

PAS LOCAL PLAN ROUTE MAPPER TOOLKIT PART 1: LOCAL PLAN REVIEW ASSESSMENT

Why you should use this part of the toolkit

The following matrix will assist you in undertaking a review of policies within your plan to assess whether they need updating.

The matrix is intended to supplement the [National Planning Policy Framework](#) (NPPF) (paragraph 33 in particular) and the associated [National Planning Practice Guidance](#) on the review of policies within the plan. Completing the matrix will help you understand which policies may be out of date for the purposes of decision making or where circumstances may have changed and whether or not the policy / policies in the plan continue to be effective in addressing the specific local issues that are identified the plan. This in turn will then help you to focus on whether and to what extent, an update of your policies is required. We would recommend that you undertake this assessment even if your adopted local plan already contains a trigger for review which has already resulted in you knowing that it needs to be updated. This is because there may be other policies within the plan which should be, or would benefit from, being updated.

This part of the toolkit deals only with local plan review. Part 2 of the toolkit sets out the content requirements for a local plan as set out in the NPPF. Part 3 of the toolkit outlines the process requirements for plan preparation set out in legislation and the NPPF. Soundness and Plan Quality issues are dealt with in Part 4 of the toolkit.

How to use this part of the toolkit

Before using this assessment tool it is important that you first consider your existing plan against the key requirements for the content of local plans which are included in the [Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 \(as amended\)](#); [The Town and Country Planning \(Local Planning\) \(England\) Regulations 2012 \(as amended\)](#) and the most up to date [NPPF](#), [PPG](#), Written Ministerial Statements and the [National Model Design Code](#). To help you with this **Part 2 of the toolkit** provides a checklist which sets out the principal requirements for the content and form of local plans against the relevant paragraphs of the [NPPF](#). Completing **Part 2 of the toolkit** will help you determine the extent to which your current plan does or does not accord with relevant key requirements in national policy. This will assist you in completing question 1 in the assessment matrix provided below, and in deciding whether or not you need to update policies in your plan, and to what extent.

To use the matrix, consider each of the statements listed in the “requirements to consider” column against the content of your current plan. You will need to take into consideration policies in all development plan documents that make up your development plan, including any ‘made’ neighbourhood plans and/ or any adopted or emerging Strategic Development Strategy. For each statement decide whether you:

- Disagree (on the basis that your plan does not meet the requirement at all);

- Agree (on the basis that you are confident that your current plan will meet the requirement)

Some prompts are included to help you think through the issues and support your assessment. You may wish to add to these reflecting on your own context.

Complete all sections of the matrix as objectively and fully as possible. Provide justification for your conclusions with reference to relevant sources of evidence where appropriate. You will need an up to date Authority Monitoring Report, your latest Housing Delivery Test results, 5 year housing land supply position, any local design guides or codes and the latest standard methodology housing needs information. You may also need to rely on or update other sources of evidence but take a proportionate approach to this. It should be noted that any decision not to update any policies in your local plan will need to be clearly evidenced and justified.

How to use the results of this part of the toolkit

The completed assessment can also be used as the basis for, or as evidence to support, any formal decision of the council in accordance with its constitution or in the case of, for example, Joint Planning Committees, the relevant Terms of Reference in relation to the approach to formal decision-making, as to why an update to the local plan is or is not being pursued. This accords with national guidance and supports the principle of openness and transparency of decision making by public bodies.

	Matters to consider	Agree / Disagree	Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement
A	PLAN REVIEW FACTORS		
A1.	<p>The plan policies still reflect current national planning policy requirements.</p> <p>PROMPT: As set out above in the introductory text, in providing your answer to this statement consider if the policies in your plan still meet the ‘content’ requirements of the current NPPF, PPG, Written Ministerial Statements and the National Model Design Code (completing Part 2 of the toolkit will help you determine the extent to which the policies in your plan accord with relevant key requirements in national policy).</p>	Agree	<p>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence): The overall aims/ objectives of the Local Plan remain relevant.</p> <p>There are some discrete areas of the plan where national guidance has been updated and policies could be added/amended to reflect that:</p> <p>Climate change –In light of SEAP, Zero 45/ climate emergency. Policy support could be more explicit for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retrofit • Minewater • Upgrading infrastructure such as electricity substations • Update renewables policy • Environment Act • Biodiversity Net gain / Local Nature Recovery Strategy <p>Housing –standard methodology, affordable housing to reflect First Homes, need to deal with custom/ self build, older peoples housing Design – Design codes, National Design Policy Reference Health and wellbeing – consider need for a policy Technical issues that have arisen/ learning from application of policies – consider further general development policy for example</p> <p>However, none of the above, either on their own or cumulatively, lead us to believe the local plan should be updated or replaced.</p> <p>In relation to climate change, the policies in the plan are aligned with the NPPF and provide policy support as appropriate. They are deliberately not too prescriptive and technologies change. It is therefore possible to instead prepare a Supplementary Planning Document to provide up to date guidance reflective of the Government’s direction of travel with the Future Homes and Future Buildings Standards. This same principle applies to design, where the policy does not preclude the preparation of design codes. Indeed some of the sites with adopted Masterplan Frameworks already have site specific design codes. Health and wellbeing is also embedded within a range of Local Plan policies and so it is not essential for a specific health and wellbeing policy to be</p>

	Matters to consider	Agree / Disagree	Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement
			<p>included as this would likely duplicate what is already included in these existing policies.</p> <p>The local nature recovery strategy will be prepared under separate legislation, and will not be part of the development plan, though appropriate connections may be desirable. As for biodiversity net gain, whilst the regime makes changes to how planning applications will be dealt with, including the requirement for the applicant to submit a “biodiversity gain plan”, the mechanisms will be mandatory and set by the Environment Act and Regulations. A draft of the latter was the subject of consultation from January to April this year. It is not easy to see what more a local plan can say as policy, given that the biodiversity net gain regime is set out in some detail, and is mandatory.</p> <p>In relation to First Homes, the policy context is set out quite fully in the new section of the NPPG added in December 2021. Moreover, the guidance says that where an LPA wishes to set local criteria different from the standard scheme, they may do so through an interim policy statement.</p> <p>We will consider whether there is sufficient clarity in the NPPF and NPPG to assist decision making, and/ or will consider other means to provide clarity and guidance.</p> <p>The Levelling UP and Regeneration Bill proposes a new type of DPDs known as supplementary plans. As the Bill is currently drafted, these would only be able to address sites or groups of nearby sites, which would appear to rule out their use for updating policy. Moreover, even if their scope should widen as the Bill progresses, it could be two years or more from now before we know whether they would be available as an instrument for policy update.</p>
A2.	<p>There has not been a significant change in local housing need numbers from that specified in your plan (accepting there will be some degree of flux).</p> <p>PROMPT: Look at whether your local housing need figure, using the standard methodology as a starting point, has gone up significantly (with the measure of significance based on a comparison with the housing requirement set out in your adopted local plan).</p>	Agree	<p>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</p> <p>The standard methodology was introduced after Local Plan review. This gives us a lower housing delivery test target over a rolling 3 year period compared with the Local Plan annualised requirement over an equivalent period. Evidence shows recent delivery lower than current Local Plan target but in excess of the housing delivery test. The National Planning Practice Guidance says (in effect) at paragraph 065 of the plan-making section that a reason a</p>

	Matters to consider	Agree / Disagree	Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement
	<p>Consider whether your local housing need figure has gone down significantly (with the measure of significance based on a comparison with the housing requirement set out in your adopted local plan). You will need to consider if there is robust evidence to demonstrate that your current housing requirement is deliverable in terms of market capacity or if it supports, for example, growth strategies such as Housing Deals, new strategic infrastructure investment or formal agreements to meet unmet need from neighbouring authority areas.</p>		<p>plan update may be required would be where there has been a change in the local housing need.</p> <p>The Local Plan housing requirement was based on the Council’s own Objective assessment of housing need (OAHN). Through the Local Plan examination process, the OAHN of 1134 dwellings per annum (dpa) was agreed upon with the Inspector, who noted that the indicative base figure for housing need, as defined in the Government’s standard method, was 898 dpa. The 1134 dpa figure was deemed necessary to align with our economic growth aspirations, which seek to significantly increase the number of jobs in the borough during the plan period.</p> <p>It is by no means unusual for the standard method used to calculate the housing delivery test target to produce a lower figure than the local plan housing requirement. This is reflective of National Planning Practice Guidance which says that the figure arrived at using the standard method is a minimum starting point, and it remains necessary to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicates, e.g. to align with an employment growth strategy.</p> <p>The Council remains committed to enhancing the local economy through promoting growth in the amount and quality of employment. A full update of the local plan will therefore need to review employment growth and land targets and consider whether the housing need figure given by the standard method at that time (which may be revised from the present formula) is in balance with the employment proposals or should be subject to an uplift. A challenge with updating the plan now and in particular the objectively assessed housing need would be the lack of certainty regarding the 2021 census data. At present there appears to be contradictions between Census data and our monitoring data. Ordinarily, Census data is deemed the more reliable source but 2021 was an exceptional year given that the Census was carried out during the second national lockdown. Examples of this include the number of dwellings/households in the census 2021 being recorded at 109, 822, which was lower than our monitoring data from 2020 (109, 234 dwellings), despite monitoring data recording approximately 600 net additional dwellings during 2020/21. A further example is the overall population data with Nomis recording the figure at 248,100 in 2020 whereas</p>

	Matters to consider	Agree / Disagree	Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement						
			<p>the Census has it at 244,600 in 2021. It is of course possible that the population did decline in that year, for example if migrant workers returned home and as a result of excess deaths. However, it was not possible for the total number of dwellings within the borough to have declined between 2020 and 2021. In turn, this casts doubt on the robustness of the Census population data.</p> <p>Without undertaking a considerable amount of work on employment and housing policy, including examination, we cannot say at this time whether the housing need figure which would emerge will be higher or lower than the current OAHN in the local plan. What can be said is that because the minimum starting point given by the standard method is well below the OAHN figure, there is no prime facie case that local housing need is higher.</p>						
<p>A3.</p>	<p>You have a 5-year supply of housing land</p> <p>PROMPT: Review your 5-year housing land supply in accordance with national guidance including planning practice guidance and the Housing Delivery Test measurement rule book</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</p> <p>Latest 5 year supply note indicates a 5.6 year land supply</p> <p>https://www.barnsley.gov.uk/services/planning-and-buildings/local-planning-and-development/our-local-plan/local-plan-research-and-evidence-documents/</p>						
<p>A4.</p>	<p>You are meeting housing delivery targets</p> <p>PROMPT: Use the results of your most recent Housing Delivery Test, and if possible, try and forecast the outcome of future Housing Delivery Test findings. Consider whether these have/are likely to trigger the requirement for the development of an action plan or trigger the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Consider the reasons for this and whether you need to review the site allocations that your plan is reliant upon. In doing so you need to make a judgement as to whether updating your local plan will support delivery or whether there are other actions needed which are not dependent on changes to the local plan.</p>	<p>Agree</p>	<p>Housing Delivery Test information</p> <p>Yes we are exceeding Housing Delivery Test targets. The extract below shows information from the published Housing Delivery Test Measurement, which can be found here: https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/housing-delivery-test</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Table 2 – Barnsley Housing Delivery Test (HDT) Figures</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1249 1249 2130 1437"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1249 1249 1373 1437">Year</th> <th data-bbox="1373 1249 1753 1437">Homes required</th> <th data-bbox="1753 1249 2130 1437">Homes delivered</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="background-color: #d8bfd8;"></td> <td style="background-color: #d8bfd8;"></td> <td style="background-color: #d8bfd8;"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Homes required	Homes delivered			
Year	Homes required	Homes delivered							

	Matters to consider	Agree / Disagree	Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement		
			2018	2,480	2,565
			2019	2,600	2,847
			2020*	2,609	3,052
			2021*	2,322	2,633
			*For the HDT measurement, the Government made a one month adjustment to the 2019-20 housing requirement, and a four month adjustment to the 2020-21 requirement, in response to the disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.		
A5.	<p>Your plan policies are on track to deliver other plan objectives including any (i) affordable housing targets including requirements for First Homes; and (ii) commercial floorspace/jobs targets over the remaining plan period.</p> <p>PROMPT: Use (or update) your Authority Monitoring Report to assess delivery.</p>	Agree	<p>The latest annual monitoring report can be accessed here: https://www.barnsley.gov.uk/media/21109/barnsley-local-plan-authority-monitoring-report-2020-21.pdf</p> <p>The annual monitoring report demonstrates that job creation and housing delivery was on trajectory prior to the pandemic. Inevitably, net housing completions and total jobs within the borough did decline in 2020/21 and 2021/22 but significant job creation is occurring as a result of employment site allocations at Hoyland coming forward with other sites anticipated to follow.</p> <p>Whilst there is a backlog of housing delivery since the start of the plan period (when measured against the annualised average of 1,134 net completions per annum), there is a robust and deliverable supply of housing (7,637 deliverable dwellings) which demonstrably exceed what is needed to meet housing delivery test targets (4,500 dwellings assuming 900 dwellings per year) and the annualised average requirement set out in the plan (5,670 based on 1,134 net additional dwellings per year). There is also a lack of evidence to suggest this backlog is creating an issue in respect of overcrowding and other likely symptoms of under supply. For example, new building and median house prices in Barnsley remains relatively more affordable than elsewhere. Importantly, population growth is not outstripping the forecast that was used to underpin the objectively assessed need figure. It remains to be seen if delivery will increase sufficiently to fully make up the accumulated backlog by the end of the plan period (as set out in the 5-year supply note) but with 11 years still to go, this is not inconceivable. It is therefore premature to conclude that backlog in housing delivery against the Local Plan requirement should trigger a partial update or necessitate the production of a new plan.</p>		

	Matters to consider	Agree / Disagree	Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement
			<p>In terms of jobs growth, Nomis data showed that up until the pandemic, the job density of the borough had increased from 0.59 to 0.64 as a result of total jobs within the borough increasing above and beyond the assumptions in the employment background paper produced during the Local Plan Examination. Total jobs fell during the pandemic resulting in a fall in the job density but with substantial jobs growth anticipated on allocated employment site and in the town centre, all things being equal, total jobs should again begin to increase as per local plan objectives.</p>
A6.	<p>There have been no significant changes in economic conditions which could challenge the delivery of the Plan, including the policy requirements within it.</p> <p>PROMPT: A key employer has shut down or relocated out of the area.</p> <p>Unforeseen events (for example the Covid-19 Pandemic) are impacting upon the delivery of the plan.</p> <p>Up-to-date evidence suggests that jobs growth is likely to be significantly more or less than is currently being planned for.</p> <p>Consider if there is any evidence suggesting that large employment allocations will no longer be required or are no longer likely to be delivered.</p> <p>You will need to consider whether such events impact on assumptions in your adopted local plan which have led to a higher housing requirement than your local housing need assessment indicates.</p> <p>Consider what the consequences could be for your local plan objectives such as the balance of in and out commuting and the resultant impact on proposed transport infrastructure provision (both capacity and viability), air quality or climate change considerations.</p>	Agree	<p>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</p> <p>The pandemic has impacted on the total number of jobs within the borough but, in relative terms, Barnsley has fared reasonably well. This can be evidenced by data relating to town centre footfall and expenditure in particular. In part, this is because it is less reliant on sectors that were most impacted by the pandemic (e.g. hospitality). As a net exporter of labour, Barnsley also stands to gain from shift to increased home working, albeit evidence is yet to emerge to substantiate the extent of this.</p> <p>Inevitably, there are uncertainties about future economic conditions. However, current evidence suggests that, all things being equal, job growth will not significantly depart from what is anticipated by the end of the plan period.</p> <p>Given that the local plan housing requirement includes an allowance for jobs growth of some 20% over the baseline demographic position, it is unlikely that economic conditions will produce a scenario whereby jobs growth demonstrably outstrips housing growth. Conversely, if economic conditions mean fewer jobs are created, it is likely that there would be a similar impact on housing completions thus avoiding a scenario where job density within the borough demonstrably decreased. As such, it is unlikely that local plan objectives will be significantly undermined by current economic uncertainty.</p>

	Matters to consider	Agree / Disagree	Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement
A7.	<p>There have been no significant changes affecting viability of planned development.</p> <p>PROMPT: You may wish to look at the Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) All-in Tender Price Index, used for the indexation of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), or other relevant indices to get a sense of market changes.</p> <p>Consider evidence from recent planning decisions and appeal decisions to determine whether planning policy requirements, including affordable housing, are generally deliverable.</p> <p>Ongoing consultation and engagement with the development industry may highlight any significant challenges to delivery arising from changes in the economic climate.</p>	Agree	<p>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</p> <p>Rising costs nationally may impact on viability of development but conversely, values have also increased in recent years. Where a developer seeks a concession in the level of affordable housing based on their assertion that it would not be viable to meet the full suite of policy requirements, the Council commissions an independent appraisal. Where this has occurred, the consultant generally finds that sites can meet the full suite of policy requirements. We are not therefore seeing evidence of any significant changes affecting the viability of planned development.</p>
A8.	<p>Key site allocations are delivering, or on course to deliver, in accordance the local plan policies meaning that the delivery of the spatial strategy is not at risk.</p> <p>PROMPT:</p> <p>Identify which sites are central to the delivery of your spatial strategy. Consider if there is evidence to suggest that lack of progress on these sites (individually or collectively) may prejudice the delivery of housing numbers, key infrastructure or other spatial priorities. Sites may be deemed to be key by virtue of their scale, location or type in addition to the role that may have in delivering any associated infrastructure.</p>	Agree	<p>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</p> <p>Masterplan Framework sites – Frameworks have been adopted for each of the sites and planning applications are under consideration on part of the MU1, MU3 and MU5 sites. Large parts of the sites covered by the Hoyland North and Hoyland West Masterplans are under construction as are large site allocations MU6, HS43 and HS75.</p>
A9.	<p>There have been no significant changes to the local environmental or heritage context which have implications for the local plan approach or policies.</p> <p>PROMPT:</p>	Agree	<p>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</p> <p>The Local Plan was deemed to be sustainable following a rigorous sustainable appraisal process and examination in public. Whilst there have been changes locally as a result of greenfield local plan allocations being developed and</p>

	Matters to consider	Agree / Disagree	Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement
	<p>You may wish to review the indicators or monitoring associated with your Sustainability Appraisal (SA) / Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) / Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).</p> <p>Identify if there have been any changes in Flood Risk Zones, including as a result of assessing the effects of climate change.</p> <p>Consider whether there have been any changes in air quality which has resulted in the designation of an Air Quality Management Area(s) or which would could result in a likely significant effect on a European designated site which could impact on the ability to deliver housing or employment allocations.</p> <p>Consider whether there have been any changes to Zones of Influence / Impact Risk Zones for European sites and Sites of Special Scientific Interest or new issues in relation to, for example, water quality.</p> <p>Consider whether there have been any new environmental or heritage designations which could impact on the delivery of housing or employment / jobs requirements / targets.</p> <p>Consider any relevant concerns being raised by statutory consultees in your area in relation to the determination of individual planning applications or planning appeals which may impact upon your plan - either now or in the future.</p>		<p>associated infrastructure being installed, at a borough level, there have been no significant changes to the environmental context.</p> <p>Since the plan was adopted, the Dearne Valley Wetlands have been designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest and there have been a number of new and updated listings and scheduled ancient monuments designated at and around Elsecar Heritage Centre. These are welcomed and reflect environmental objectives in the Local Plan. As the Council co-operated with both Natural England and Historic England throughout the Local Plan process, we made sure that nearby site allocations would not be impacted upon by these designations and vice versa. An example of this includes the removal of a proposed site allocation in the vicinity of Elsecar Heritage Centre prior to the plan being submitted for examination.</p> <p>No new air quality management areas have been designated since the plan was adopted and the borough is not affected by new designations relating to water quality. Nonetheless, in recognition of climate change, including the recent drought, a new Supplementary Planning Document is being prepared</p>
A10.	<p>No new sites have become available since the finalisation of the adopted local plan which require the spatial strategy to be re-evaluated.</p> <p>PROMPT:</p> <p>Consider if there have been any new sites that have become available, particularly those within public ownership which, if they were to come forward for development, could have an impact on the spatial strategy or could result in loss of employment and would have a significant effect on the quality of place if no new use were found for them.</p>	Agree	<p>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</p> <p>The Spatial Strategy within the plan is steering development towards the more sustainable locations in and around Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns. Planning permission has not been sought or granted on any windfall sites that would require the overall spatial strategy to be revisited.</p>

	Matters to consider	Agree / Disagree	Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement
	Consider whether any sites which have now become available within your area or neighbouring areas could contribute towards meeting any previously identified unmet needs.		
A11.	<p>Key planned infrastructure projects critical to plan delivery are on track and have not stalled / failed and there are no new major infrastructure programmes with implications for the growth / spatial strategy set out in the plan.</p> <p>PROMPT: You may wish to review your Infrastructure Delivery Plan / Infrastructure Funding Statement, along with any periodic updates, the Capital and Investment programmes of your authority or infrastructure delivery partners and any other tool used to monitor and prioritise the need and delivery of infrastructure to support development.</p> <p>Check if there have been any delays in the delivery of critical infrastructure as a result of other processes such as for the Compulsory Purchase of necessary land.</p> <p>Identify whether any funding announcements or decisions have been made which materially impact upon the delivery of key planned infrastructure, and if so, will this impact upon the delivery of the Local Plan.</p>	Agree	<p>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources): from the latest Annual Monitoring Report includes an updated infrastructure delivery programme and can be accessed via the following link: https://www.barnsley.gov.uk/media/21109/barnsley-local-plan-authority-monitoring-report-2020-21.pdf</p> <p>Since the Local Plan was adopted, key infrastructure that was identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan has been delivered, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the recent gyratory scheme between the town centre and M1 J37 • the link road through the Hoyland West Development, which effectively acts as a bypass for Hoyland Common • increased capacity at key roundabouts on the road network including Cathill, Broomhill and Wath Road roundabouts to the east of the borough and Claycliffe and Low Barugh roundabouts to the north west <p>There are also a number of schemes for local infrastructure where applications have been approved or are under consideration, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new secondary school • Active travel infrastructure on routes identified in the Local Plan • Roundabouts to provide access to the MU1 site • Widening of the River Dearne Bridge on the A61.

	Matters to consider	Agree / Disagree	Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement
A12.	<p>All policies in the plan are achievable and effective including for the purpose of decision-making.</p> <p>PROMPT: Consider if these are strategic policies or those, such as Development Management policies, which do not necessarily go to the heart of delivering the Plan’s strategy.</p> <p>Identify if there has been a significant increase in appeals that have been allowed and /or appeals related to a specific policy area that suggest a policy or policies should be reviewed.</p> <p>Consider whether there has been feedback from Development Management colleagues, members of the planning committee, or applicants that policies cannot be effectively applied and / or understood.</p>	Agree	<p>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</p> <p>The council closely monitors its appeal record and reports on it at each Planning & Regulatory Board meeting. Typically, 75-80% of appeals are dismissed. This demonstrates that plan policies are effective but also that officers are not being too lenient (i.e. if 100% of appeals were dismissed, this may suggest the Council is only refusing applications that are significantly harmful).</p> <p>Since the plan was adopted, the Council has increased the resources devoted to planning enforcement. This has resulted in a demonstrable increase in formal enforcement action. Where appeals are lodged under ground A (i.e. that planning permission should be granted), the Council also has a robust record of such enforcement appeals being dismissed.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the policies within the plan are achievable and effective for the purpose of decision making.</p>

	Matters to consider	Agree / Disagree	Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement
A13.	<p>There are no recent or forthcoming changes to another authority's development plan or planning context which would have a material impact on your plan / planning context for the area covered by your local plan.</p> <p>PROMPT: In making this assessment you may wish to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review emerging and adopted neighbouring authority development plans and their planning context. ● Review any emerging and adopted higher level strategic plans including, where relevant, mayoral/ combined authority Spatial Development Strategies e.g. The London Plan. ● Review any relevant neighbourhood plans ● Consider whether any of the matters highlighted in statements A1- A12 for their plan may impact on your plan - discuss this with the relevant authorities. ● Consider any key topic areas or requests that have arisen through Duty to Cooperate or strategic planning discussions with your neighbours or stakeholders - particularly relating to meeting future development and /or infrastructure needs. 	Agree	<p>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No SYMCA plan exists or plans to produce one in advance of Local Plan review ● Under the duty to co-operate, the service has engaged with neighbouring authorities, including Sheffield and Wakefield in relation to their own plan preparation. Through this, no significant issues have arisen that materially impact on the Barnsley Local Plan.
A14.	<p>There are no local political changes or a revised / new corporate strategy which would require a change to the approach set out in the current plan.</p> <p>PROMPT: In making this assessment you may wish to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review any manifesto commitments and review the corporate and business plan. ● Engage with your senior management team and undertake appropriate engagement with senior politicians in your authority. ● Consider other plans or strategies being produced across the Council or by partners which may impact on the appropriateness of your current plan and the strategy that underpins it, for instance, Growth Deals, economic growth plans, local industrial strategies produced by the Local Economic Partnership, housing/ regeneration strategies and so on. 	Agree	<p>Reason (with reference to plan policies, sections and relevant evidence sources):</p> <p>The Council remains under the same political control since the plan was adopted and produced a new Corporate Plan for 2021-2024 which aligns with its 2030 Strategy. Within this, 5 priorities are identified, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Healthy Barnsley ▪ Learning Barnsley ▪ Growing Barnsley ▪ Sustainable Barnsley ▪ Enabling Barnsley <p>These priorities are compatible with the aims and objectives of the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council has successfully secured various sources of government and devolved funding since the plan was adopted. Spatially, areas for which this</p>

	Matters to consider	Agree / Disagree	Extent to which the local plan meets this requirement
			funding is earmarked are identified as priorities for growth and investment within the Local Plan.

	ASSESSING WHETHER OR NOT TO UPDATE YOUR PLAN POLICIES	YES/NO (please indicate below)	
A15.	You AGREE with <u>all</u> of the statements above	Yes	<p>If no go to question A16.</p> <p>If yes, you have come to the end of the assessment. However, you must be confident that you are able to demonstrate and fully justify that your existing plan policies / planning position clearly meets the requirements in the statements above and that you have evidence to support your position.</p> <p>Based on the answers you have given above please provide clear explanation and justification in section A17 below of why you have concluded that an update is not necessary including references to evidence or data sources that you have referenced above. Remember you are required to publish the decision not to update your local plan policies. In reaching the conclusion that an update is not necessary the explanation and justification for your decision must be clear, intelligible and able to withstand scrutiny.</p>
A16.	You DISAGREE with one or more of the statements above and the issue can be addressed by an update of local plan policies		If yes, based on the above provide a summary of the key reasons why an update to plan policies is necessary in section A17 below and complete Section B below.
A17.	<p><u>Decision:</u> Update plan policies / No need to update plan policies (delete as necessary)</p> <p>Reasons for decision on whether or not to update plan policies (clear evidence and justification will be required where a decision not to update has been reached):</p>		

	<p>The aims and objectives of the plan remain aligned with those set out in the NPPF. Whilst the pandemic has impacted on housing delivery in 2020/21 and 2021/22, there has been demonstrable activity on key local plan site allocations on land that was taken out of the Green Belt when the plan was adopted in 2019. This ranges from adoption of masterplan frameworks, requests for formal pre-application advice, submission of planning applications and commencement of development. This activity includes both commercial and residential developments across all areas of the borough earmarked for growth suggesting that sites remain attractive and viable. Significant progress has also been made in the Town Centre with the completion of the Glassworks scheme, closure of the Jumble Lane level crossing and construction of a new bridge as well as planning applications to develop Courthouse Campus (The Seam) and the Eastern Fringe (proposed Youth Zone) site allocations</p> <p>Key infrastructure that was identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan has also been delivered and the plan provides a robust starting point for decision making, as demonstrated by Council's planning appeal record.</p> <p>Other actions that may be required in addition to or in place of an update of plan policies</p> <p>We will consider other mechanisms, for example dealing with Sustainable Construction and Climate Change Adaptation through SPD prepared under the current SPD regulations where we have existing policy hooks.</p>		
	B. POLICY UPDATE FACTORS	YES/NO (please indicate below)	Provide details explaining your answer in the context of your plan / local authority area
B1	Your policies update is likely to lead to a material change in the housing requirement which in turn has implications for other plan requirements / the overall evidence base.	No	
B2	The growth strategy and / or spatial distribution of growth set out in the current plan is not fit for purpose and your policies update is likely to involve a change to this.	No	
B3	Your policies update is likely to affect more than a single strategic site or one or more strategic policies that will have consequential impacts on other policies of the plan.	No	
	You have answered yes to one or more questions above.		You are likely to need to undertake a full update of your spatial strategy and strategic policies (and potentially non-strategic policies). Use your responses above to complete Section B4.

	<p>You have said no to <u>all</u> questions (B1 to B3) above</p>	<p>If you are confident that the update can be undertaken without impacting on your spatial strategy and other elements of the Plan, you are likely to only need to undertake a partial update of policies. Complete Section B4 to indicate the specific parts / policies of the plan that are likely to require updating based on the answers you have given above.</p>
<p>B4</p>	<p>Decision: Full Update of Plan Policies/ Partial Update of Plan Policies (delete as necessary) TBC</p> <p>Reasons for scope of review:</p>	

<p>Date of assessment:</p>	<p>16th September 2022 (Updated in light of critical friend advice from the Planning Officers Society)</p>
<p>Assessed by:</p>	<p>Paula Tweed</p>
<p>Checked by:</p>	<p>Joe Jenkinson</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	