• Education and community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Offices</td>
<td>• Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Developments designed to support the creative and digital industries</td>
<td>• Developments designed to support the creative and digital industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential development, including live-work units</td>
<td>• Residential development, including live-work units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Multi storey car parking</td>
<td>• Multi storey car parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A new public park and improved public spaces</td>
<td>• A new public park and improved public spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We will consider retail and leisure development in line with the sequential approach as set in TC1.</td>
<td>We will consider retail and leisure development in line with the sequential approach as set in TC1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 103</td>
<td>Policy BTC22 Development Site 3 Courthouse Campus</td>
<td>We will allow the following types of development:</td>
<td>Policy BTC22 Development Site 3 Courthouse Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Education and community facilities</td>
<td>• Education and community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Offices</td>
<td>• Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Developments designed to support the creative and digital industries</td>
<td>• Developments designed to support the creative and digital industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential development, including live-work units</td>
<td>• Residential development, including live-work units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development of the site will be expected to:</td>
<td>The development of the site will be expected to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Include the creation of a new public open space; and</td>
<td>• Include the creation of a new public open space; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide improvements to pedestrian links and public spaces</td>
<td>• Provide improvements to pedestrian links and public spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Take account of the Conservation Area status of part of the site</td>
<td>• Take account of Conserve or enhance the Conservation Area status of part of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We will use planning conditions or a planning obligation to ensure the above aspects are included in the development.</td>
<td>We will use planning conditions or a planning obligation to ensure the above aspects are included in the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 104</td>
<td>Policy BTC23 Eastern Gateway</td>
<td>We will allow transport related development, office, education, community and youth facilities and public spaces within the Eastern Gateway District.</td>
<td>Policy BTC23 Eastern Gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development within the District must make provision for the Green Sprint and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the gateways.</td>
<td>Development within the District must make provision for the Green Sprint and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the gateways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We will not allow developments that would be harmful to the liveliness and economic strength of the town centre.</td>
<td>We will not allow development that would be harmful to the Other uses will only be supported where they contribute to the vitality and viability, liveliness and economic strength of the town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 105</td>
<td>Policy BTC24 Development Site 4 Land between the Transport Interchange and Harborough Hill Road</td>
<td>We will allow the following types of development:</td>
<td>Policy BTC24 Development Site 4 Land between the Transport Interchange and Harborough Hill Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Offices</td>
<td>• Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Education, community and youth facilities</td>
<td>• Education, community and youth facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Transportation uses associated with the adjacent Transport Interchange</td>
<td>• Transportation uses associated with the adjacent Transport Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public space</td>
<td>• Public space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential</td>
<td>• Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ancillary retail</td>
<td>• Ancillary retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development of the site will be expected to:</td>
<td>The development of the site will be expected to:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND GREEN SPACE

**Main Modification Reference**: MM 106  
**PolicyGS1 and supporting text**: Policy GS1 Green Space  
**Original Text (where applicable)**:  
We will work with partners to improve existing green space to meet the standards in our Green Space Strategy.  
Green Spaces are green open areas which are valuable for amenity, recreation, wildlife or biodiversity and include types such as village greens, local open spaces, country parks, formal gardens, cemeteries, allotments, woodlands, recreation grounds, sports pitches and parks.  
Proposals that result in the loss of green space, or land that was last used as green space, will not normally be allowed unless:  
- An assessment shows that there is too much of that particular type of green space in the area which it serves and its loss would not affect the existing and potential green space needs of the borough; or  
- The proposal is for small scale facilities needed to support or improve the proper function of the green space.  
We will assess the need for green space against the standards in our Green Space Strategy. In instances where the loss of green space is deemed acceptable following assessment, compensatory provision will be required which is of equivalent or improved quality, quantity and accessibility.  
In addition we will expect new developments to provide and maintain appropriate green space. This requirement is set out in the Infrastructure and Planning Obligations Policy.  
Where appropriate new green space should secure access to adjacent areas of countryside.  
Further detail on provision, layout and design of green space is set out in Supplementary Planning Document ‘Open Space Provision on New Housing Developments’.  
17.17 New green spaces will be provided over time and it will not be possible for the Proposals Map to always be up to date. A separate map called the Green Space Register will be kept up to date and available to view on our website.

**Main Modification**:  
- Make provision for the Green Sprint and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of gateways;  
- Consider any implications arising from its location adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area  
- Not be harmful to the liveliness and economic strength of the town centre.

**PolicyGS1 Green Space**:  
We will work with partners to improve existing green space to meet the standards in our Green Space Strategy.  
Green Spaces are green open areas which are valuable for amenity, recreation, wildlife or biodiversity and include types such as village greens, local open spaces, country parks, formal gardens, cemeteries, allotments, woodlands, recreation grounds, sports pitches and parks.  
Proposals that result in the loss of green space, or land that was last used as green space, will not normally be allowed unless:  
- An assessment shows that there is too much of that particular type of green space in the area which it serves and its loss would not affect the existing and potential green space needs of the borough; or  
- The proposal is for small scale facilities needed to support or improve the proper function of the green space; or  
- An appropriate replacement green space of equivalent or improved quality, quantity and accessibility is provided which would outweigh the loss.  
We will assess the need for green space against the standards in our Green Space Strategy. In instances where the loss of green space is deemed acceptable following assessment, compensatory provision will be required which is of equivalent or improved quality, quantity and accessibility.  
In addition we will expect new developments to provide and maintain appropriate green space. This requirement is set out in the Infrastructure and Planning Obligations Policy.  
Further detail on provision, layout and design of green space is set out in Supplementary Planning Document ‘Open Space Provision on New Housing Developments’.  
In order to improve the quantity, quality and value of green space provision we will require qualifying new residential developments to provide or contribute towards green space in line with the standards set out in the green space strategy and in accordance with the requirements of the Infrastructure and Planning Obligations Policy. The Supplementary Planning Document ‘Open Space Provision on New Housing Developments’ offers guidance to developers on what will be expected in terms of open space provision in order to achieve those standards.  
Where there is a requirement to provide new green space an assessment will be carried out to determine the most appropriate provision, taking into account site characteristics and constraints. In cases where it is deemed unsuitable to make provision for open space within or adjacent to a development site, suitable off-site open space facilities may be acceptable either as new facilities or improvements to those existing. Where appropriate new green space should secure access to adjacent areas of countryside.

17.7 New green spaces will be provided over time and it will not be possible for the Proposals Map to always be up to date. A separate map called the Green Space Register will be kept up to date and available to view on our
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 107</td>
<td>Policy LC1 Landscape Character</td>
<td>Policy LC1 Landscape Character</td>
<td>17.17 We will assess the quality and value of each green space to judge which spaces should be given the highest level of protection from development, which spaces need to be improved and which spaces may no longer be suitable for their current purpose. The four possible outcomes of this assessment are shown in the table below along with a description of the decisions we will need to make for each outcome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### High quality and low value
- **We will firstly try to improve the value of the space without changing its main use.**
- **If this is not possible, we will consider changing the main use of the space to improve its value.**
- **Only if both of the above are not possible will we consider allowing the space to be built on.**

### High quality and high value
- This is the category we want all green spaces to achieve.
- **We will protect all spaces in this category from development.**

### Low quality and low value
- **We will firstly try to improve the quality of the space if this will improve its value.**
- **If this is not possible, the space may not be needed and we may allow it to be built on.**

### Low quality and high value
- We will try to improve the quality of the space.
- **We will protect all spaces in this category from development.**

Policy and supporting text together with relevant bullet points from the pink box to be moved to chapter 13 Local Character Policy LC1 Landscape Character

Development will be expected to retain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the individual Landscape Character Area in which it is located (as set out in the Landscape Character Assessment of Barnsley Borough 2002 and any subsequent amendments).

Development which may adversely affect the purpose of the Peak District National Park or be harmful to its valued characteristics will not be allowed.

Given the close relationship between the west of the borough and the Peak District National Park, it is important to recognise the special qualities of the national park need to be protected from development in Barnsley which could cause harm.

Planning permission will not be granted for development that is considered to be harmful to the valued characteristics of the national park.

We will produce a Supplementary Planning Document on Landscape Character to provide more detailed guidance on how to assess the impact of development on the landscape. The Landscape Character Assessment was carried out in 2002. The former Countryside Agency 2002 guidelines are still current.

**The Peak District National Park Landscape Strategy** will aid this consideration as it recognises the flow of landscape beyond the boundary of the National Park. The Council will refer to Section 62(2) of the Environment Act in determining when it is appropriate to consult the Peak Park on development proposals which may cause harm or where there is doubt as to whether or not the proposal would cause harm.

We will produce a Supplementary Planning Document on Landscape Character to provide more detailed guidance on how to assess the impact of development on the landscape. The Landscape Character Assessment was carried out in 2002. **This was reviewed in 2016 to inform the Local Plan.** The former Countryside Agency 2002 guidelines are still current.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 108 Green Belt and Safeguarded Land Policy GB2 and supporting text</td>
<td>Policy GB2 Replacement, extension and alteration of existing buildings in the Green Belt Provided it will not have a harmful impact on the appearance, character or openness of the Green Belt, we will allow the following development in the Green Belt:</td>
<td>Policy GB2 Replacement, extension and alteration of existing buildings in the Green Belt</td>
<td>Provided it will not have a harmful impact on the appearance, character or openness of the Green Belt, we will allow the following development in the Green Belt:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Replacement buildings where the new building is in the same use and is not materially larger than that which it replaces</td>
<td>• Replacement buildings where the new building is in the same use and is not materially larger than that which it replaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Extension or alteration of a building where the total size of the proposed and previous extensions does not exceed the size of the original building</td>
<td>• Extension or alteration of a building where the total size of the proposed and previous extensions does not exceed the size of the original building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dividing an existing house to form smaller units of accommodation</td>
<td>• Dividing an existing house to form smaller units of accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We will allow the change of use or conversion of buildings in the Green Belt provided that:</td>
<td>All such development will be expected to:</td>
<td>All such development will be expected to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The existing building is of a form, scale and design that is in keeping with its surroundings. The existing building is of a permanent and substantial construction and a structural survey demonstrates that the building does not need major or complete reconstruction for the proposed new use</td>
<td>• be of a high standard of design and reflect the architectural style of the existing dwelling and vernacular styles in the locality; respect the character of the existing building and its surroundings, in its footprint, scale and massing, elevation design and materials; and</td>
<td>• be of a high standard of design and reflect the architectural style of the existing dwelling and vernacular styles in the locality; respect the character of the existing building and its surroundings, in its footprint, scale and massing, elevation design and materials; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The proposed new use is in keeping with the local character and the appearance of the building</td>
<td>• be of a scale and design that harmonises with the existing building (which must remain the dominant visual feature);</td>
<td>• be of a scale and design that harmonises with the existing building (which must remain the dominant visual feature);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The loss of any building from agricultural use will not give rise to the need for a replacement agricultural building, except in cases where the existing building is no longer capable of agricultural use.</td>
<td>• have no adverse effect on the amenity of local residents, the visual amenity of the area, or highway safety.</td>
<td>• have no adverse effect on the amenity of local residents, the visual amenity of the area, or highway safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We will allow the change of use or conversion of buildings in the Green Belt provided that:</td>
<td>18.6 The NPPF states that an extension to a building is not inappropriate if it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. We will allow extensions provided that cumulatively they would not amount to more than a doubling of the size of the original building. Original means as existing in 1948 or, in relation to a building constructed later, as it was built. A house which has been subdivided will not be considered as the original building. In the case of a replacement building, the original building means the building that was replaced.</td>
<td>18.6 The NPPF states that an extension to a building is not inappropriate if it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. We will allow extensions provided that cumulatively they would not amount to more than a doubling of the size of the original building. Original means as existing in 1948 or, in relation to a building constructed later, as it was built. A house which has been subdivided will not be considered as the original building. In the case of a replacement building, the original building means the building that was replaced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The existing building is of a form, scale and design that is in keeping with its surroundings. The existing building is of a permanent and substantial construction and a structural survey demonstrates that the building does not need major or complete reconstruction for the proposed new use</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 The original building must remain the dominant visual feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 109 Green Belt and Safeguarded Land Policy GB3</td>
<td>Policy GB3 Changes of use in the Green Belt</td>
<td>Policy GB3 Changes of use in the Green Belt</td>
<td>We will allow the change of use or conversion of buildings in the Green Belt provided that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We will allow the change of use or conversion of buildings in the Green Belt provided that:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The existing building is of a form, scale and design that is in keeping with its surroundings;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The existing building is of a form, scale and design that is in keeping with its surroundings. The existing building is of a permanent and substantial construction and a structural survey demonstrates that the building does not need major or complete reconstruction for the proposed new use</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The existing building is of a permanent and substantial construction and a structural survey demonstrates that the building does not need major or complete reconstruction for the proposed new use;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The proposed new use is in keeping with the local character and the appearance of the building</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The proposed new use is in keeping with the local character and the appearance of the building; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The loss of any building from agricultural use will not give rise to the need for a replacement agricultural building, except in cases where the existing building is no longer capable of agricultural use.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The loss of any building from agricultural use will not give rise to the need for a replacement agricultural building, except in cases where the existing building is no longer capable of agricultural use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All such development will be expected to:</td>
<td>All such development will be expected to:</td>
<td>All such development will be expected to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be of a high standard of design and reflect the architectural style of the existing dwelling and vernacular styles in the locality; respect the character of the existing building and its surroundings, in its footprint, scale and massing, elevation design and materials; and</td>
<td>• be of a scale and design that harmonises with the existing building (which must remain the dominant visual feature);</td>
<td>• be of a scale and design that harmonises with the existing building (which must remain the dominant visual feature);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• be of a scale and design that harmonises with the existing building (which must remain the dominant visual feature);</td>
<td></td>
<td>• respect the character of the existing building and its surroundings, in its footprint, scale and massing, elevation design and materials; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• have no adverse effect on the amenity of local residents, the visual amenity of the area, or highway safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• have no adverse effect on the amenity of local residents, the visual amenity of the area, or highway safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification Reference</td>
<td>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</td>
<td>Original Text (where applicable)</td>
<td>Main Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 110</td>
<td>Green Belt and Safeguarded Land</td>
<td>Policy GB4 Permanent Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwellings</td>
<td>Proposals for agricultural and forestry workers dwellings will be allowed provided that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- They support existing agricultural or forestry activities on well established agricultural or forestry units;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- There is clearly an established existing functional need which relates to a full time worker;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The unit and the agricultural activity concerned have been established for at least 3 years and profitable for at least one of them, are currently financially sound and have a clear prospect of remaining so; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The functional need could not be fulfilled by another existing dwelling on the unit or in the area which is suitable and available for occupation by the workers concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development will be expected to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Be of a size commensurate with the established functional need;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Be sited directly adjacent to existing buildings wherever possible;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Be of a high standard of design and reflect the architectural style of the existing dwelling and vernacular styles in the locality; respect the character of its surroundings, in its footprint, scale and massing, elevation design and materials; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Be of a scale and design which harmonises with the existing dwelling and ensures that it remains the dominant visual feature;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Have no adverse effect on the amenity of local residents, the visual amenity of the area, or highway safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where permission is granted we may remove permitted development rights, and impose occupancy conditions as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| MM 111                      | Green Belt and Safeguarded Land | Policy GB5 Temporary Agricultural and Forestry Workers Dwellings | Proposals for temporary agricultural and forestry workers dwellings will be allowed provided that: |
|                              |                               | Development will be expected to: |                                    |
|                              |                               | - Be of a high standard of design and reflect the architectural style of the existing dwelling and vernacular styles in the locality; |
|                              |                               | - Be of a scale and design which harmonises with the existing building (which must remain the dominant visual feature); |
|                              |                               | - Have no adverse effect on the amenity of local residents, the visual amenity of the area, or highway safety. |
|                              |                               | Where permission is granted we may remove permitted development rights, and impose occupancy conditions as appropriate. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy GB5</td>
<td></td>
<td>that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There is clear evidence of a firm intention and ability to develop the enterprise concerned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A functional need can be demonstrated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There is clear evidence that the proposed enterprise has been planned on a sound financial basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The functional need could not be fulfilled by another existing dwelling on the unit or in the area which is suitable and available for occupation by the workers concerned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development will be expected to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• be of a size commensurate with the established functional need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• be sited directly adjacent to existing buildings wherever possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• be of a high standard of design and reflect the architectural style of the existing dwelling and vernacular styles in the locality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• be of a scale and design which harmonises with the existing dwelling and ensures that it remains the dominant visual feature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• have no adverse effect on the amenity of local residents, the visual amenity of the area, or highway safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Where permission is granted this will be for a specified temporary period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 112</td>
<td>Safeguarded Land table</td>
<td>Table of Safeguarded land as per page 269 onwards of the 2016 Publication version</td>
<td>Table to be replaced with updated list of safeguarded land – see Annex 1 of this Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 113</td>
<td>Policy GB6 Safeguarded Land</td>
<td>Policy GB6 Safeguarded Land</td>
<td>Policy GB6 Safeguarded Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph 18.20</td>
<td>We will only grant planning permission on sites allocated as safeguarded land for development that is needed for the operation of existing uses, or alternative uses where the development will protect the open nature of the land, and will not affect the potential for future development of the site. The permanent development of safeguarded land will only be permitted following the adoption of a replacement Local Plan which proposes such development.</td>
<td>We will only grant planning permission on sites allocated as safeguarded land for development that is needed for the operation of existing uses, or alternative uses where the development will protect the open nature of the land, and will not affect the potential for future development of the site. The permanent development of safeguarded land will only be permitted following the adoption of a replacement review of the Local Plan which proposes such development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development on safeguarded land will normally only be allowed where it is consistent with Green Belt policy and which would not affect the potential for the future development of the site in accordance with the following policy.</td>
<td>Development on safeguarded land will normally only be allowed where it is consistent with Green Belt policy the National Planning Policy Framework and which would not affect the potential for the future development of the site in accordance with the following policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 114</td>
<td>Green Belt and Safeguarded Land</td>
<td>NPPF paragraph 85 states where necessary local planning authorities should identify areas of ‘safeguarded land’ between the urban area and Green Belt, in order to meet long term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period. Its suitability as an allocation for development will be considered in a future review of the Local Plan.</td>
<td>NPPF paragraph 85 states where necessary local planning authorities should identify areas of ‘safeguarded land’ between the urban area and Green Belt, in order to meet long term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period. Its suitability as an allocation for development will be considered in a future review of the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>paragraph 18.21</td>
<td>Any review of the Local Plan which includes assessment of the suitability of safeguarded land for development will include the normal planning considerations of the sustainability and suitability of sites for development.</td>
<td>Any review of the Local Plan which includes assessment of the suitability of safeguarded land for development will include the normal planning considerations of the sustainability and suitability of sites for development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 115</td>
<td>Paragraphs 18.22 and 18.23</td>
<td>18.22 Safeguarded land can only be released in exceptional circumstances which may include a lack of five year land supply or a local need. Where there is a local need a safeguarded land site may be considered, for example, through a neighbourhood plan.</td>
<td>18.22 Safeguarded land can only be released in exceptional circumstances which may include a lack of five year land supply or a local need. Where there is a local need a safeguarded land site may be considered, for example, through a neighbourhood plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</td>
<td>Original Text (where applicable)</td>
<td>Main Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 116</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.23 Safeguarded land is land that is not Green Belt and does not have Green Belt policies applied to it. Its release should be in accordance with the above policy or where other exceptional circumstances apply.</td>
<td>19.23 Safeguarded land is land that is not Green Belt and does not have Green Belt policies applied to it. Its release should be in accordance with the above policy or where other exceptional circumstances apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 117</td>
<td>Policy CC1 Climate Change and Sustainable Construction</td>
<td>19.1 Tackling and adapting to climate change are key issues that need to be addressed through the planning system. The following policies seek to minimise the borough's contribution to climate change, and also provide a policy framework to ensure development is able to both mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.</td>
<td>19.1 Tackling and adapting to climate change are key issues that need to be addressed through the planning system. The following policies seek to minimise the borough's contribution to climate change, and also provide a policy framework to ensure development is able to both mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CC1 Climate Change</td>
<td>Development will be expected, subject to viability, to:</td>
<td>Policy CC1 Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce and mitigate the impact of growth on the environment and carbon emissions</td>
<td>Development will be expected, subject to viability, to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure existing and new communities are resilient to climate change</td>
<td>• Reduce and mitigate the impact of growth on the environment and carbon emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Harness the opportunities that growth, and its associated energy demands, brings to increase the efficient use of resources through sustainable construction techniques and the use of renewable energy</td>
<td>• Ensure existing and new communities are resilient to climate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We will take action to adapt to climate change by:</td>
<td>• Harness the opportunities that growth, and its associated energy demands, brings to increase the efficient use of resources through sustainable construction techniques and the use of renewable energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Giving preference to development of previously developed land in sustainable locations</td>
<td>We will take action to adapt to climate change by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Locating and designing development to reduce the risk of flooding</td>
<td>• Giving preference to development of previously developed land in sustainable locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Promoting the use of sustainable drainage systems</td>
<td>• Locating and designing development to reduce the risk of flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Promoting investment in Green Infrastructure to promote and encourage biodiversity gain</td>
<td>• Promoting the use of sustainable drainage systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development will be expected, subject to viability, to demonstrate how it minimises resource and energy consumption, compared to the minimum target under current Building Regulations legislation, and how it is located to withstand the longer term impacts of climate change.</td>
<td>Development will be expected, subject to viability, to demonstrate how it minimises resource and energy consumption, compared to the minimum target under current Building Regulations legislation, and how it is located to withstand the longer term impacts of climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All non-residential development will be expected, subject to viability, to achieve at least BREEAM standard of 'very good' or equivalent. This should be supported by preliminary assessments at planning application stage.</td>
<td>All non-residential development will be expected, subject to viability, to achieve at least BREEAM standard of 'very good' or equivalent. This should be supported by preliminary assessments at planning application stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All developments will be expected, subject to viability, to seek to initially incorporate appropriate design measures to reduce energy use, and thereafter decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy sources in order to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and should at least achieve the appropriate carbon compliance targets as defined in the Building Regulations.</td>
<td>All developments will be expected, subject to viability, to seek to initially incorporate appropriate design measures to reduce energy use, and thereafter decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy sources in order to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and should at least achieve the appropriate carbon compliance targets as defined in the Building Regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We will seek to reduce the causes of and adapt to the future impacts of climate change by:</td>
<td>We will seek to reduce the causes of and adapt to the future impacts of climate change by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Giving preference to development of previously developed land in sustainable locations;</td>
<td>• Giving preference to development of previously developed land in sustainable locations;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Promoting the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions through sustainable design and construction techniques;</td>
<td>• Promoting the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions through sustainable design and construction techniques;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Modification Reference</td>
<td>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</td>
<td>Original Text (where applicable)</td>
<td>Main Modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.6 For housing development energy efficiency is regulated by Building Regulations. We will encourage energy efficiency that exceeds those minimum standards set out in national standards and take that into account where proposed in support of a planning application.</td>
<td>• Locating and designing development to reduce the risk of flooding; • Promoting the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS); • Promoting and supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy; and • Promoting investment in Green infrastructure to promote and encourage biodiversity gain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.7 We will use the BREEAM (British Research Establishment Assessment Method) to measure the environmental performance of all non domestic buildings. As well as energy use and the emissions generated BREEAM deals with water use, materials and waste management, land use and ecology, pollution, health and well-being and transport.</td>
<td>19.7 We will use the BREEAM (British Research Establishment Assessment Method) to measure the environmental performance of all non domestic buildings. As well as energy use and the emissions generated BREEAM deals with water use, materials and waste management, land use and ecology, pollution, health and well-being and transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 118</td>
<td>Insert new policy CC2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Separate out sustainable design and construction into a new stand-alone policy as follow: Policy CC2 Sustainable Design and Construction Development will be expected to minimise resource and energy consumption through the inclusion of sustainable design and construction features, where this is technically feasible and viable. All non-residential development will be expected, to achieve a minimum standard of BREEAM ‘Very Good’ (or any future national equivalent). This should be supported by preliminary assessments at planning application stage. Supporting text Development proposals will be expected to consider energy efficiency and sustainable design from the outset and will be required to include details of their sustainability within their Design and Access Statement. For housing development energy efficiency is regulated by Building Regulations. We will encourage energy efficiency that exceeds those minimum standards set out in national standards and take that into account where proposed in support of a planning application. We will use the BREEAM (British Research Establishment Assessment Method) to measure the environmental performance of all non domestic buildings. As well as energy use and the emissions generated BREEAM deals with water use, materials and waste management, land use and ecology, pollution, health and well-being and transport. We will encourage and plan for sustainable decentralised zero or low carbon energy generation, such as biomass-fuelled district heating or combined heat and power (CHP) schemes. Where a heat network is not available or viable, a contribution ensuring connection to a future district heating scheme is required on suitable developments. Developments not connected and unsuitable for future connection to a heat network will rely on energy generated from renewables, like solar panels, photovoltaics and heat pumps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 119</td>
<td>Policy CC3 Flood Risk</td>
<td>Policy CC 3 Flood Risk The extent and impact of flooding will be reduced by: • not permitting new development where it would be at an unacceptable risk of flooding.</td>
<td>The extent and impact of flooding will be reduced by: • Not permitting new development where it would be at an unacceptable risk of flooding from all any sources of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
floodings from all sources of flooding, or would give rise to flooding elsewhere not allowing development in the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b) unless it can be demonstrated that there would not be a harmful effect on the ability of this land to store floodwater.

- requiring developers with proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3 to provide evidence of the sequential test and exception test where appropriate
- requiring site-specific Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs) for proposals over 1 hectare in Flood Zone 1 and all proposals in Flood Zones 2 and 3
- expecting proposals over 1000 m² floor space or 0.4 hectares in Flood Zone 1 to demonstrate how the proposal will make a positive contribution to reducing or managing flood risk
- expecting all development proposals on brownfield sites to reduce surface water run-off by at least 30% and development on greenfield sites to maintain or reduce existing run-off rates requiring development proposals to use Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in accordance with policy CC4 using flood resilient design in areas of high flood risk.

#### MM 120 Renewables Policy RE1

Policy RE1 Low Carbon and Renewable Energy

All developments will be expected to seek to incorporate initially appropriate design measures, and thereafter decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy sources in order to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and should at least achieve the appropriate carbon compliance targets as defined in the Building Regulations.

We will allow development that produces renewable energy as long as there is no significant harmful effect on:

- The character of the landscape and appearance of the area
- Living conditions
- Biodiversity, Geodiversity and water quality
- Heritage assets, their settings and cultural features and areas
- Key views of, from or to scenic landmarks or landscape features
- Highway safety, or
- Infrastructure including radar

In assessing effect, we will consider the extent to which appropriate mitigation could reduce the effect to a less than significantly harmful effect.

Proposals will be expected to include information regarding their efficiency, particularly in respect of wind turbines.

Proposals must be accompanied by information that shows how the local environment will be protected, and that the site will be restored when production ends.

20.5 Proposals for development that produces renewable energy will be assessed against this policy. Such developments can include wind turbines, biomass heating systems, roof mounted wind turbines, photovoltaic cell, ground source heating and cooling systems and hydroelectric power. Given Barnsley’s coal mining history, the potential for water at

Policy RE1 Low Carbon and Renewable Energy

All developments will be expected to seek to incorporate initially appropriate design measures, and thereafter decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy sources in order to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and should at least achieve the appropriate carbon compliance targets as defined in the Building Regulations.

We will allow development that produces renewable energy as long as there is no significant harmful effect on material harm upon:

- The character of the landscape and appearance of the area;
- Living conditions;
- Biodiversity, Geodiversity and water quality;
- Heritage assets, their settings and cultural features and areas;
- Key views of, from or to scenic landmarks or landscape features
- Highway safety, and
- Infrastructure including radar.

In assessing effect, we will consider the extent to which appropriate mitigation could reduce the effect to a less than significantly harmful effect. Appropriate mitigation which could reduce harm to an acceptable level.

Proposals will be expected to include information regarding their efficiency, particularly in respect of wind turbines.

Proposals must be accompanied by information that shows how the local environment will be protected, and that the site will be restored when production ends.

20.5 Proposals for development that produces renewable energy will be assessed against this policy. Such developments can include wind turbines, biomass heating systems, roof mounted wind turbines, photovoltaic cell, ground source heating and cooling systems and hydroelectric power. The policy does not apply to wind turbines, which will be considered against government policy as set out in the written ministerial statement of 18 June 2015 and clarified in Planning Practice Guidance. Given Barnsley’s coal mining history, the potential for water at or near the surface of flooded redundant mine workings may form a sustainable local means to power ground source heat pumps. We
Policy RE AC1 Wind Turbine Areas of Search

Indicative Areas of Search for Wind Turbines have been identified on the Policies Map. These will be subject to further investigation with any final boundaries and development principles set out in a Supplementary Planning Document.

20.12 The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that Planning Authorities should consider identifying Areas suitable for Renewable Energy in their Local Plans. The June 2015 Ministerial Statement on Wind Energy states that local authorities should only consider granting planning permission for wind turbines where they have been allocated within Local Plans and have community support.

20.13 The Council together with neighbouring authorities commissioned the “South Pennines Wind Energy Landscape Study” to identify the landscape sensitivity of different areas to wind turbines (Julie Martin Associates and Land Use Consultants (2014)). The Study is strategic in nature and does not remove the need for individual site assessments.

20.14 The land shown on inset map 6 as an ‘Area of Search’ represents those areas of the Borough with the greatest capacity to accommodate a limited amount of new development. However, the Study indicates that the areas are variously sensitive to turbines of different heights. These areas are indicated on inset map 6 and are:

D – Moorland Fringes/Upland Pastures (shown lilac on inset map 6) – sensitive to anything other than very small turbines (up to 24m to blade tip); lower slopes sensitive to anything more than single turbines, higher land highly sensitive to large (11-20) and very large (21+) wind farms.

N – Rolling Wooded Farmland (shown green on inset map 6) – sensitive to anything other than very small and small turbines (up to 59m to blade tip); highly sensitive to groups larger than medium wind farms (6-10) and large (11-20) and very large (21+) wind farms.

Q – Industrial / Business Parks (shown blue on inset map 6) – sensitive to anything other than small, small clusters and small groups (up to 5 turbines).

20.15 In addition, wider cumulative impacts will always need to be taken into account.

20.16 Landscape capacity is only one issue that requires consideration in identifying areas suitable for wind turbines. Other important issues that require further consideration include:

- Sensitive to inappropriate development. Section 11(A)2 of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as amended) states that “conservation of natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM 122 Policy MIN1 Minerals | Policy MIN 1 Minerals          | Provision will be made for non-aggregate mineral resources including primary and secondary resources as follows:  
- existing sites with planning permission for the extraction of minerals will be shown on the Policies Map which accompanies this Local Plan and will be protected from inappropriate development that could result in their sterilisation  
- areas of Search are identified in this Local Plan  
- Areas of Safeguarding are identified in this Local Plan  
- it is expected that future extraction of minerals will normally take place within existing quarries or by site extensions rather than new sites  
- wherever possible sustainable modes of transport will be used in connection with primary mineral extraction and in the transportation of secondary aggregates  
- proposals for the exploration and production of oil and gas (including petroleum, natural gas, coal mine methane, coal bed methane or underground gasification of coal), will generally be supported  
- Proposals for the exploration and production of shale gas via hydraulic fracturing will generally be supported  
- proposals to extract minerals prior to the commencement of non-minerals development which may otherwise sterilise the mineral, will generally be supported  
- proposals for the recovery of material from mineral waste tips and land reclamation schemes (which may include the recycling, blending, processing and distribution of substitute and secondary materials), will generally be supported in appropriate locations as part of mineral extraction/reclamation schemes  
- the surface coal resource and fireclay and brick clay will be protected from sterilisation from non mineral surface development  
All minerals proposals should:  
- be of limited duration  
- have no unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity impacts  
- be subject to high quality and appropriate reclamation and afteruse within a | Provision will be made for non-aggregate mineral resources including primary and secondary resources as follows:  
- Existing sites with planning permission for the extraction of minerals will be shown on the Policies Map which accompanies this Local Plan and will be protected from inappropriate development that could result in their sterilisation  
- Areas of Search are identified in this Local Plan  
- Areas of Safeguarding are identified in this Local Plan  
- It is expected that future extraction of minerals will normally take place within existing quarries or by site extensions rather than new sites  
- Wherever possible sustainable modes of transport will be used in connection with primary mineral extraction and in the transportation of secondary aggregates  
- Proposals for the exploration and production of oil and gas (including petroleum, natural gas, coal mine methane, coal bed methane or underground gasification of coal), (excluding shale) will generally be supported  
- Proposals for the exploration and production of shale gas via hydraulic fracturing will generally be supported  
- Proposals for the recovery of material from mineral waste tips and land reclamation schemes (which may include the recycling, blending, processing and distribution of substitute and secondary materials), will generally be supported in appropriate locations as part of mineral extraction/reclamation schemes  
- The surface coal resource and fireclay and brick clay will be protected from sterilisation from non mineral surface development  
- Support proposals for extraction where the stone is the original source of, or is needed for the repair or restoration of, a heritage asset  
All minerals proposals should:  
- Be of limited duration;  
- Have no unacceptable adverse environmental or amenity impacts; |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Modification Reference</th>
<th>Chapter / Policy of Local Plan</th>
<th>Original Text (where applicable)</th>
<th>Main Modification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM 123</td>
<td>Chapter 25 Community Infrastructure Supporting text to policy I1 Paragraph 25.6</td>
<td>reasonable timescale; and • result in a net increase in biodiversity and/or geodiversity interests.</td>
<td>• Be subject to high quality and appropriate reclamation and afteruse within a reasonable timescale; and • Result in a net increase in biodiversity and/or geodiversity interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 124</td>
<td>Policy I2 Educational Facilities and Community Uses</td>
<td>Policy I2 Educational Facilities and Community Uses</td>
<td>Policy I2 Educational and community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We will support the provision of schools, educational facilities and other community facilities.</td>
<td>We will support the provision of schools, educational facilities and other community facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The sites allocated for Advanced Learning Centres in the Education Sites DPD will be safeguarded for such purposes.</td>
<td>The sites allocated for Advanced Learning Centres in the Education Sites DPD will be safeguarded for such purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New schools, educational facilities and community uses should be located centrally to the communities they serve, in places where they will be accessible by walking, cycling and public transport.</td>
<td>New schools, educational and community facilities and community uses such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship, should be located centrally to the communities they serve, in places where they will be accessible by walking, cycling and public transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Such uses will be protected from development unless it can be demonstrated that the sites and premises are no longer required by the existing use or an alternative community use.</td>
<td>Such uses will be protected from development unless it can be demonstrated that the sites and premises are no longer required by the existing use or an alternative community use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 125</td>
<td>Section 26 Monitoring and Indicators</td>
<td>Add the following text after the monitoring and indicators table</td>
<td>Add the following text after the monitoring and indicators table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Infrastructure Delivery Programme below is extracted from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016. Future Annual Monitoring Reports will contain a narrative updating on progress against this delivery programme.</td>
<td>The Infrastructure Delivery Programme below is extracted from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016. Future Annual Monitoring Reports will contain a narrative updating on progress against this delivery programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Insert the delivery programme from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan as per Appendix 4 of document MC1 (Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications):</td>
<td>Insert the delivery programme from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan as per Appendix 4 of document MC1 (Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 126</td>
<td>Housing Trajectory</td>
<td>Replace the housing trajectory graph at Appendix 2 of the plan with the latest trajectory as agreed through the examination process – see Annex 2 to this Appendix</td>
<td>Replace the housing trajectory graph at Appendix 2 of the plan with the latest trajectory as agreed through the examination process – see Annex 2 to this Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM 127</td>
<td>New appendix 6 with all superseded policies</td>
<td>New Appendix 6 to be added to the plan listing all UDP saved policies and Core Strategy policies. Policies to be inserted as per Appendix 3 of document MC1 (Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications).</td>
<td>New Appendix 6 to be added to the plan listing all UDP saved policies and Core Strategy policies. Policies to be inserted as per Appendix 3 of document MC1 (Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 1 MM112 - Table of Safeguarded Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Site address</th>
<th>Site area (hectares)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAF 1</td>
<td>North of Burton Road, West Green</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 5</td>
<td>Land north of Staincross Common</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 6</td>
<td>West of Barugh</td>
<td>14.50 16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC33</td>
<td>Land North of Rockingham, Birdwell</td>
<td>14.6 23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 7</td>
<td>East of Sheffield Road, Hoyland Common</td>
<td>23.5 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H79</td>
<td>Lane north of Wood Walk, Hoyland</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H85</td>
<td>Land North East of Hemingfield</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 9</td>
<td>East of Sandybridge Lane, Shafton</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 10</td>
<td>Land behind Queens Drive, Shafton</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 35</td>
<td>Land off Cemetery Road, Grimethorpe</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4</td>
<td><strong>Land North of The Green View, Shafton</strong></td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 12</td>
<td>North of Midland Road, Royston</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 13</td>
<td>South of Church Hill, Royston</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 15</td>
<td>South of Coniston Drive, Bolton</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 16</td>
<td>West of Castle Lane, Penistone</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 17</td>
<td>East of Castle Lane, Penistone</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 31</td>
<td>Land off Mortimer Road, Cubley</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 37</td>
<td>Land at Springvale, Penistone</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 38</td>
<td>Land off Moors Avenue, Penistone</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC 41</td>
<td>Pitt Street, Low Valley</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC 42</td>
<td>South of Pit Lane and West of Windmill Road, Wombwell</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 18</td>
<td>Land North and South of Roughbirchworth Lane, Oxpring</td>
<td>5.1 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 20</td>
<td>Off High Street, Great Houghton</td>
<td>6.7 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 21</td>
<td>South of New Smithy Drive, Thurlstone</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 22</td>
<td>Site north of Halifax Road, Thurgoland</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 23</td>
<td>South of Springwood, off Cote Lane, Thurgoland</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 24</td>
<td>South of Halifax Road, Thurgoland</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 25</td>
<td>East of Beech Avenue, Silkstone</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 27</td>
<td>North of Darton Road, Crawthorne</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 28</td>
<td>South of Wellthorne Avenue, Ingibirthworth</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 30</td>
<td>Land South of Wellthorne Lane, Ingibirthworth</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 32</td>
<td>High Hoyland</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 33</td>
<td><strong>Land off New Road and Lidgett Lane, Pilley</strong></td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAF 34</td>
<td>Land off Lidgett Lane and Pilley Green, Pilley</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>