Appendix 4: Survey Form Index Sheet

The completed forms for all sites surveyed are available to view and download from our website. Due to the number of sites surveyed the forms have been split into 15 survey areas:

1. Aston, Swallownest and Fence
2. Bassingthorpe Farm
3. Dalton
4. Dinnington
5. Kiveton and North Anston
6. Maltby, Hellaby, Bramley and Thurcroft
7. Masbrough
8. Northfield, Eastwood and Aldwarke
9. Parkgate
10. Rotherham Town Centre and Moorgate
11. Swinton and Kilnhurst
12. Templeborough, Brinsworth and Catcliffe
13. Waleswood
14. Wath, Manvers and Cortonwood
15. Waverley

A PDF document is provided for each survey area containing a site map and completed form for each of the sites surveyed. Each site has been clearly bookmarked by reference number to enable the information to be easily accessed.

The following tables indicate the sites falling within each survey group.

If you have any problems accessing or queries regarding the documents then please contact Forward Planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone: 01709 823869</th>
<th>Post: Rotherham MBC Forward Planning Planning and Regeneration Service Bailey House Rawmarsh Road ROTHERHAM S60 1TD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 01709 823865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:forward.planning@rotherham.gov.uk">forward.planning@rotherham.gov.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minicom: 01709 823536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web: <a href="http://www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning">www.rotherham.gov.uk/forwardplanning</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Area</td>
<td>Site Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston, Swallownest and Fence</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassingthorpe Farm</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalton</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinnington</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Area</td>
<td>Site Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiveton and North Anston</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltby, Hellaby, Bramley and</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurcroft</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masbrough</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Area</td>
<td>Site Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northfield, Eastwood and Aldwarke</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkgate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Area</td>
<td>Site Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Town Centre and Moorgate</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Area</td>
<td>Site Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templeborough, Brinsworth</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Catcliffe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waleswood</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wath, Manvers and Cortonwood</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Area</td>
<td>Site Ref.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverley</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Reference: 19  
UDP Reference: E36  
Original Assessment Date: 10/02/2006  
2009 Update: 10/12/2009

Site Name: Fence Farm Business Park

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 2.75  
Land remaining in 2009 =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline skirts the SE edge of the site. Access through Mediplan’s curtilage unlikely to be acceptable. Owner indicates that access could be gained from south in return for some residential development (subject to acceptability in highway terms).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reasonable but not outstanding surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to Greenbelt on Sheffield Road, housing and industrial area/A57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No None available - Green Belt or already developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No. Has a UDP Business Use allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>High - RiDO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>Adjacent to major road (A57) and B road to Aston/Swallownest. 4.7km to M1 J33</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>Yes Greenfield site</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access may be need to be addressed to enable development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

Mediplan (Health care / medical supplies) 2002

No

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No No planning applications

Overall market attractiveness score:

3

Reasoning: Good access, greenfield site

Reasonable site in market attractiveness terms

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No Unlikely - nearest railway is 300m but difference in levels/road barrier

No change

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Nearest bus stop is on Sheffield Road (100m). Service 23AB/206/216 Rotherham - Dinnington - Sheffield 2 per hour. SYPTPE scores moderate for access to public transport.

PTE score site 1

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Swallownest is 1km away

No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes Presence of hedges around and on the site but these degraded in places. Site currently forms an attractive green wedge - amenity & rough grassland, plus pond & hedgerows. Would require survey & appropriate mitigation measures.

No change

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

JSA claimant score of 2.19%

No change

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No Greenfield

Overall sustainable development score:

2

2009 Update:

Overall sustainable development score:

2

Original Score

2009 SCORE

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

2

2009 Update:

1
Reasoning: Can address local employment needs, good accessibility to transport

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Close to new housing estates in Swallownest

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
No NO

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie
Serves settlements identified as limited growth area

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Well placed to support local employment but not within any strategically important zones

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
No sign boards. Site currently used for grazing. An attractive environment

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
None identified

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:
Good marketing potential, attractive site well placed to meet local employment needs but less so strategic and sustainability

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation

Poor scoring, green field site

2009 Update:

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Close to new housing estates in Swallownest

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
No NO

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie
Serves settlements identified as limited growth area

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Well placed to support local employment but not within any strategically important zones

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
No sign boards. Site currently used for grazing. An attractive environment

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
None identified

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:
Good marketing potential, attractive site well placed to meet local employment needs but less so strategic and sustainability

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

Serves a potential principal settlement

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

Could consider re-allocation to urban greenspace if unlikely to come forward for employment

2009 Update:

Reasonable strategic location, however access constraints and adjoining uses limit attractiveness
**Site Name:** Swallownest Industrial Area Plot 2

**Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) =** 1.75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation in progress with imminent completion - RSY have shortlisted developers. Landfill Gas consultation zone. Overhead line and pylon in NW corner of site. Landfill/ tipping site adjacent to northern boundary beyond railway cutting.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Disposal/MU sites adjacent, Scheduled Washland and Greenbelt on two sides. Curtis Power tip and plant hire firm creating an eyesore and mud on road and heavy traffic.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  E94 a possibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Progress board on site. RSY RiDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High potential on completion of restoration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to A57 - 3.6km to M1 J33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>Yes - site now restored and ready for development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  RSY restoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:**

- Reclamation complete. Some units operational on site to north. This site has yet to be developed
- Scheduled Washland and Greenbelt on two sides.
- RiDO indicate high potential
- No change
- Yes - site now restored and ready for development
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?
No. Reclamation site - Beighton Colliery, clearance of existing uses - concrete plant

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes Beighton Colliery Regeneration. Possible advanced manufacturing and metals

Overall market attractiveness score: 3
Reasoning: Reclamation scheme should create a marketable site regardless of the adjacent uses

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
Yes Adjacent to railway line

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?
Bus stops close to site entrance. Service Nos 27/27A/264 Waterthorpe to Rotherham - 1 per hr, less accessible (720 m) 23/24/206/216 - Sheffield - Dinnington - Rotherham 2/hr. SYPTLE scores poor for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
Swallownest 1km, Waterthorpe 1.8km

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No NO - former colliery site. Beighton Nature Reserve adjacent but protected by railway line and landscape bund

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
JSA claimant score of 2.19%

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score: 2

2009 Update:
Yes development taken place

2009 Update:
No change

Overall sustainable development score: 2

2009 Update:
Site reclaimed and development of land appears to be underway

2009 Update:
Issue of levels difference may be a problem

2009 Update:
PTE score site 1

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
Reasoning: Not close to services, but a brownfield site

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Within 350m of residential areas in Swallownest

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
No NO

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie
Serves settlements identified as limited growth area

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Good location to serve local settlements

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Development progress boards on site

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
None

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:

Regeneration scheme and reasonable location to serve local settlements, good access to national road network

Recommendation: Retain as employment development site

Reasonable score although some distance from local facilities

2009 Update:
Close to residential areas at Swallownest however there are potential problems in crossing the B6200

No change

2009 Update:
Serves a proposed principal settlement

2 2

2009 Update:

No change

2 2

2009 Update:

Reasonable location to serve local settlements, good access to national road network

2 2

Recommendation: Retain as employment development site
## Site Name: Swallownest Industrial Area Plot 5

### Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 0.35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor/dangerous Access onto one way system to cut-off part of Chesterfield Road. Falls within the boundary of RSY Beighton Colliery reclamation although not actively part of scheme at present. Affected by traffic to Landfill site and plant hire firm. Landfill Gas consultation zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenbelt and MU adjacent to site. Reclamation site on restoration will enhance the environment. Plant Hire and Waste Disposal firm create a poor environment. Bounded by railway cutting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - ongoing restoration and marketing of Beighton Colliery site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Apparently - RiDO. No signs on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Apparently High - RiDO</td>
<td></td>
<td>RiDO indicate high potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>Adjacent to A57, 3.5km to M1 J31</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Constraints not a problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:**
- Enclosed site but no serious constraints to development
- Green Belt, bounded by roads and railway cutting
- No change
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

No. Note reclamation of adjacent site E93

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes RB2004/1347 O/L for MU as part of the reclamation scheme on E93. Possibly advanced manufacturing & metals

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Likely to be more attractive once the reclamation is complete and development proceeds on E93. Access needs consideration

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No Adjacent to railway but in a deep cutting.

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Bus stops close to site entrance. Service Nos 27/27A/264 Waterthorpe to Rotherham - 1 per hr, less accessible (720 m) 23/24/206/216 - Sheffield - Dinnington - Rotherham 2/hr. SYPTE scores poor for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Swallownest 0.9km, Waterthorpe 2km

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No Adjacent to Greenbelt but unlikely to detract. May be some biodiversity around railway cutting? bushes on site

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

JSA claimant score of 2.19%

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

2009 Update:

Original Score 2009 SCORE

1 1

Reasonably attractive site. Owners currently considering potential uses for site.

Score of 1 is based on PTE score for adjacent site

No change

No change

No change

No change

No change

No change

No change

No change

No change
**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
*Within 260m of residential areas in Swallownest*

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
*No. Possible clusters - advanced manufacturing & metals*

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie
*Serves settlements identified as limited growth area*

**Overall strategic planning score:**

*Reasoning: Good location to serve local settlements*

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

*Overgrown site surrounded on three sides by roads and also a railway cutting. Embanked on 3 sides. Overgrown and littered.*

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
*No - gated*

**Overall assessment score**

*Reasons for overall score:*

*Regeneration scheme and reasonable location to serve local settlements, good access to national road network*

*Recommendation: Retain as employment development site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road infrastructure means site is relatively inaccessible to local communities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves potential principal settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small, remote site</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overgrown site surrounded on three sides by roads and also a railway cutting. Embanked on 3 sides.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Attractiveness</td>
<td>Original Score</td>
<td>2009 SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electricity substation and powerlines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New unit is fine but others are of poor quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed quality of site environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed surroundings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High potential given location and success of existing uses/new occupiers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very good access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issue?
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No
Development likely to take place first on remainder of MU site to south, but could be some longer term potential

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Mixed uses, some could be in declining sectors

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Generally high scoring in market attractiveness terms

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
Yes
Rail link may be available but at lower site level

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

2009 Update:
Yes the colliery site has been reclaimed and developed and there are a number of new occupiers.

Development of new commercial premises has taken place.

Development has now taken place on the majority of the MU site to the south although there may be some redevelopment opportunities on other smaller sites currently in use in the future.

Mixed uses, some could be in declining sectors or non-traditional employment such as caravan storage.

No change

No change

2009 Update:

No, although site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site:
future development to include buffer habitat
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  

2009 Update: 2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  

Yes

2009 Update: Yes site is brownfield

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Brownfield site let down by lack of accessibility and proximity to local facilities

2009 Update: No change

Q2.6 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  

2009 Update: 2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  

Yes

2009 Update: Yes site is brownfield

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Brownfield site let down by lack of accessibility and proximity to local facilities

2009 Update: No change

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  

Some nearby residential areas but problems crossing B6200

2009 Update: No change

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  

Yes Objective 1 (although funding unlikely to be available for this site)

2009 Update: Not in an area of strategic importance

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  

Serves a potential principal settlement

2009 Update: No change

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Reasonably good in strategic terms

2009 Update: No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Not really suitable for alternative uses (previous lack of interest in pub/restaurant permission)

2009 Update: No change

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update: No change

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score: Reasonable scores across all factors

2009 Update: No change

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
## Site Name: Lay cast, Fence Farm (East of railway line)

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Close to railway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to sewage works and railway. Floodplain runs along boundary to west.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conversion may be possible although redevelopment may be preferable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has now been cleared and awaits opencast reclamation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonable site layout and environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surroundings are generally of a good quality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Surroundings are generally of a good quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Scrubland to rear of site could be developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lane Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Lane Walker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GVA Grimleys are the agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High potential having regard to location, accessibility and site size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good road access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good road access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No  Clearance and reclamation likely to require additional funds

2009 Update:
Yes clearance complete and reclamation of site due to start.

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Planning permission 09/1119 for remediation and 09/1155 mixed use development

2009 Update:

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No  Growth sectors likely to require more modern facilities - could meet future demands if comprehensively redeveloped

2009 Update:
Site is to be comprehensively redeveloped for commercial activity.

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Site on market

2009 Update:
Site no longer occupied, awaiting redevelopment.

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Overall medium market attractiveness reflecting mixed scoring

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

Yes  Potential for rail access

2009 Update:

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

1  1

2009 Update:

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

1  1

2009 Update:

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes  Some potential for impact given location within Woodhouse washlands

2009 Update:
There are mature trees on site.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2  2

2009 Update:
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes  Land to rear of site may be greenfield

Overall sustainable development score:  
Reasoning: Reasonable site although concerns regarding proximity to residential population and other facilities

2009 Update:  
Potential high quality site.

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  
Yes  Objective 1

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  
Yes  Objective 1

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  
No change

Overall strategic planning score:  
Reasoning: Reasonably well placed strategically

2009 Update:  
No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Unsuitable for other uses given location

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:  
No change

Overall assessment score  
Reasons for overall score:  
Scores reasonably well across all criteria

2009 Update:  
Scores reasonably well across all criteria, site is currently being reclaimed for development.

Recommendation:  Allocate as employment development site
Site Name: Jeld Wen, Fence Farm (west of railway)

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adjacent to railway, sewage works, much of this site is within Flood Zone 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No the site is not being marketed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Site Reference: 99  Date of Assessment: 12/06/2006  Officer: Helen Sleigh

Current users: 2009 Assessment Date: 10/12/2009  Officer: Helen Sleigh / Ryan Shepherd

2009 Update:
- Adjacent to railway, sewage works, much of this site is within Flood Zone 2
- The small greenfield area within the site is only accessible through Jeld Wen.
- No the site is not being marketed

2009 Update:
- No change

2009 Update:
- No change

2009 Update:
- No change

2009 Update:
- No change

---

Site Reference: 99  Date of Assessment: 12/06/2006  Officer: Helen Sleigh

Current users: 2009 Assessment Date: 10/12/2009  Officer: Helen Sleigh / Ryan Shepherd

Site Name: Jeld Wen, Fence Farm (west of railway)

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adjacent to railway, sewage works, much of this site is within Flood Zone 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No the site is not being marketed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
Storage buildings

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes Could be suitable for growth sectors given large grounds and location of site.

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Could be continued demand for current user (particularly if classed within construction sector)

Reasoning: Generally site is attractive to the market

Overall market attractiveness score: Generally site is attractive to the market.

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
Yes Potential for rail access

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
Although close to major public transport routes in Sheffield and Woodhouse Mill station

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
Yes Possible impacts as within Woodhouse washlands

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:
Adjacent site (ELR 98) viable without public funding

2009 Update:
Several minor extensions, 05/0851 change of use of a warehouse to research facility

2009 Update:
Site or buffer is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Brownfield site with potential rail access, although concerns around accessibility and proximity of other services

2009 Update:

Site is brownfield

2009 Update:

Reasoning: Brownfield site with potential rail access, although concerns around accessibility and proximity of other services

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Scores reasonably well in strategic terms

2009 Update:

Scores reasonably well in strategic terms

2009 Update:

Scores reasonably well in strategic terms

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Unsuitable for alternative uses

2009 Update:

Unsuitable for alternative uses; predominantly within Flood Zone 2

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score: Reasonable site highly rated in market attractiveness terms

2009 Update:

Reasonable site highly rated in market attractiveness terms

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
### Site Name: Mansfield Road Industrial Estate, Aston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bad neighbour uses, site ownership constraints</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low quality but functional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)??</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low quality environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attractive wider setting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes  Land to south and east within greenbelt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>In active employment use, site appears fully utilised but there are indications it is still being marketed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Quality of the site diminishes its attractiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High potential given location on main road</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Located off main road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Market Attractiveness**

**Current users:**

**2009 Assessment Date:** 11/12/2010  **2009 Officer:** Helen Sleigh / Ryan Shepherd

**Score**

**Original Score**

**2009 Update:**

**No change**
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?

Yes  Redevelopment may require public funding to improve quality of development

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

07/0825, 07/0260, 08/0105: truck / coach washing machine, associated buildings and use of land as extension to truck washing.

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No  Redevelopment may help improve quality. Existing concrete use is part of construction sector

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Mix of uses likely to remain in demand

Overall market attractiveness score: Mixed scoring but overall a reasonably attractive site for the market

Reasoning: Mixed scoring but overall a reasonably attractive site for the market

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPT scores this site low in accessibility by sustainable transport modes

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

2009 Update:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2.1</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2.2</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYPT scores this site low in accessibility by sustainable transport modes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2.3</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2.4</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: 2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

2009 Update: The site is brownfield

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Reasonably sustainable site although remote from facilities

No change

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: 3

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes  Objective 1

2009 Update: The site is not in an area of strategic importance

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update: Serves a potential principal settlement

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Close to nearby housing however unlikely to attract Objective 1 funding

Close to nearby housing

2009 Update: 2

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Visually prominent site surrounded by greenbelt. Unsuitable for other uses - Mansfield Road is a good boundary for existing residential development

2009 Update: Visually prominent site surrounded by greenbelt currently unsuitable for other uses.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Public Right of Way (PROW) along Brookhouse Road

2009 Update: No change

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score: Reasonably attractive, sustainable and strategic site

2009 Update: No change

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
Employment Land Review Update 2009
South of Aston Common Industrial Estate
Off Mansfield Road, Aston
(suggested allocation)
### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong> No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography (current industrial estate is on a plateaux), greenbelt, greenfield site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong> Open countryside, excellent views No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Adjacent industrial estate <strong>2009 Update:</strong> No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>given location and accessibility to main road network <strong>2009 Update:</strong> Concern regarding development of employment activities given topography of site, hence medium marketing potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Good access to main road network</td>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong> Good access to main road network No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall market attractiveness score:</td>
<td>Reasonable attractive site reflects mix of low and high criteria scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning: Reasonably attractive site</td>
<td>Reasonably attractive site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Reasonably attractive site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
<td>SYPTES scores are lower than previously.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
<td>Likely negative impact of biodiversity and amenity value, likely to have ecological value requiring considerable mitigation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Likely negative impact of biodiversity and amenity value, likely to have ecological value requiring considerable mitigation</td>
<td>Scoping of impact of any new development on ecology will be required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Greenfield site remote from local services and limited accessibility by public transport

No change

1 1

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: 3 3

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes Objective 1

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update: Serves a potential principal settlement

2 2

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Close to nearby residential area but of limited importance strategically

No change

2 2

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Visually prominent site, currently farmed. Unsuitable for alternative uses.

No change

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score: Reasonably attractive to market and some limited strategic importance, however low sustainability score

2009 Update: Could be reasonably attractive to the market with some limited strategic importance, however low sustainability score

2 2

Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site
Employment Land Review Update 2009
East of Aston Common Industrial Estate
Off Mansfield Road, Aston
(suggested allocation)
**Site Reference:** East of Mansfield Road Industrial Estate, Aston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield, greenbelt site. Distinct hedgerow boundary to edge of current industrial estate, existing farmland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Open countryside, excellent views</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Yes - Adjacent industrial estate</td>
<td>Adjacent industrial estate and other Green Belt land within the boundary of the A57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>High given location and accessibility to main road network</td>
<td>Medium potential for employment development given topography of the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Good access to main road network</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Market Attractiveness Score:**

Current users: 2009 Assessment Date: 11/12/2009 2009 Officer: Helen Sleigh / Ryan Shepherd

Original Score: 2009 Update: No change
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
Yes

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:
Original Score | 2009 Update: Reasonably attractive site reflects mix of low and high criteria scores
Reasoning: Reasonably attractive site | 2 | 2

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
No

SYPT scores this site low

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
Yes Some impact although currently arable land therefore limited negative impact on biodiversity

Scoping of the impact on ecology may be required.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
2

2009 Update: Yes

2009 Update: No

2009 Update: SYPT scores this site low

2009 Update: Scoping of the impact on ecology may be required.

2009 Update: 2
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Greenfield site remote from local services and limited accessibility by public transport

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes Objective 1

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Close to nearby residential area but of limited importance strategically

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Visually prominent site, currently farmed. Unsuitable for alternative uses.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Reasonably attractive to market and some limited strategic importance, however low sustainability score

Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site

2009 Update:
Not brownfield

Overall sustainable development score: 1
Reasoning: No change

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Close to nearby residential area but of limited importance strategically

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Visually prominent site, currently farmed. The site could be considered for residential purposes providing an adequate buffer to the industrial estate is provided.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Could be reasonably attractive to market and some limited strategic importance, however low sustainability score

Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site
### Site Name: Treeton Scrapyard

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>1 Greenbelt allocation, floodrisk, access issues, ground contamination, bad neighbour uses</td>
<td>2009 Update: Flood Zones confirmed as Zone 2 and 3. Green belt allocation; access issues and probable ground contamination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>Poor quality buildings</td>
<td>Buildings are functional and appear fit for purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>Site environment generally poor</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Wooden/landscaped setting adjacent to River Rother</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, but the Mill House and curtilage immediately adjacent to the site are on the market with Fernie Greaves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Low marketing potential given constraints and location</td>
<td>Site considered to have some marketing potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Poor access to main roads through residential areas</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No Possibly not as decontamination may make redevelopment unviable

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Future market may be in decline unless converted to other specialist waste processing

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Limited attractiveness for employment use

2009 Update:

Metal recycling takes place on site.

The market for metals recycling does not appear to be in decline.

Limited attractiveness for employment use however the metals recycling activity appears to be strong in this locality.

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTSE scores site 3 however limited accessibility by other modes of transport

2009 Update:

SYPTSE have now revised their scoring system and the accessibility score for this site has been reduced to 1.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No town or local centres nearby

2009 Update:

No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No Potential for development to improve biodiversity and environmental value by remediation/decontamination.

2009 Update:

Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: 2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

2009 Update: 2

Reasoning: Reasonable sustainability credentials although constraints and current greenbelt allocation limit potential redevelopment

Reasoning: The overall score has now been revised to reflect the poor SYPTE accessibility rating.

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: 3

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes Objective 1

2009 Update:

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

3

Overall strategic planning score:

2009 Update: 2

Reasoning: Potentially well placed to serve local strategic needs, although unlikely to access Objective 1 funding and ability to meet strategic needs is questionable

Reasoning: Not well located to meet strategic needs.

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Potential scope for other waste related processing facilities and possible travellers site with remediation/decontamination

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score: Reasonable scoring in sustainability and strategic terms but very limited market potential.

2009 Update: Generally poor site however it meets some needs in the recycling sector.
Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation
Site Name: Aston Common (remainder of LDF0449)

**Market Attractiveness**

Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?

2009 Update:
Green Belt; greenfield; distinct hedgerow boundaries, steeply sloping site - topography a significant factor in any future development

Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?

2009 Update:
N/A

Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?

2009 Update:
N/A

Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?

2009 Update:
Open countryside with excellent views.

Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?

No

2009 Update:
Yes adjacent sites included within this Employment Land Review

Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?

No

2009 Update:
No

Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?

2009 Update:

Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

2009 Update:
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Reasonably attractive site

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

No

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:

Yes there may be interest from a potential developer

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

N/A

2009 Update:

Reasonably attractive site

2009 Update:

SYPTE have scored this location low for sustainable transport and accessibility

2009 Update:

There may be an ecological impact but this needs to be assessed in the future.

2009 Update:

2
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

**Overall sustainable development score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasoning:</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited sustainable development scores.</td>
<td>Site is greenfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not in an area of Strategic Importance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Serves a potential principal settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall strategic planning score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasoning:</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close to residential areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Visually prominent site, currently farmed. Could be considered for housing development.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for overall score:</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A reasonably attractive site for employment purposes, that is visually prominent and close to residential areas. Could also be considered for housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:** Retain current non-employment allocation
**Site Name:** Bassingthorpe Farm, south of greasebrough lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - other sites suggested as part of Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td>RIDO indicate low marketing potential - current access issues, remoteness of location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

2009 Update: New access roads would be required to facilitate development

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

None

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Limited attractiveness given constraints

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

No

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

PTE score site 1

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes - trees, hedgerows, impact on openness. The potential impact on the setting of listed buildings,
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning:

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update:

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

structures and historic parklands associated with Wentworth Woodhouse (which would require further consideration). Site partially overlaps Local Wildlife Site and development in this area should be avoided if at all possible.

2009 Update:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor score at present, but would improve if developed as a mixed use urban extension</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:
Low scoring site which is remote at present

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:
Low scoring site which is remote at present

Recommendation:  Allocate as employment development site
Site Ref No: ELR134_LDF162
Site Area: 20.18 ha

Employment Land Review Update 2009
Bassingthorpe Farm

Scale: NTS
Date: Nov 2009

Rotherham MBC
Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD

(C) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright. RMBC Licence 100019587

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
Site Name: bassingthorpe farm, north of scrooby lane

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>Green Belt, steep topography, potentially unstable land, pylons, access, the potential impact on the setting of listed buildings, structures and historic parklands associated with Wentworth Woodhouse (which would require further consideration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Reasonable surroundings. Part of site adjacent to Ron Hull industrial site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Yes - other sites at Bassingthorpe Farm put forward as a potential urban extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>RIDO indicate low marketing potential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

2009 Update:
Reasonable access to main road network although some distance to motorway

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update:
No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

2009 Update:
N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning:
Limited attractiveness given constraints

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

2009 Update:
PTE score site 1

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update:
Part of site close to Parkgate town centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

2009 Update:
Yes - trees, open watercourse, hedgerows, impact on
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

No

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Low scores although these would increase if site was developed as part of a mixed use urban extension

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Envisage 10% of the site being for B1 uses as part of residential led mixed use urban extension. If developed then land close to existing employment areas would act as a B1 buffer
Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:

2009 Update:
Low scores at present, likely to increase if the wider area came forward as an urban extension

Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the</td>
<td>Listed building, flood risk on small area, Green Belt, pylons/power lines, topography, the potential impact on the setting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of this site?</td>
<td>of listed buildings, structures and historic parklands associated with Wentworth Woodhouse (which would require further consideration)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an</td>
<td>Countryside - attractive surroundings</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Yes - other sites at Bassingthorpe Farm forming part of suggested urban extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low</td>
<td>Low marketing potential</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning:

Limited attractiveness given current context and constraints

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

No

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

N/A

2009 Update:

Good access to main road but some distance to motorways. New access would be required to allow access to all Bassingthorpe Farm sites

Yes

No

PTE score site 3

Some distance to nearest facilities

Limited attractiveness given current context and constraints

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning:

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Part of site adjoins residential area

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Potential extension to Rotherham urban area

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Envisage 10% of the site being for B1 uses as part of residential led mixed use urban extension. Any new development would provide a B1 buffer to the existing Barbot Hall industrial estate.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Yes - mature trees, hedgerows, close to listed building, significant views. The potential impact on the setting of listed buildings, structures and historic parklands associated with Wentworth Woodhouse (which would require further consideration)

2009 Update:

Limited sustainability scores; would increase if developed as part of a mixed use urban extension

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

Limited sustainability scores; would increase if developed as part of a mixed use urban extension

2009 Update:

High scoring in strategic terms

2009 Update:
Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:

2009 Update:

*Reasonable scores at present, likely to increase if the wider area came forward as an urban extension*

Recommendation: *Allocate as employment development site*
Site Reference: 136  Date of Assessment: 2009  Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

Current users: 2009 Assessment Date: 15/12/2009 2009 Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

Site Name: bassingthorpe farm, south of musbrough lane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Belt, power lines, topography, adjacent to recycling centre, the potential impact on the setting of listed buildings, structures and historic parklands associated with Wentworth Woodhouse (which would require further consideration)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential, countryside, grassed refuse tip to south of site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - other sites put forward as part of proposed Bassingthorpe Farm urban extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>RIDO indicate low marketing potential</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Limited attractiveness given constraints

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

No

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

PTE score site 1

Remote from local facilities at present

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Yes - mature hedgerows, impact on views/openness, agricultural land, the potential impact on the setting of listed buildings, structures and historic parklands

2009 Update:

Close to main road but some distance from motorway

Yes

No

N/A

N/A

2009 Update:

Limited attractiveness given constraints
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Envisage 10% of the site being for B1 uses as part of residential led mixed use urban extension. Live/work units or small B1 units may be preferable in this location given topography and impact development could have on views from Rotherham town centre. Whilst objecting to development of this site, consultants concerned about the potential impact on the setting of listed buildings, structures and historic parklands associated with Wentworth Woodhouse suggest the following mitigation measures:
- Appropriate woodland/landscape buffer planting to the edge of the site along the ridge along Munsbrough Lane;
Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:**

- The limiting of the height of development to 2 storey residential/commercial use, in order to avoid building rising above the existing housing on the skyline;
- Limiting the height of any development on the areas to the east of Scrooby Lane and south of Barbot Old Hall Farm;
- Ensuring that no tree planting would be planted that would rise above ridgelines from these two locations, be in itself out of keeping with the historic character and detract from the historic setting of Wentworth Woodhouse and its associated parkland.

**2009 Update:**

Reasonable scores at present, likely to increase if the wider area came forward as an urban extension

**Recommendation:**  
*Allocate as employment development site*
**Site Reference:** 137  
**Date of Assessment:**  
**Current users:**  
**2009 Assessment Date:** 15/12/2009  
**Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh  
**Site Name:** bassingthorpe farm, bassingthorpe lane  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Green Belt, pylons / power lines, topography, proximity of Vicktrex site, substantive wildlife and geological features including potential green corridor, the potential impact on the setting of listed buildings, structures and historic parklands associated with Wentworth Woodhouse (which would require further consideration)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: countryside, residential; attractive surroundings</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Yes - other Bassingthorpe Farm sites put forward as potential urban extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Low marketing potential</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

2009 Update: Close to main road network but some distance from motorway

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update: Yes

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning:

Limited attractiveness given constraints

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

2009 Update: PTE score site 1

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update: Remote from local facilities at present

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

2009 Update: Yes - mature trees / hedgerows, agricultural land, impact on openness. The potential impact on the setting of
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

No

2009 Update: 3

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning:

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Some areas adjacent to existing housing

2009 Update: 3

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

2009 Update: HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Potential extension to Rotherham urban area

2009 Update: 3

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Envisage 10% of the site being for B1 uses as part of residential led mixed use urban extension. Buffer would be required adjacent to Quarry Lane / Gin House Lane. Whilst objecting to development of this site, consultants concerned about the potential impact on the setting of listed buildings, structures and historic parklands associated with Wentworth Woodhouse (which would require further consideration). Local Wildlife Site is within this site, with substantive wildlife interest, geological and geomorphological interest focused on the stream. Access to and within the site should avoid impacting on the Local Wildlife Site. The site also adjoins another Local Wildlife Site and future development should include buffer habitat.
Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:**

- Listed buildings, structures and historic parklands associated with Wentworth Woodhouse suggest the following mitigation measures:
  - Appropriate woodland/landscape buffer planting to the edge of the site along the ridge along Munsbrough Lane;
  - Limiting the height of development to 2 storey residential/commercial use, in order to avoid building rising above the existing housing on the skyline;
  - Limiting the height of any development on the areas to the east of Scrooby Lane and south of Barbot Old Hall Farm;
  - Ensuring that no tree planting would be planted that would rise above ridgelines from these two locations, be in itself out of keeping with the historic character and detract from the historic setting of Wentworth Woodhouse and its associated parkland.

**2009 Update:**

Reasonable scores at present, likely to increase if the wider area came forward as an urban extension.

**Recommendation:** Allocate as employment development site
STAGE 2 SURVEY RESULTS / SCORING - 2009 UPDATE

Date of Assessment: 19/06/2006 Officer: Rachel Overfield

Site Name: Oldgate Lane, Dalton,

Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?
No constraints evident

Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?
Church and other buildings could be converted but not easily

Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?
Poor, run down environment

Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?
Poor, run down environment

Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?
No No

Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?
No No evidence of marketing

Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?

Site Reference: 53  Date of Assessment: 19/06/2006 Officer: Rachel Overfield

Current users: 2009 Assessment Date: 17/11/2009 2009 Officer: Helen Sleigh / Ryan Shepherd

Original Score 2009 Score 2009 Update:

Market Attractiveness

Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?
No constraints evident

Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?
Church and other buildings could be converted but not easily

Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?
Poor, run down environment

Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?
Poor, run down environment

Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?
No No

Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?
No No evidence of marketing

Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?

2009 Update:
Potential conflict with the church; part of site has now been purchased under housing Market Renewal Pathfinder Initiative and are considering the options for re-development.

2009 Update:
Demolition around the church has taken place.

2009 Update:
The environment is being improved by the demolition of the bonded warehouse and the older residential properties in this area.

2009 Update:
The environment is being improved through demolitions and will be improved further in any subsequent new development.

2009 Update:
Yes now demolition has commenced in the wider area.

2009 Update:
No - site owned by RMBC to facilitate regeneration
Low marketing potential given site and surrounding quality

Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

Adjacent to main road providing reasonable access main road network

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

Yes No obvious viability constraints

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No recent activity

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Reasonable prospects for future

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Reasonable but not outstanding in market attractiveness terms

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTÉ score this site high for sustainable transport modes.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

544m to nearest local/town centre

Given the current HMR Pathfinder proposals RiDO perceive the site to have low marketing potential.

2009 Update:

No change

Public funding is being used to improve the local environment for the benefit of residents.

2009 Update:

Warehouse demolished but no planning permissions sought or granted for further activities.

2009 Update:

None - church likely to remain

2009 Update:

Not outstanding in market attractiveness terms

2009 Update:

No change
Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?  
No  No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:  
Reasoning: Reasonable site but let down by access to local services  
No change

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  
Surrounded by residential use

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  
Yes  within various regeneration initiative areas

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  
Serves a key Babtie settlement

Overall strategic planning score:  
Reasoning: Scores highly on all elements  
No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Active church on site. Surrounded by housing therefore could be potential for housing development.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score  
Reasons for overall score: Scores well in strategic terms but not so  
Scores well in strategic terms but not so
not so well in sustainability and well in market attractiveness terms.
market attractiveness.

Recommendation: Re-allocate to non-employment allocation
### Site Name: R/O Dalton WMC, Dalton

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No direct access to the site, part of site in floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access constraints, part of site in floodplain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A no existing development</td>
<td>2009 Update: N/A no existing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A no existing development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A no existing development</td>
<td>2009 Update: N/A no existing development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A no existing development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Mixed surroundings, built development to road, existing vegetation, sports pitches to north</td>
<td>2009 Update: Mixed surroundings, built development to road, existing vegetation, sports pitches to north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed surroundings, built development to road, existing vegetation, sports pitches to north</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No No</td>
<td>2009 Update: No No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No No</td>
<td>2009 Update: No No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Low - no market interest to date</td>
<td>2009 Update: Low - no market interest to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - no market interest to date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Close to main road</td>
<td>2009 Update: Close to main road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to main road</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability constraints?

Yes  No  obviously excessive constraints

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No  No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

Reasoning: *Site has limited market attractiveness*

1  1

**Sustainable Development**

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No  No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

**SYPTEx score this site high**

2  3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Immediately adjacent to Dalton local centre

**2009 Update:**

No change  3  3

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes  Well developed green space with mosaic of vegetation and habitats, would require ecological survey work and mitigation measures. Site provides a distinct and important element within the adjacent green space land. Negative impact on existing biodiversity value, would require mitigation.

**2009 Update:**

No change

---

2009 Update:

No - the site has not come forward and it is unlikely to do so without public sector support to resolve some of the outstanding issues

1  1

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

N/A

2009 Update:

Site has very limited attractiveness.

1  1

2009 Update:

Site has very limited attractiveness.

1  1

2009 Update:

No - the site has not come forward and it is unlikely to do so without public sector support to resolve some of the outstanding issues

1  1

2009 Update:

No  1

2009 Update:

SYPTE score this site high  3  3

2009 Update:

No change  3  3

2009 Update:

No change
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  
2009 Update: 3 2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
No  Greenfield  
2009 Update:  
Overall sustainable development score:  
Reasoning: Well placed and accessible site, however greenfield and potential biodiversity issues  
Site has considerable constraints from its biodiversity / ecological value.  
Overall strategic planning score:  
Reasoning: Very good site in strategic terms  
Scores well in strategic terms  
Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:  
Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?  
No  
Overall assessment score  
Reasons for overall score: Scores well in accessibility and strategic terms but let down in terms of market attractiveness  
Although within Rotherham Urban Area, the site does not have direct access to the main route. There is likely to be a significant impact on biodiversity if this site
Recommendation: Re-allocate to non-employment allocation
Site Name: Land west of Rotherham Golf Course, Thrybergh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Zone 3; Green Belt; inaccessible (shared access with the golf club) and some power lines overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Relatively remote from view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer: Helen Sleigh / Ryan Shepherd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update:

No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

2009 Update:

SYPT score this site low

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:

Would require an access road and measures to deal with the Flood Zone 3 issues

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

N/A

2009 Update:

Many site constraints and site in a remote location not visible from the main highway network.

2009 Update:

SYPTE score this site low

2009 Update:

There may be biodiversity interest on the site. Local Wildlife Site is within this site and development should be avoided within this area if at all possible

2009 Update:

1
**Q2.6** Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

*No*

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**Reasoning:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:**

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall assessment score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential biodiversity interests means only part of the site could be developed. The site is remote and has limited access. There are many site constraints and the site is in a remote location not visible from the main highway network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Only potential constraint is eastern part of site is near sewage works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Caravan sales/storage on opposite side of Todwick Road, and proximity of sewage works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Yes E46 - part of Outline planning permission for phase 2 redevelopment of former colliery along with this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Expected to be on market soon given success of phase 1 of Dinnington colliery redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Good access to main road network as adjacent to B6463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Funding secured for redevelopment of the colliery site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?
Outline planning permission for redevelopment

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes Will provide land suitable for a range of businesses as part of the comprehensive redevelopment scheme for the former colliery. Identified as potentially suitable for advanced metals and manufacturing by Renaissance South Yorkshire

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Attractive to market given commitment to funding and development and provision of land to meet market requirements

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?
SYPTA scores poor for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
No local or town centres within 500m

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
Yes Likely loss of existing habitat arising from temporary permission for willow coppicing, and existing grass land and shrubs.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
JSA claimants rate of 2.63

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes Related to restoration condition

2009 Update:
RB2008/1562 - permission for new access road granted and work started

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
PTE score site 2

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
Coppicing no longer taking place and infrastructure works underway

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change
Overall sustainable development score: 2
Reasoning: Generally scores well although not accessible to local services
No change

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Some housing within 100m of the site, although majority of residential areas are more than 500m away
No change

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes Within UDP regeneration and Objective 1 P5 areas
No longer within Objective 1 P5

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie
Well located to serve areas identified as growth and key growth settlements
Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Scores highly although some issue of proximity of local population
No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score: 3
Reasons for overall score:
Well located site, part of comprehensive regeneration scheme
No change

Recommendation: Retain as employment development site
Church Lane (North)

Dinnington

Employment Land Review 2009

Site Ref No: LDF098, ELR015

Site Area: 1.41 ha

Site boundary

1.41 Ha

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

(C) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright. RMB Licence 100019587

DATE: Nov 2009
SCALE: NTS

Site Name: Dinnington Church La (north)

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 3.05  Land remaining in 2009 =

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed industrial environment, including land being developed as phase 1 of the colliery redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Adjacent to E45. Part of this site (east of Church Lane) is within phase 1 of the colliery redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  That part of site in phase 1 is being marketed by Knight Frank/Fearnie Greaves (signs promote development of 'Bentley Business Park')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site being marketed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good access to main road network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Funding already secured for redevelopment of former colliery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- High quality developments on phase 1
- Site being marketed
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

*Development of infrastructure underway to support development on part of the allocation*

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes  Redevelopment will support development meeting market needs

**Overall market attractiveness score:** 3

**Reasoning:** Site very attractive to the market

**No change**

---

**Sustainable Development**

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYTPE scores poor for access to public transport.

**PTE score site 3**

**No change**

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Nearest local or town centre is over 500m from site

**No change**

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes  Land within phase 2 of colliery redevelopment is currently grassland therefore some potential loss of habitat. Plot 21b is being developed now, should have installed amphibian fencing but have not - this has been referred to EN. Dev on 21b & 21c should maintain a 8m buffer along Eel Mires Dike in line with overall Dinnington Colliery outline application.

**Woodland buffer should be protected and ponds on site could support wildlife**

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

JSA claimant rate is 2.63

**2**

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes  Related to previous planning permission condition

**No change**

**Overall sustainable development score:** 2

**No change**
Reasoning: Reasonable site let down by access to services

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Some housing close to site, however majority is 4 to 500m away

2009 Update: No change

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes Within UDP regeneration and Objective 1 P5 area. Site also potentially suitable for advanced metals and manufacturing

2009 Update: No longer within Objective 1 P5 area

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie
Potentially serves settlements identified as growth and key growth areas

2009 Update: Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Well placed to support regeneration although some concern at proximity of local community

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

none

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:
Part of comprehensive redevelopment scheme

Recommendation: Retain as employment development site

2009 Update:
Well located site, with high market attractiveness scores
### Site Name: Dinnington Outgang Lane

#### Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 12.4

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Adjacent to existing industrial areas and urban greenspace</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sites/units being marketed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>Good access to main road network</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>Yes Funding already used to enable redevelopment of colliery</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?</td>
<td>Development already taken place elsewhere within the allocation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Update:

- Development taken place in rest of the UDP allocation however no recent planning permission or developments
Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes  Part of redevelopment of colliery. Site also identified as potentially suitable for advanced metals and manufacturing

Overall market attractiveness score:

| Reasoning: | Site very attractive to the market |
| Original Score | 3 | 3 |
| 2009 Update: | No change |

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Frequent bus service serves Monksbridge Road/Outgang Lane. SYPTEx scores good for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No local or town centre within 500m

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No - current site prepared for development. Unlikely to be any adverse impact on adjacent greenspace. Landscape plans yet to be agreed for Dinnington Colliery Outline application. Some existing vegetation retained around edge of site that is to be incorporated into plans, also care required for plots adjacent to the dike as buffer zone is being agreed

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

JSA claimant rate is 2.63

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes  Brownfield with regard to previous planning permission

Overall sustainable development score:

| Reasoning: | Reasonable site but some issue of accessibility of local services |
| Original Score | 2 | 2 |
| 2009 Update: | No change |

| 2009 Update: | Site or buffer is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat |
| Original Score | 3 | 3 |
| 2009 Update: | No change |

| 2009 Update: | Site or buffer is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat |
| Original Score | 3 | 3 |
| 2009 Update: | No change |

| 2009 Update: | Site or buffer is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat |
| Original Score | 3 | 3 |
| 2009 Update: | No change |

| 2009 Update: | Site or buffer is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat |
| Original Score | 3 | 3 |
| 2009 Update: | No change |
**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Some parts of site close to residential areas, but majority of housing is 500m or more away

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?

Yes  
Within UDP regeneration area and Objective 1 P5 area. Site also identified as potentially suitable for advanced metals and manufacturing

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie

Potentially serves settlements identified as growth and key growth settlements

**Overall strategic planning score:**

3  3

**Reasoning:** Site would support local regeneration, although some issue of proximity of local residents

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

2009 Update:

**Overall assessment score**

3  3

**Reasons for overall score:**

Part of comprehensive redevelopment scheme

Recommendation: Retain as employment development site

2009 Update:

Well located sites, attractive to the market

Site Name: Dinnington Cramfit Brook

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 10.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to sewage works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to countryside to south, but also adjacent to sewage works and industrial estate to the west</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E42 which along with this site is phase 2 of the colliery redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - expected on market soon given success of phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scheme will eventually provide access to main road as part of infrastructure development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently only accessible to main roads through adjacent sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability problem?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding in place for redevelopment of former colliery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

Permission granted for children’s hospice on part of site. Planning permission for colliery redevelopment

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes Part of colliery redevelopment and will support development meeting market needs. Site potentially suitable for advanced manufacturing and metals.

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Is likely to become attractive to market but several factors limit current overall score

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Poorly served at present. SYPTE scores poor for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No residential areas close

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes Currently used for willow coppicing, therefore potential for loss of habitats in future. Also potentially some impact on open views to the urban greenspace to the south. Site is adjacent to Cramfit Brook (HS304). Landscape / management plans for the entire dinnington colliery site ongoing, the restoration plans include the adjacent greenspace

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

JSA rate of 2.63

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes Related to previous planning permission

2009 Update:

RB2008/1562 - permission granted for new access road and work started on site

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

Attractive site with development of infrastructure underway

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No - site no longer used for coppicing and infrastructure works underway. Site or buffer is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

PTE score site 1

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change
Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Remote location

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Part of site is within 500m of housing, although majority are over 500m

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes Within UDP regeneration area and Objective 1 P5 area. Potentially suitable for advanced manufacturing and metals.

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie
Potentially serves areas identified as growth and key growth areas

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Well placed to support local regeneration, although some concern regarding proximity of local population

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Note that currently development restricted to owner occupiers by the land owner. Site includes balancing facility to deal with drainage. Recommendation is to retain the site as an employment development site, but that this would exclude the balancing facility.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
none

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:
Part of comprehensive redevelopment scheme. Likely to be

2009 Update:
Attractive site which is part of a
more attractive in the medium to long term. comprehensive redevelopment scheme. Likely to be developed in the medium to long term.

**Recommendation:** Retain as employment development site
### Site Name: Timber Yard and adjoining properties, Dinnington

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Timber Centre is accessed by a separate entrance. Site accessed from Outgang Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to all units is not from main road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable building quality - some timber yard buildings could be re-used for storage/manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable site quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable surroundings, adjacent to greenspace, residential and industrial uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>High quality landscaping and public realm treatment along Outgang Lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although owners indicate little prospect of marketing timber yard for continued use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High marketing potential for site given proximity to colliery redevelopment, although in current state the site will have less potential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RIDO have scored this site with medium marketing potential given the current owners interest in seeking planning permission for residential development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

Reasonable access to main road network

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues? 

Yes Re-use of buildings could be viable as would residential development. Redevelopment for industrial use less likely to be viable

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No

Extension

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No Unlikely to be suitable given preferable locations on Dinnington Colliery

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Manufacturing use may have continued demand but timber yard and other uses likely to see decline

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Reasonably attractive site

2009 Update:

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Quality bus corridor, site close to Dinnington town centre

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update:
Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No - although timber yard has some scrubland to rear of site and substantial tree belt to boundary

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

1

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

Mixed scoring but overall a reasonably sustainable site close to Dinnington town centre

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

3

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes UDP regeneration area, Objective 1, proposed masterplanning work by neighbourhoods

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

Overall strategic planning score:

Well placed to serve local strategic needs

Reasoning: Mixed scoring but overall a reasonably sustainable site close to Dinnington town centre

2009 Update:

There could also be wet woodland along the northern boundary. Site or buffer is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat

2009 Update:

Yes

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

Yes UDP Strategic Regeneration Area, within housing renewal masterplanning area

2009 Update:

Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

Potential for redevelopment for housing given adjacent residential uses to east of the site

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Reasonable site that scores highly in terms of supporting strategic needs

2009 Update:
This site is currently subject to a planning application for residential purposes.

Recommendation: Re-allocate to non-employment allocation
## Monksbridge Trading Estate, Dinnington (ELS003)

**Site Reference:** 105  
**Date of Assessment:** 12/06/2006  
**Officer:** Helen Slei

**Current users:**  
**2009 Assessment Date:** 24/11/2009  
**2009 Officer:** Helen Sleigh / Ryan Shepherd

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Potential access constraints, residential on part of site limits future development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reasonable buildings, garage occupies large corner plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor site environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Substantial landscaping and green belt land opposite this site to north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No - site fully occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High potential given location and close to Dinnington Colliery site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some access issues but generally well located to main road network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>2009 Update</td>
<td>Original Score</td>
<td>2009 Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall market attractiveness score:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasoning:</strong> Overall a reasonably attractive site reflecting a range of criteria scores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainable Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
<td>SYPTE scores this site high</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
<td>New retail facilities provided at Laughton Common</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

**Overall sustainable development score:**
**Reasoning:** Reasonably sustainable brownfield site although not in close proximity to local services

**Strategic Planning**
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

**Overall strategic planning score:**
**Reasoning:** High scoring, well placed to serve local needs

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Limited potential for alternative uses - residential may be considered but unlikely to link well with existing residential areas. Could be considered comprehensively with ELS004

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**
**Reasons for overall score:** Reasonably well placed site, well placed to meet local strategic needs

2009 Update:
The site is brownfield

2009 Update:
Reasonably sustainable brownfield site.

2009 Update:
UDP Strategic Regeneration Area

2009 Update:
Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
In conclusion this is a reasonably attractive employment site, well placed to continue meeting local strategic needs.
Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: Access for John Owen Transport Haulage is only available from Outgang Lane not Monksbridge Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access from Monksbridge Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings currently in use. Includes row of terrace houses currently subject to CPO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: Low quality site environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low quality site environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: Reasonably good surroundings - directly opposite Dinnington Colliery site entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably good surroundings - directly opposite Dinnington Colliery site entrance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: Yes Adjoining land currently in use (ELS003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Adjoining land currently in use (ELS003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: High potential given location and close to Dinnington Colliery site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High potential given location and close to Dinnington Colliery site</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: Some access issues but generally well located to main road network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some access issues but generally well located to main road network</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability 

No Redevelopment most likely to require public funding

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Some activity related to Brookes Concrete site

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes Some potential for higher quality employment uses in relation to Dinnington Colliery site

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Mixed prospects for occupiers. Concrete product likely to be part of construction growth sector

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Overall a good site reasonably attractive to the market

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTTE scores this site as high.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2 3

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2 2
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Fairly sustainable site although concern over proximity of local services
No change

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Yes

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes UDP regeneration area, Objective 1, neighbourhoods masterplans

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?
Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Well placed to meet local needs
No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Potential for residential development for which there could be some demand (Council have been approached regarding possible housing). Could be considered comprehensively with ELS003.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: High scoring strategically and reasonable in sustainability and market attractiveness terms
No change

2009 Update:
The site is brownfield

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
Yes

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
### Site Name: Rotherham Road B1 site, Laughton Common

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Some access and parking issues</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Buildings generally of a poorer quality, some potential for re-use</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Overall quality is poor (although mix of sites means no overall layout).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Substantial hedgerow to parts of main road</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area is of mixed quality, however there has been some new build within reasonable layouts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Surrounding landscape not of a very high quality.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding landscape includes residential and caravan storage; quality of local environment not too bad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>No, although sites within this area could be comprehensively developed</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Medium marketing potential for site</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is considered that this is a well used employment area and there are no vacancies.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Reasonably close to main roads but adjacent to residential area and also Todwick</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No  Comprehensive redevelopment likely to require subsidy

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employmenet uses/planning briefs)?

Waterside business park

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes  Waterside business park meets needs of small businesses - similar potential for other parts of the site

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Mixed prospects, some likely to be in growth sectors. Caravan storage appears to be spreading without planning permission.

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Reasonably attractive site

2009 Update: New development has come forward since the last ELR. 3 3

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

2009 Update: SYPTE score this site high. 2 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update: 1 1

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No  Although hedgerow may have some limited value

2009 Update: Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat

2009 Update: 05/1902: planning permission granted for the development of B1 business units. Also there have been several other minor permissions granted.
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: 2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

2009 Update: The site is brownfield

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Generally sustainable although local services are not located close by

No change

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: 

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes UDP regeneration area, Objective 1, neighbourhoods masterplans

2009 Update: UDP regeneration area, Housing Renewal neighbourhood masterplans

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update: Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: High scoring site suited to meeting local needs

No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Some potential for residential development although this would need to be comprehensive (and waterside park is a modern B1 development).

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score: Generally a reasonable site particularly in strategic terms

2009 Update: Good site well located to continue meeting local requirements.
Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
Employment Land Review 2009

North of Todwick Road

Site Area: 13.53 ha

Site Ref No: ELR108

DATE: Nov 2009

SCALE: NTS

Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD
Rotherham MBC

Site boundary

Site Area: 13.53 ha

13.53 HA

Employment Land Review 2009

North of Todwick Road

13.53 HA
Date of Assessment: 12/06/2006  
Officer: Helen Slei

Site Name: North of Todwick Road Industrial Estate, Dinnington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site accessed only via Safety Clean site</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Attractive surroundings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Low potential given access constraints</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Accessible only through existing Safety Kleen site, problems of Todwick Road cross roads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

Yes  Probably viable as expansion land but development for other users could require public funding to overcome constraints

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

07/1920 new waste transfer station associated with Safety Kleen.

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No  No - site land locked and inaccessible

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score: Poor market attractiveness primarily due to access constraints

Reasoning: Poor market attractiveness primarily due to access constraints

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYMTE score this site low

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

1

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes  Adjacent pond is of significant value as only location of one of our BAP species. Vegetation complements surrounding countryside. Site may be part of Thurcroft Public Trail. Negative impact would require significant mitigation.

Now designated a Local Wildlife Site. Wildlife interest includes the potential for water voles, Pilwort and neutral grassland.
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: 2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Overall sustainable development score:

Original score: 1
Reasoning: Poor unsustainable site

2009 Update: 1
Reasoning: Poor unsustainable site development would have a significant potential impact on biodiversity.

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: 1

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes UDP regeneration area, Objective 1, possible neighbourhoods mini masterplans

2009 Update: UDP Strategic Regeneration Area

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update: Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

Overall strategic planning score:

Original score: 1
Reasoning: Some potential to meet local needs, although remote from local residential population

2009 Update: 2
Reasoning: No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Potential to allocate as greenbelt or urban greenspace. Not suitable for other development. The Thurcroft to Dinnington Mineral Line public trail runs adjacent to the site.

Designated a Local Wildlife Site

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

The Thurcroft to Dinnington Mineral Line public trail runs adjacent to the site and is particularly well used

Overall assessment score

Original score: 1
Reasoning: Overall a poor inaccessible site

2009 Update: 1
Reasoning: Overall a poor inaccessible site, the
interest on the Local Wildlife Site may well prohibit any future development. Consideration will need to be given to re-allocating site for countryside / bio-diversity purposes.

Recommendation: Re-allocate to non-employment allocation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2009 Update: Green Belt, access to A57 dependent on the improvement of Todwick Crossroads and the development of a new roundabout.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009 Update: The release of this site from the Green Belt depends on the future spatial strategy for the Borough or the site is essential to meet strategic employment needs. This site may be released as part of the urban extension to Dinnington Principal Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009 Update: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: RIDO view this site as having high marketing potential, however there are policy and access constraints that need to be resolved before the site is released.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name: Dinnington West Urban Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No - to be considered as an urban extension or a strategic employment site to meet Boroughwide needs.

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score: 1

Reasoning:

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTÉ score this site low.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

A limited level of new services and facilities may be needed in this locality if this development is to proceed.
Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:

Development in this location may have an impact on biodiversity and an assessment of this impact and any mitigation will need to be considered. Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat

The site is greenfield

Part of proposed urban extension to Dinnington. If this site comes forward, consideration needs to be given to improving its sustainability credentials.

The site could provide local jobs for local people if adjoining sites were also released as part of the urban extension. However this site may be considered to be of strategic importance for employment purposes.

No - however could serve Dinnington Principal town and the southern area of Rotherham.

Proposed as an urban extension to Dinnington, a potential principal settlement for growth.

Proposed as an urban extension to Dinnington Principal Town.
Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**2009 Update:**

*Potential long term strategic site to serve southern part of the Bough. Proposed as an urban extension to Dinnington Principal Town.*

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:**

**Recommendation:**  *Allocate as employment development site*
### Land at Bookers Way South Yorkshire Caravans (including site ELR12)

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Access currently from Rotherham Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Predominantly open storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Urban greenspace, residential, industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning:

2009 Update:

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

Reasoning:

Original Score  2009 SCORE

Yes adjacent to railway line

SYPTTE scores this site high.

More than 500m to nearest local services and facilities.

No negative impact although site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat.
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**Reasoning:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:**

| Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use: | |

| Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes? | |

| Overall assessment score | |
| Reasons for overall score: | |

| 2009 Update: | |

| Site is brownfield | |

| Reasonable scores. | |

| Within a Unitary Development Plan Strategic Regeneration Area | |

| Serves a potential principal settlement for growth | |

| Good scoring site | |

| Existing use for caravan storage, but without planning permission, however the site is well placed to meet future local needs. Proximity to railway line and adjacent uses mean housing unlikely to be suitable. |
Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
### Site Reference: 170  Date of Assessment: 2009  Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

**Current users:** 2009 Assessment Date: 10/08/2010  Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

**Site Name:** Land at Common Road / Todwick Road, Dinnington

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Green Belt, Perimeter hedgerows and mature trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Close to existing industrial estate however sites within a generally attractive environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Although not scored by RIDO, RIDO scored sites nearby such as the former colliery as 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Adjacent to Common Road, good access to main road network however Todwick Crossroads does experience congestion at peak periods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update: Yes

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Overall a reasonably attractive site to the market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009 Update: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009 Update: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: Yes - remote from local facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009 Update: Site currently grassland, hedgerows and mature trees - although consultants for the landowner indicate that a phase 1 habitat and protected species survey reveals that no noteworthy biodiversity potential would be prejudiced by development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: No - Greenfield site

09 Update: Scores poorly across most criteria

Overall sustainable development score:

2009 Update:

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update:

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

2009 Update:

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update:

Overall strategic planning score:

2009 Update:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

2009 Update:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:

2009 Update:

Reasonably self contained site with good access to the road network. Although it is remote from residential areas or facilities it is adjacent to the existing North Anston.
Trading Estate

Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site
Employment Land Review Update 2009

Former UNSCO site, Kiveton Park Station

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
(C) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright. RMBC Licence 100019587
### Site Reference: 93  Date of Assessment: 12/06/2006  Officer: Helen Sleigh

**Current users:**

**2009 Assessment Date:** 14/12/2009  **Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

**Site Name:** Former UNSCO site, Kiveton Park Station

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Market Attractiveness</strong></th>
<th><strong>Original Score</strong></th>
<th><strong>2009 Score</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>Poor access, existing derelict buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>Generally poor quality and unsuitable for conversion - although office building and one factory unit may be convertible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>Poor environment</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Edge of greenbelt / open countryside</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Limited uses because of access issues and remoteness of site</td>
<td>RIDO indicate medium potential, although this may be limited by access issues and remoteness of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Remote from main road network</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No Clearance unlikely to be viable for industrial development alone, although residential development could fund restoration

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Application for residential use refused and current mixed use application going to appeal following refusal

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes Quality if wider setting could prove attractive for some growth sectors

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A - former use ceased on site

Overall market attractiveness score:

Original Score: 2

Reasoning: Overall limited attractiveness due to constraints and remote location

2009 Update: No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE score site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes Site contains range of semi-natural habitats, however development could provide a positive impact through mitigation and improvement of biodiversity value

2009 Update: Site or buffer is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: 

1

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes  Brownfield although some parts of site are greenfield

2009 Update: 

No change

Overall sustainable development score: 

Reasoning: Generally low scoring site remote from nearby settlements

Site is remote from nearby settlements

1

Strategic Planning 

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: 

No change

Yes  Within Objective 1 area

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes  Within Objective 1 area

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Yes  Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

Overall strategic planning score: 

Reasoning: Scores reasonably well however remote location raises questions over suitability to meet local needs

No change

1

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Large industrial site in a very poor unsustainable location - careful consideration of alternative uses needed. Potential to allocate as greenbelt

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Adjacent to Chasterfield Canal

Overall assessment score 

Reasons for overall score: Although sustainability and strategic factors score reasonably well the location and market attractiveness factors limit overall

Location and market attractiveness factors, along with the remote location limit the overall score

1

2009 Update: 

No change

Site is remote from nearby settlements

No change 

Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

No change 

Adjacent to Chasterfield Canal

2009 Update:

Location and market attractiveness factors, along with the remote location limit the overall score

2
Recommendation: *Retain current employment allocation*
Site Reference: 94  Date of Assessment: 12/06/2006  Officer: Helen Sleigh
Current users: 2009 Assessment Date: 14/12/2009  Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

Site Name: Council depot, Kiveton Bridge

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site? Access, proximity to railway line and Chesterfield Canal, allocated greenbelt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Also within Area of Known Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some buildings of reasonable quality but only limited potential for conversion to other uses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally poor quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounded by woodland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential? Poor site access, although site visibility on egress is very good</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDO indicate medium potential for marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote from main road network</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

| No | Public funding most likely be required and required to ensure high quality development | 2009 Update: No change |

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

| 2009 Update: No change |

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

| No | Access and greenbelt status are constraints | 2009 Update: No change |

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

| Council depot functions could be rationalised in future | 2009 Update: No change |

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

| Overall generally limited market attractiveness | 2009 Update: No change |

**Sustainable Development**

| Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses? | 2009 Update: No change |

| Yes | Adjacent to rail line so potential but highly unlikely |

| Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce? | 2009 Update: PTE score site 3 |

| 2 | 3 |

| Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site? | 2009 Update: No change |

| 1 | 1 |

| Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself? | 2009 Update: Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat |

| Yes | Possible impact on surrounding woodland and also habitats associated with the Canal |

| Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment? | 2009 Update: |

| 1 | 1 |
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes Part brownfield although open areas likely to be greenfield

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Generally poor in sustainability terms

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Yes Objective 1

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes Objective 1

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Site has limited potential to serve local needs

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Potential to provide visitor and parking facilities for Chesterfield Canal but issues surrounding vehicular access need to be considered.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Generally a poorly located site within the greenbelt

Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation
### Market Attractiveness

**Q1.1** Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?  

2009 Update:  
No change  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1.2** What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?  

*Good quality, suitable for conversion*  
Suitable for conversion or continued use  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1.3** What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?  

*Good quality site environment*  
No change  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1.4** Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?  

*Reasonably attractive surroundings*  
No change  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1.5** Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?  

No  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1.6** Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?  

No  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1.7** Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?  

*Reasonably good potential given location off main road, although relatively close to higher quality Dinnington colliery site*  
No change  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1.8** Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.  

*Excellent access to main road*  
No change  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability 
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
Current application for new storage buildings
2009 Update:

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes Potential to meet future requirements of growth sectors, particularly given accessibility to main road network.
2009 Update:

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Current user within tourism sector could see continued demand
Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Whilst there are some low criteria scores overall the site performs well in market attractiveness terms

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
Possibly remote from most frequent services

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
Remote from local services

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

2009 Update:
Yes, although investment could be required to assist marketing of site given length of vacancy

2009 Update:
Storage buildings now developed 1 3

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change 3 3

2009 Update:
Site performs well in market attractiveness terms 3 3

2009 Update:
Adjacent to railway line - part of site could therefore be served

2009 Update:
PTE scores site 3 2 3

2009 Update:
Remote from local services 1 1

2009 Update:
Close to Anston Stone Wood and some mature trees on site, although site currently developed. Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  

2009 Update: 1

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3? Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Brownfield site however some concerns regarding accessibility and availability of local services

2009 Update:
Reasoning: Brownfield site however some concerns regarding availability of local services

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Well placed to serve local community despite not being within a strategically important location

2009 Update:
Reasoning: Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Residential development could be considered

2009 Update:
Residential could only be considered as part of a comprehensive redevelopment of the whole site

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Generally performs well across all criteria - well placed to meet local needs within Anston. Potential for

2009 Update: No change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well placed to serve local community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves a potential principal settlement for growth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential development could be considered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
greater utilisation of site

Recommendation:  
Retain current employment allocation
### Site Name: Red Hill Quarry

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regionally Important Geological Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access, topography, landfill waste</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Buildings generally poor, although some could be suitable for re-use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open areas - buildings generally poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally poor quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally poor quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, although could be linked to Kiveton Wire and Steel</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RIDO indicate medium marketing potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

Yes  Viable for some alternative uses

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update:
Viable for some alternative uses, but clearance of the site for redevelopment may require assistance

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Yes - continued demand for recycling

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Generally scores poorly across all criteria

2009 Update:
Continued demand for recycling and construction industries

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTE scores site 2

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update:
PTE score site 3

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes  Possibly given open areas and edges and top of quarried areas

2009 Update:
Possibly given open areas and edges and top of quarried areas and Regionally Important Geological Site. Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
Yes

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes
Part brownfield and part may be greenfield - need to check permissions

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Reasonably sustainable site

2009 Update:
No change

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Yes

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Scores reasonably well and although close to some housing it is not close to large residential population

2009 Update:
No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Not suitable for alternative uses except perhaps green or environmental uses/storage

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:
Low market attractiveness score and whilst it scores reasonably well in sustainability and strategic terms there are concerns about the remoteness of this location

2009 Update:
Scores reasonably well in sustainability and strategic terms; there are concerns about the remoteness of this location
remoteness of the location

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
### Site Name: Kiveton Wire and Steel, Kiveton Bridge

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site? | 2              | 2          | Visibility may be an issue.  
Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use? | 2              | 2          | Relatively old age but suitable for future use/conversion |
| Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)? | 2              | 2          | Reasonable site environment.  
Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers? | 2              | 2          | Reasonable surroundings |
| Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site? | 2              | 2          | No although could be linked to Red Hill Quarry  
Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use? | 2              | 2          | No |
| Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential? | 2              | 2          | No change  
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks. | 1              | 1          | Need to go through South Anston or Kiveton Park |
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No Unlikely to be viable for employment use but could be viable if other uses are developed

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update:
Redevelopment of the site for other employment uses may not be viable without funding

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes May be part of advanced manufacturing and metals growth sector - need to check with NR/CB

2009 Update: No change

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Possibly high if part of growth sector

Overall market attractiveness score: Fairly attractive site, possibly in growth sector

Reasoning: Fairly attractive site, possibly in growth sector

2009 Update: No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses? No

2009 Update: No change

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
PTE scored site 2

2009 Update: PTE score site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No but tree belt at top of quarry may be valuable from a biodiversity perspective

2009 Update:
Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat. New development may impact on the biodiversity and geodiversity potential of the site unless access to the quarry faces and associated calcareous grassland are retained.
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**Reasoning:** Brownfield site but concerns over proximity to local services

No change

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  
But only a small population living nearby

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  
Yes  **Objective 1**

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:** Reasonably well scored but concerns over remoteness and potential to address local needs

No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Limited potential for alternative uses - could be used for green/environmental uses. Housing unlikely to be supported given remote location

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:**  
Scores reasonably well however low scoring in sustainability terms and concerns over ability to support local needs in this remote location

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

No change

Scores reasonably well however concerns over ability to support local needs in this remote location

No change

No change

No change
location

Recommendation: *Retain current employment allocation*
Employment Land Review 2009

Site adjacent to Bus Depot on Sheffield Road, North Anston

Site Area: 1.55 Ha
Site Ref No: ELR129_LDF0252

Site adjacent to Bus Depot on Sheffield Road, North Anston

Site Area: 1.55 Ha
Site Ref No: ELR129_LDF0252
**Site Name:** adjacent to coach depot on sheffield road, north anston

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2009 Update: Green Belt. Significant access issues - very limited access from A57. Most realistic access would be through coach depot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: Attractive surroundings although adjacent to railway lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009 Update: Yes - ELR site 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009 Update: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: RIDO indicate medium potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2009 Update: On the strategic A57 route between Sheffield and Worksop however only accessible realistically is through the coach depot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning:

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:
Site may not be deliverable for high quality development without funding

2009 Update:
None

2009 Update:
Appears to be in use by Network Rail as a compound

2009 Update:
Poor site with significant access issues

2009 Update:
Yes

2009 Update:
PTE score site

2009 Update:
More than 500m to facilities

2009 Update:
Yes - close to Anston Stone Wood although impact could be mitigated through sensitive landscaping. Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3? No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
No

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study? No

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:

Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation
| Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site? | 2009 Update: Greenfield, green belt site likely to be suitable for B1 light industrial use only. Pylons |
| Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use? | N/A |
| Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)? | N/A |
| Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers? | Green Belt, agricultural land to north of Kiveton Park |
| Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site? | No |
| Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use? | No |
| Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential? | RIDO indicate low marketing potential given remote location; likely to serve local community only |
| Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks. | Access will need to pass through residential areas |
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning:
Limited attractiveness to the market

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
No

PTE score site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
Approx. 1.4km to local centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

May be some impact on the surrounding countryside given that the site is green belt and on a ridge. If developed, sensitive landscaping will be essential. Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

No
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:

2009 Update:

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:
Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site
Site Name: Lincoln Street Workshops, Maltby

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Surrounding residential uses may limit potential redevelopment, although B1 use would remain acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some vacancies but potential for improvement to ensure continued use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Needs some attention to improve site environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Generally reasonable residential surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reasonably successful units likely to continue providing opportunities for small businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change. Some vacancies but potential for improvement to ensure continued use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2009 Update:

- Some vacancies but potential for improvement to ensure continued use
- Needs some attention to improve site environment
- Generally reasonable residential surroundings
- Reasonably successful units likely to continue providing opportunities for small businesses
- No change. Some vacancies but potential for improvement to ensure continued use

### Site Reference: 81

- Current users: 2009
- Assessment Date: 10/12/2009
- Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

### 2009 Update:

- Some vacancies but potential for improvement to ensure continued use
- Needs some attention to improve site environment
- No change.

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Surrounding residential uses may limit potential redevelopment, although B1 use would remain acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some vacancies but potential for improvement to ensure continued use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Needs some attention to improve site environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Generally reasonable residential surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reasonably successful units likely to continue providing opportunities for small businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change. Some vacancies but potential for improvement to ensure continued use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2009 Update:

- Some vacancies but potential for improvement to ensure continued use
- Needs some attention to improve site environment
- Generally reasonable residential surroundings
- Reasonably successful units likely to continue providing opportunities for small businesses
- No change. Some vacancies but potential for improvement to ensure continued use

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Surrounding residential uses may limit potential redevelopment, although B1 use would remain acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some vacancies but potential for improvement to ensure continued use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Needs some attention to improve site environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Generally reasonable residential surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reasonably successful units likely to continue providing opportunities for small businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change. Some vacancies but potential for improvement to ensure continued use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2009 Update:

- Some vacancies but potential for improvement to ensure continued use
- Needs some attention to improve site environment
- Generally reasonable residential surroundings
- Reasonably successful units likely to continue providing opportunities for small businesses
- No change. Some vacancies but potential for improvement to ensure continued use
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability concerns? 
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal? 
Yes  Likely to continue to provide premises for small businesses

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Mix of uses currently

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Attractiveness limited by location

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
245m to town centre

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:
No change, however needs some investment to improve quality and security

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
Number of vacancies at present and perhaps uncertain future of current occupiers

2009 Update:
Attractiveness limited by location and site environment

2009 Update:
Attractiveness limited by location and site environment

2009 Update:
PTE score site 3

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update: No change
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Generally sustainable location
No change

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Yes

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes Mini masterplan propose by neighbourhoods

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?
No

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Good strategic site
Reasonable site in strategic terms
No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Within residential allocation therefore potential to consider housing as alternative use. Could consider changing allocation to business to bolster employment provision.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
No

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Good site well placed to support small local businesses
No change

Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation
Site Reference: 82  Date of Assessment: 22/06/2006  Officer: David Edwards
Current users: 2009  Assessment Date: 10/12/2009  Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

Site Name: Lantern Engineering and adjoining site, Maltby

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings of poor quality, little potential for conversion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally poor site environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within a generally residential environment, adjoining school and open space</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Open space to the East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Lantern Engineering site for sale - on market with Merryweathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reasonable market potential given location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable access to main road network although bottleneck/congestion around Hellaby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability gap? Yes

2009 Update: Viability of existing operation is in question and redevelopment of the site for employment use is unlikely to be viable

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Depot site could be rationalised in future, engineering site currently on market

No change 1 1

Overall market attractiveness score:

2

Reasoning: Generally mid to low scores in attractiveness terms

No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

2009 Update: No change

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE score site 1

2

2009 Update: No change

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

345m to Maltby town centre

2

2009 Update: No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

2009 Update: No change

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: 2 2
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: *Generally good in sustainability terms*

| Original Score | 2 |
| 2009 Update | No change |

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

| Original Score | 3 |
| 2009 Update | No change |

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes *Proposed mini masterplanning by neighbourhoods*

| Original Score | 3 |
| 2009 Update | No |

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

| Original Score | 3 |
| 2009 Update | No |

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: *High scores for strategic factors*

| Original Score | 3 |
| 2009 Update | Reasonable scores for strategic criteria |

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
*Potentially suitable for housing given surrounding uses*

| Original Score | 3 |
| 2009 Update | Potential site to serve local needs |

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

| Original Score | |
| 2009 Update | |

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: *Good site which scores high in strategic terms, particularly given lack of employment land within Maltby*

| Original Score | 3 |
| 2009 Update | Well located site to serve local needs |

Recommendation: *Re-allocate to non-employment allocation*
Employment Land Review Update 2009
Maltby West Industrial Area

Site Ref No: LDF0332_ELR083
Site Area: 7.42 ha

Key

Site Boundary

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
(C) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright. RMBC Licence 100019587
### Site Name: Maltby West Industrial Area

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some residential use within part of site, multiple ownerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of quality but overall good and likely to support further conversion for alternative uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable quality, some parts poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good quality setting, particularly to south and west</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Land to west</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High potential given accessibility to motorway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good access to main road network and close to M18, although bottleneck/congestion in Hellaby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issue?
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
Offices, current application for development of B1 units

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Mixture of uses at present

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Good site which could have more potential

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
On quality bus corridor

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
396m to local centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:
Yes, although redevelopment of whole site could require assistance

RB2006/1989 - permission for B1 units granted but not implemented

Wincanton site provides specialist chilled storage distribution depot

2009 Update:

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Good site which could have more potential

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
On quality bus corridor

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
396m to local centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

**Overall sustainable development score:**
**Reasoning:** Scores fairly well in sustainability terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Yes

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?
No

**Overall strategic planning score:**
**Reasoning:** Scores highly on strategic criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

*Could be potential for housing on site if subject to comprehensive development*

**Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?**

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:** Generally a good employment site including a specialist chilled storage distribution depot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:** Retain current employment allocation
### Site Name: Warwick Road, Maltby

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current greenbelt, within minerals buffer zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Mixed but reasonable setting - industrial estate, open views</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Yes greenbelt land further to west/north-west</td>
<td>Adjacent to clay pit site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Potentially high marketing value given proximity to motorway and success of Hellaby industrial estate</td>
<td>Potentially high given location although site does not have great access to main road and would not provide main road frontage development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Good access to main road network and close to motorway, although congestion bottleneck at Hellaby</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
N/A

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes Has potential to meet requirements of some growth sectors

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
N/A

Overall market attractiveness score: 2
Reasoning: Moderate potential market attractiveness

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
Quality bus corridor

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
462m from local centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
Yes Adjacent Ibstock site has high biodiversity interest and populations of legally protected species - adjoining vegetated land (including this site) should also be considered to support these populations and should not be developed.

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No planning permission however Has potential to meet requirements of some growth sectors

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: Moderate potential market attractiveness although currently allocated as green belt

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: PTE score site 3

2009 Update: More than 500m walking distance to nearest local centre

2009 Update: Site or buffer is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: 1

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Overall a moderate sustainable development score, although note the biodiversity concerns of potential development

Overall sustainable development score:

2

Reasoning: Poor sustainability scores and potential impact on biodiversity

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: No change

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes Proposed mini masterplanning

2009 Update: No change

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update: No

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: High scoring strategically

Overall strategic planning score:

3

Reasoning: Reasonable scoring site in strategic terms

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Retain as greenbelt. Unlikely to be any other potential alternatives

2009 Update: Could be suitable for development, at least on the frontage alongside the police station

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update: Could be suitable for development, at least on the frontage alongside the police station

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score: Reasonable site with potential to support the local community, although biodiversity issues could be a significant constraint

2009 Update: Site has potential to support the local community, although biodiversity issues could be a significant constraint
Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site
Site Ref No: LDF0610_ELRO85
Site Area: 8.01 ha

Employment Land Review Update 2009
Thurcroft Industrial Estate
## Site Name: Thurcroft industrial estate, Thurcroft

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed age and quality of buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor general layout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to residential, open views to north</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Greenbelt land to north</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium marketing potential having regard to site location and context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some distance to main road network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues? Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
Yes

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes Potential to meet food and drink sector requirements

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Various uses at present

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Overall limited market attractiveness

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
No change

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
No change

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

2009 Update:
Silo for Kerry Foods developed, industrial unit and trade counter developed

Overall reasonableness market attractiveness

Reasoning: Overall reasonable market attractiveness

Original Score 2009 Score

2009 Update: No change

PTE score site 3

No change

No change

No change

No change

No change

No change

No change
Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: *Generally sustainable site*

**Strategic Planning**
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
  
  Yes  
  **Objective 1**

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
  
  **2009 Update:**
  
  **Yes Objective 1**

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

**Overall strategic planning score:**
Reasoning: *Reasonably good strategic site*

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

*Limited potential for other uses - residential could be considered if comprehensively developed*

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**2009 Update:**

**Site is in a sustainable location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:**

**Serves a potential local service centre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:**

**Limited potential for other uses - residential could be considered if comprehensively developed, however it is currently a successful industrial estate**

**Overall assessment score**
Reasons for overall score: *Reasonable site which serves existing needs*

Recommendation: *Retain current employment allocation*
Employment Land Review Update 2009

Land off Kingsforth Lane, Thurcroft (suggested allocation)
## Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Varying topography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently greenbelt, overhead powerlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Industrial estate to south and open views to north</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Industrial estate to south and land to north</td>
<td>Industrial estate to the south is in use. Land to the north could be developed but it is green belt at present and extending the industrial estate further is likely to be inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Medium potential given location</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Some distance to main road network</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No change

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

| Reasoning: Limited overall market attractiveness, generally low scoring site | No change |

**Sustainable Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor access to bus stop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>415m from Thurcroft town centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Could have limited impact, although appears to be arable land therefore potentially low biodiversity value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2009 Update:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| No change | No change |

| PTE score site 2 | No change |

| 2 | 2 |
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

**Overall sustainable development score:**

Reasoning: *Limited sustainability score reflecting location on edge of settlement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:**

Sustainability score reflects location of site on edge of settlement

*Strategic Planning*

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Yes  

**Overall strategic planning score:**

Reasoning: *Well placed to serve local community needs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:**

Reasonably well placed to serve local community needs

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes  

**Overall assessment score**

Reasons for overall score: *Well placed to meet local needs in strategic terms but generally poor scores for sustainability and limited market attractiveness*

**Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site**
Council Depot and adjoining Employment Land Review 2009

Site Area: 3.74 Ha

SITE REF NO: LDP0366-ELR087

Site boundary

Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright. RMBC Licence 100019587

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
## Market Attractiveness

### Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?

**Poor access via residential area, potential ground contamination**

**2009 Update:**

No change

**Score:** 2 2

### Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?

**Poor quality**

**2009 Update:**

No change

**Score:** 1 1

### Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?

**Generally poor.**

**2009 Update:**

One way system within depot

**Score:** 1 1

### Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?

**Surrounding setting is generally of a reasonable quality**

**2009 Update:**

Predominantly residential surroundings

**Score:** 2 2

### Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?

Yes  

**2009 Update:**

Open space to south

**Score:** 2 2

### Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?

No

**2009 Update:**

No

### Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?

**Site context and access limits potential**

**2009 Update:**

No change, although note that B1 uses are acceptable within residential areas

**Score:** 1 1

### Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

**Access through residential area (although Yorkshire Water site access via main road)**

**2009 Update:**

No change

**Score:** 1 1
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Yorkshire Water site remains operational, depot uses could be rationalised in future

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Generally limited market attractiveness given location and access

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
412m to Bramley town centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

2009 Update:

Unlikely to require funding, although note that buildings would require clearing

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE score site 3. Any future development should look to provide pedestrian / cycle links to Bawtry Road

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change although note that small number of housing permitted on land no longer in operational use by Yorkshire Water

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

PTE score site 3. Any future development should look to provide pedestrian / cycle links to Bawtry Road

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change although note that small number of housing permitted on land no longer in operational use by Yorkshire Water

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change
Q.2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: 1

Q.2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

2009 Update: No change

Overall sustainable development score:

2009 Update: No change

Reasoning: Generally sustainable site

Strategic Planning

Q.3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: No change

Q.3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

2009 Update: No change

Q.3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

2009 Update: No change

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Reasonable site to meet local needs

2009 Update: No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Potentially suitable for housing as part of comprehensive development. Yorkshire Water site likely to remain operational

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update: No change

Overall assessment score

2009 Update: No change

Reasons for overall score: Generally low scoring - reasonable in sustainability and strategic terms but low market attractiveness

Recommendation: Re-allocate to non-employment allocation
## Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Green belt. Parts of site still in use for clay extraction. Minerals planning permission runs to 2042 and whilst the owners indicate that parts of the site may be available within the plan period, existing planning permission requires restoration to agricultural use for land associated with mineral extraction. To enable built development land would require restoration to provide development platforms, including significant landscaping. The site includes Hellaby Brook, a Regionally Important Geological Site and other areas with abandoned quarry faces with substantive geological features of national importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed - industrial estate adjacent, housing adjacent to site although some screening in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - LDF0312 - land of Warwick Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Name:** Clay pits, off Fordoles Head Lane, Maltby

**Date of Assessment:** 10/12/2009

**Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

**Site Reference:** 130

**Current users:**

**2009 Update:**

- Green belt. Parts of site still in use for clay extraction. Minerals planning permission runs to 2042 and whilst the owners indicate that parts of the site may be available within the plan period, existing planning permission requires restoration to agricultural use for land associated with mineral extraction. To enable built development land would require restoration to provide development platforms, including significant landscaping. The site includes Hellaby Brook, a Regionally Important Geological Site and other areas with abandoned quarry faces with substantive geological features of national importance.

- N/A

- N/A

- Mixed - industrial estate adjacent, housing adjacent to site although some screening in place

- Yes - LDF0312 - land of Warwick Road

- No
Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?

Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

2009 Update:

Potentially high - close to M18 and Hellaby industrial estate

2009 Update:

Close to M18

2009 Update:

Restoration will be required and may require funding

2009 Update:

No. Extant mineral workings permission

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

Site continues to be worked - likely to continue, although some land may be available for alternative uses within the plan period

2009 Update:

Some reasonable scores and attractive location but unlikely to be available in the plan period

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

PTE scores site 1
Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update: More than 500m to local centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

2009 Update: Yes - part of site is a candidate wildlife site. Great Crested Newts are present and part of the site is covered by a Protected Species License. The extant mineral permission requires restoration to agricultural use. Part of the site is a Regionally Important Geological Site and other parts of the site also contain substantive geological features. The areas adjacent to Hellaby Brook forms a significant geomorphological feature and potential green corridor.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: Mix of brown and green field - the majority being green field

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

2009 Update: Poor scoring site

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: Part of site is within 250m of housing, although majority of site is beyond this

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

2009 Update: No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update: Serves a potential principal settlement

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning:

2009 Update: Near to a popular industrial location and substantial residential population, however limited accessibility
Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:**

*2009 Update:*

*Generally poor scoring site, with long term mineral extraction meaning it is unlikely to be available within the plan period*

**Recommendation:** *Retain current non-employment allocation*
Site Reference No: ELR131_LDF0328
Site Area: 1.03 Ha

Employment Land Review Update 2009
Land off Rotherham Road, Maltby

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
(C) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright. RMBC Licence 100019587
### Site Reference: 131  Date of Assessment: 2009  Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

#### Current users:  B1 Allocation off Rotherham Road, Maltby

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: Hellaby Brook, potential impact on countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: Views from site to south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: High marketing potential given location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: Close to M18 although there is congestion at Hellaby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
<td>PTE scores site 3</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
<td>More than 500m to nearest local centre</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</td>
<td>Yes - potential impact on greenbelt and open views</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Update:

3. None, although public inquiry into proposed office development due in February 2010

2. Yes - provides office space if development gets permission and goes ahead

1. N/A

2009 Update:

2. Attractive location for the market

2009 Update:

1. Yes - potential impact on greenbelt and open views
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**Reasoning:**

Scores poorly in sustainable development terms despite being on a quality bus corridor

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

No

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

No

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:**

Serves a potential principal settlement

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Reasonably well located site

Public inquiry into proposed office floorspace expected in February 2010. Note: permission subsequently granted at appeal.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:**

reasonably well located site

**Recommendation:** Allocate as employment development site
Site Ref No: LDF0409_ELR143
Site Area: 0.95 ha

Employment Land Review Update 2009
Tarmac, Blyth Road, Maltby

Rotherham MBC
Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD

Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD
**Site Name:** Tarmac site, Blyth Road, Maltby

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Possible ground contamination, listed building on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reasonable buildings which could be re-used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>reasonable site environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Significant views to south across local wildlife site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td>RIDO indicate low marketing potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access from Rotherham road, reasonably close to M18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

2009 Update:

Public funding may be required depending upon ground contamination

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No

2009 Update:

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

2009 Update:

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Part of construction / infrastructure sector

2009 Update:

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Reasonable but not outstanding site

2009 Update:

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

2009 Update:

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE score site 3

2009 Update:

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Close to Maltby town centre

2009 Update:

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No although site has views to the local wildlife site to the south. Site or buffer is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat

2009 Update:

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

No

2009 Update:

PTE score site 3 3

2009 Update:

Close to Maltby town centre 3

2009 Update:

No although site has views to the local wildlife site to the south. Site or buffer is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat 2

2009 Update:
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**Reasoning:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?</td>
<td>No, although I site put forward by HMR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site well placed to meet local needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good site but accessibility and listed building limit attractiveness of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:** *Retain current employment allocation*
Site Ref No: LDF0416_EL1R147
Site Area: 2.62 ha

Employment Land Review Update 2009
South of Rotherham Road
Hellaby

Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD

Scale: NTS
Date: Nov 2009

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
(C) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright. RMBC Licence 100019587
Site Reference: 147  Date of Assessment: 10/12/2009  Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh
Current users: 2009 Assessment Date: 10/12/2009  Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh
Site Name: South of rotherham road, maltby

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Yes - views to south, open countryside</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Yes - site to the north</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Potentially high given location and interest in adjoining site</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Close to M18 but congestion at Hellaby</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update: Yes

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

None

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Site likely to be attractive to the market, although green belt at present

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

2009 Update: No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE score site 3

2009 Update: Facilities more than 500m away

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Facilities more than 500m away

2009 Update: Yes - impact on biodiversity, green belt, and openness of countryside

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes - impact on biodiversity, green belt, and openness of countryside

2009 Update: No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

1

2009 Update: Yes - impact on biodiversity, green belt, and openness of countryside

1
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

2009 Update:
No

Overall sustainable development score:

2009 Update:
Poor scores in sustainable development terms despite being on a quality bus corridor

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update:

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

No

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:

2009 Update:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

2009 Update:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:

2009 Update:
Reasonable scoring site overall

Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation
Employment Land Review Update 2009

North of Bawtry Road

Hellaby

Site Ref No: LDF0320_ELR149
Site Area: 0.80 ha

Rotherham MBC
Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD

Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD

Scale: NTS

DATE: Nov 2009

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
(C) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright. RMBC Licence 400919587

Site Boundary
LDF Boundary

ELR149
0.80 Ha
**Site Name:** north of bawtry road, hellaby

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong> Partly urban greenspace, close to scheduled ancient monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong> Reasonable setting; site forms part of setting of Hellaby Hall Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong> No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong> No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>High potential given location and popularity of Hellaby Industrial Estate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong> Close to M18 J1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Reference:** 149  
**Date of Assessment:** 07/12/2009  
**Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning:

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: Yes

2009 Update: No

2009 Update: No

2009 Update: No

2009 Update: No

2009 Update: No

2009 Update: N/A

2009 Update: Attractive, although small site; greenspace allocation intended to protect the setting of Hellaby Hall

2009 Update: PTE score site 3

2009 Update: Some distance from local services

2009 Update: Potentially yes - site within Area of Known Interest

2009 Update: 1

2009 Update: 0

2009 Update: 2

Original Score

2009 SCORE
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
No

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:

Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation
Site Name: East of Cumwell Lane, Hellaby

Market Attractiveness

Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?
- **2009 Update:**
  green belt, accessed from country road, right turn only on to Bawtry Road, Highways Agency may object given proximity of M18

Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?
- **2009 Update:**
  N/A

Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?
- **2009 Update:**
  N/A

Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?
- **2009 Update:**
  Attractive surroundings although adjacent to M18

Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?
- **2009 Update:**
  No

Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?
- **2009 Update:**
  No

Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?
- **2009 Update:**
  RIDO indicate high potential

Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.
- **2009 Update:**
  Access may be an issue, however close to M18 junction 1
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Reasonable scoring site

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:

Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation
Site Name: Land between Cumwell Lane and the M18, Hellaby

Market Attractiveness

Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?

2009 Update:
Green belt, access from country road, left turn only on to Bawtry Road, Highways Agency may object given proximity of M18

Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?

2009 Update:
N/A

Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?

2009 Update:
N/A

Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?

2009 Update:
Attractive location although adjacent to M18

Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?

No

Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?

No

Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?

2009 Update:
RIDO indicate high potential

Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

2009 Update:
Adjacent to M18
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update: Yes

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

**Reasoning:**

*reasonably attractive location however significant highway constraints*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1  Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2  Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3  Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
<td>PTE score site 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4  Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
<td>Remote from local services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5  Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</td>
<td>Potential impact as site currently grassed. UDP also indicates it is an area of known interest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:  

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  
No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  

Overall strategic planning score:  
Reasoning:  

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:  

Recommendation:  *Retain current non-employment allocation*
Site Reference: 159  Date of Assessment: 07/12/2009  Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

Current users:  
Site Name: Land north west of M18 junction 1

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greenbelt, access is very poor, pylons and overhead pylons cross the site, topography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adjacent to the M18, pylons on site reduce quality of the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RIDO indicate medium potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaining access to the site is an issue given proximity of the roundabout.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Limited market attractiveness given site constraints

1

2009 Update:

Access and pylons on site are significant constraints and public funding may be required to enable development

2009 Update:

No

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

2009 Update:

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE scores site 3

3

2009 Update:

Close to Bramley town centre

3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update:

Yes

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

2009 Update:

Yes

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:

Yes

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

2009 Update:

No
Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning:

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: Reasonably sustainable site

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

2009 Update: No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update: serves a potential principal settlement for growth

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning:

2009 Update: Reasonable strategic planning scores

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

2009 Update:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:

2009 Update: Reasonable sustainability and strategic scores, however significant constraints limit overall score

Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation
### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2009 Update: Greenbelt, hedgerows and trees on perimeter of site, highway (served by a road of a differing character to the main estate roads)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2009 Update: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2009 Update: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: Adjacent to M18 but generally attractive location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009 Update: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009 Update: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009 Update: Potentially high - close to M18 and adjacent to Hellaby industrial estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: Reasonable access through hellaby industrial estate, close to M18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update: Yes

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

2009 Update: No

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update: No

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: No

2009 Update:

generally attractive location with market interest, although currently green belt

Original Score

2009 Score

2

2009 Update:

PTE score site 1

2009 Update:

Distant from local services

2009 Update:

Possibly - views of the ecologists likely to be required

2009 Update:

Distant from local services

2009 Update:

Possibly - views of the ecologists likely to be required
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning:

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update:

No

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

2009 Update:

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update:

Serves a potential principal settlement

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning:

Low scoring strategic site

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

2009 Update:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:

2009 Update:

Generally poor scoring site; not well related to the main industrial estate

Recommendation:  Retain current non-employment allocation
| Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site? | 2009 Update: Access, possible reclamation (presence of former rail line requires clarification), Holmes Tail Goit on northern perimeter. Part of site currently being used for skip storage |
| Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use? | N/A - no existing | Temporary metal storage buildings and small brick building on part of site currently in use for skip storage |
| Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)? | N/A | Poor site environment |
| Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers? | Surrounded by railway line, nightclub and main road | Surrounded by railway line, nightclub and main road. Site has views of town centre |
| Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site? | No | No change |
| Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use? | No | Yes - RIDO indicate site being marketed |
| Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential? | Limited by surroundings | RIDO consider site to have high marketing potential |
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

*Immediate access to main road network via roundabout*

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?

Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

None

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

Reasoning: *Limited by surroundings*

---

**Sustainable Development**

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE scored the site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Remote from any services and facilities; Rotherham town centre provides the nearest opportunity

---

**2009 Update:**

Immediate access to main road network via roundabout, however convoluted highway system to get to main road

**2009 Update:** No - it is considered that the highway issues would require funding to resolve

**2009 Update:**

No change

**2009 Update:**

No change

**2009 Update:**

Current part of site used for skip storage (Booths) and seems likely to continue

**2009 Update:**

Market attractiveness limited by neighbouring infrastructure

**2009 Update:**

Remote from any services and facilities; Rotherham town centre provides the nearest opportunity

**Original Score**

**2009 Score**

1

1

2

2

2

2

2
Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?  
No  No  

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  

2009 Update:  
3  2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes  

Overall sustainable development score:  
Reasoning: *Reasonably sustainable site*  
2  2

Strategic Planning  

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  

2009 Update:  
No change  
2  2

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  
Yes  Objective 1, Pathfinder  

2009 Update:  
Within Pathfinder only

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  

Key settlements served  

2009 Update:  
Within Rotherham urban area  
3  3

Overall strategic planning score:  
Reasoning: *Well located site*  
3  3

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:  

2009 Update:  

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?  

2009 Update:  

Overall assessment score  
Reasons for overall score: *Reasonable site but let down by surrounding environment*  

2009 Update:  
Reasonable site let down by surrounding environment and accessibility issues  
2  2

2009 Update:  
No change  
2  2

2009 Update:  
Within Pathfinder only  
3  3

2009 Update:  
Reasonable site let down by surrounding environment and accessibility issues  
2  2
Recommendation:  *Retain current employment allocation*
### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Masbrough Street is a cul-de-sac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access could be better</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of ages</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite poor for a standard industrial area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not sit in high quality surroundings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No evidence</td>
<td>Yes - 2 vacant units being marketed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium potential although close to town centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although site access is not great</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
Development of industrial units

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No No - general industrial use

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Mix of uses likely to continue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall market attractiveness score:</th>
<th>Reasoning: Reasonably attractive site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce? |
| Adjacent to rail station and near bus station |
| No change                                      |

| Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site? |
| No change                                      |

| Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself? |
| No None                                         |

| Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment? |
| No change                                      |

| Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3? |
| Yes No change                                      |
Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: **Good sustainable location**

**Strategic Planning**
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes **Objective 1, Pathfinder, town centre masterplan**

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

**Key settlements served**

**Overall strategic planning score:**
Reasoning: **High scoring strategic site**

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

2 units being marketed

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**
Reasons for overall score: **Good overall general industrial site**

Recommendation: **Retain current employment allocation**
Site Reference: 88  Date of Assessment: 23/06/2006  Officer: Nick Ward
Site Name: Millmoor/Scrapyard, Masbrough

### Market Attractiveness

**Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?**

Scrapyard is a bad neighbour use

| 2009 Update: | Scrapyard is a bad neighbour use however the site is constrained in terms of access, proximity to railway line and Centenary Way. |

**Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?**

Mix of buildings, varying quality

No change

| 2009 Update: | No change |

**Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?**

Generally low quality environment

| 2009 Update: | Generally low quality environment, including poor circulation (such as dead end streets) |

**Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?**

Poor quality surroundings, bounded by main road, railway, general industrial area

No change

| 2009 Update: | No change |

**Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?**

No

| 2009 Update: | No change |

**Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?**

No

| 2009 Update: | Yes - RIDO indicate marketing |

**Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?**

Medium potential given location

| 2009 Update: | Medium potential. Scrapyard represents an established user and significant local employer, however concern about the long term future of the vacated Millmoor football ground. |
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

*Reasonable access to main road network*

2009 Update: Reasonable access to main road network, although access to scrapyard is on a complicated one way system

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

*No Demolition and reclamation likely to be required*

2009 Update: No change

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employmenet uses/planning briefs)?

*No significant development*

2009 Update: No change

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

*No*

2009 Update: Scrap metal and recycling uses are becoming stronger in economic terms

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

*Mix of uses, recycling industry could remain strong in the future*

2009 Update: No change

Overall market attractiveness score:

**Reasoning:** Unattractive site with bad neighbour use

2009 Update: Lower quality environment but mix of existing uses provide significant local job opportunities

---

**Sustainable Development**

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

*Yes Potential for rail and canal access*

2009 Update: Potential for rail access but unlikely to proceed in the near future

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

2009 Update: PTE scored site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update: No defined local centre in Masbrough, however limited services & facilities nearby hence the score of 2

---

**Original Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for rail access but unlikely to proceed in the near future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTE scored site 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No defined local centre in Masbrough, however limited services &amp; facilities nearby hence the score of 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for rail access but unlikely to proceed in the near future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTE scored site 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No defined local centre in Masbrough, however limited services &amp; facilities nearby hence the score of 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Relatively well located brownfield site

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Well located strategically, with some resident population nearby and within a strategically important area

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Comprehensive development for housing could be acceptable, especially having regard to the Pathfinder work in the area

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:
Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
Overall assessment score: 3
Reasons for overall score: Whilst the site is limited in market attractiveness terms it scores highly on sustainability and strategic criteria
2009 Update: No change
Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
Employment Land Review Update 2009

Midland Road/Wortley Road
Masbrough

Site Ref No: ELR089
Site Area: 9.03 ha

Site Boundary

Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office.
(C) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright. RMBC Licence 100019587

DATE: Nov 2009
SCALE: NTS

9.03 Ha
**Site Reference:** 89  
**Date of Assessment:** 23/06/2006  
**Officer:** Nick Ward  

**Current users:**  
**2009 Assessment Date:** 11/11/2009  
**2009 Officer:** H Sleigh & R Shepherd  

**Site Name:** Midland Road / Wortley Road, Masbrough

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multiple ownerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Range of types of buildings. Some large older buildings may be unsuitable for conversion. Ivanhoe Business Park probably underutilised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reasonable quality, some landscaping but generally scruffy appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Surrounding area is generally residential and employment use in nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parts of Midland Road as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Good location but generally poor environment around Ivanhoe Business Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

**Good access to main road network**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed uses, generally manufacturing and storage/haulage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasoning:** Reasonably attractive site

---

**Sustainable Development**

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTE score site 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No defined local centres but there are limited services and facilities nearby hence score of 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2009 Update:

- Planning masterplans prepared for the Ivanhoe Business Park and submitted for consideration in the LDF.
- RB2009/1007 - permission for conversion and extension to form offices

2009 Update:

- Mixed occupiers, generally manufacturing and storage/haulage

2009 Update:

- No defined local centres but there are limited services and facilities nearby hence score of 2
Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

\textit{No Trees on sites could be retained}

\textbf{2009 Update:} No change

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

\textbf{2009 Update:}

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

\textbf{Yes}

\textbf{2009 Update:} No change

\textbf{Overall sustainable development score:}

\textbf{Reasoning:} \textit{Reasonably well located brownfield sites}

\textbf{2009 Update:} No change

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

\textbf{2009 Update:}

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

\textbf{Yes HMR Pathfinder, Objective 1}

\textbf{2009 Update:} Within Pathfinder only

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

\textbf{2009 Update:} Within Rotherham urban area

\textbf{Overall strategic planning score:}

\textbf{Reasoning:} \textit{Well located strategically}

\textbf{2009 Update:} No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

\textit{Residential might be considered given wider residential character}

\textbf{2009 Update:} No change

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

\textbf{2009 Update:}

\textbf{Overall assessment score}

\textbf{Reasons for overall score:} \textit{Reasonable site, well located in strategic terms}

\textbf{2009 Update:} No change

\begin{tabular}{c c c c}
\hline
\textbf{Original} & \textbf{Score} & \textbf{2009} & \textbf{SCORE} \\
\hline
3 & 2 & 3 & 3 \\
\hline
3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\
\hline
2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Recommendation:  *Retain current employment allocation*
Site Reference: 90  Date of Assessment: 23/06/2006  Officer: Nick Ward

Current users: 2009 Assessment Date: 01/11/109  2009 Officer: H Sleigh & R Shepherd

Site Name: Clough Road / Union Street, Masbrough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity pylons/sub station, some residential/shop/other service uses on site likely to limit development opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most unsuitable for conversion except potentially the bus depot (although the site could be redeveloped)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most unsuitable for conversion except potentially the bus depot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonable quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonable quality in surrounding area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable quality in surrounding area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - Wortley Road / Midland Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Wortley Road / Midland Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - 1 unit being marketed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mix of ownerships, generally reasonable market potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of ownerships, generally reasonable market potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good access to main road network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good access to main road network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?

No  **Land assembly and clearance required for comprehensive development**

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

**No significant development**

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

**Mix of uses currently on site**

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

Reasoning: *Reasonable but not outstanding market attractiveness*

| 2 | 2 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTE scores site 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No defined local centre in Masborough, however there are limited facilities nearby hence the score of 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No significant development, however a number of permissions for employment uses, some of which implemented</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mix of uses include supermarket, pubs and employment premises</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasonable but not outstanding market attractiveness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PTE scores site 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No defined local centre in Masborough, however there are limited facilities nearby hence the score of 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Relatively sustainable brownfield site

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes HMR Pathfinder, Objective 1

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: High scoring strategic site

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
May have potential for housing

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Reasonable site well placed in strategic terms

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
Employment Land Review Update 2009
Harrison Street
Meadowbank Industrial Area

Site Ref No: ELR092
Site Area: 10.37 ha

Site Boundary
SCALE: NTS
DATE: Nov 2009

Rotherham MBC
Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD
### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some bad neighbour uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Some reasonably modern buildings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasonable site environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasonable but not outstanding quality of surrounding area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium potential reflecting location and quality of environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good access to main road network</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2009 Update:

- Small users; very few vacant plots or premises
- Reasonably modern buildings on Harrison Street
- No change
- No change
- Some vacant units being marketed
- No change
- No change
- No change
- No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site assembly and clearance would be required</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No significant development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mix of current uses, recycling sector could remain strong in the future</strong></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall market attractiveness score:</strong></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasoning:</strong> Reasonably attractive site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
<td>PTE scores site 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Overall sustainable development score:**

*Reasoning: Brownfield site in area of high unemployment let down by proximity to local services and accessibility*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall strategic planning score:**

*Reasoning: High scoring strategically with nearby population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield site let down by a lack of proximity to local services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:**

*Could potentially be suitable for residential development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would only be suitable for housing if major comprehensive redevelopment was undertaken, however this would lead to significant loss of local jobs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Blackburn Meadows nature reserve and canal to south of site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall assessment score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for overall score: Reasonable site in market and sustainability terms and well placed strategically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain current employment allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Reference: 3 UDP Reference: E17
Original Assessment Date: 08/02/2006

Site Name: Aldwarke Wharf Business Park

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 11.78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site has poor existing access, is partially adjacent to sewage works and is in the floodplain (consider access could be improved and landscaping used to mitigate bad neighbours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements have been made to the main industrial estate road (Waddington Way) to enable greater access for pedestrians and cyclists including lighting and a pavement along Waddington Way. It is hoped that in the future an appropriate cycle / pedestrian link will be provided to the canal towpath.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjoining uses mix of industrial and retail uses and sewage works nearby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjacent to the canal and railway. A reasonable industrial area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, Potentially developed with E18 and E19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change from previous survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes currently one unit to let.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - issues are poor access, sewage works could be detrimental to marketing and occupiers can only lease buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small area of land adjacent to Aldwarke Lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site is adjacent to Alwarke Lane (A6123)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability?

Yes

Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

Committed to produce planning brief in light of objective 1 funded masterplan. Planning permission granted for warehouse extension

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Site has medium market attractiveness and could be developed with adjacent sites, although they require reclamation. Would need access improvements

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

Yes Site adjacent to railway and canal

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Bus stop on Aldwarke Lane has 2 bus services only

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Site is approx. 810m from Parkgate town centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No The undeveloped area of land include some vegetation. Within Aldwarke Lane Heritage Site (HS371) Ecological survey work submitted with 2004/1993. Survey report includes mitigation recommendations that have been conditioned

2009 Update:

Yes

Aldwarke Masterplan is not currently being progressed. A number of planning permissions have been granted over recent years.

Yes provision of general industrial units.

Site has medium market attractiveness and could be developed with adjacent sites.

Original Score 2009 Score 2009 Update

No change to previous survey

SYPTPE score this site High (3) however this is inconsistent with the sites owned by Yorkshire Water, hence the change to 1 to reflect the adjacent site scores.

No change to previous survey

A small part of the designated Local Wildlife Site is contained within this site. Future development to include buffer habitat
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  
JSA claimant rate is 5.48%

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:  
Reasoning: Site is not that well related to a town centre and has limited bus services. Claimed footpath and permissive cycle track run alongside boundary.

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  
Site is approx. 600m from housing in Parkgate area

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?  
Yes HMRP, Aldwarke regeneration area, Objective 1 - P4b

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?  
Potentially serves settlements identified as growth and key growth areas

Overall strategic planning score:  
Reasoning: The site is within several strategically important areas and nearby settlements score high in Babtie study but is not that well related to a town centre

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Plot 6 (1.28ha) could only realistically be used as expansion land for the adjacent unit

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:
Limited market attractiveness, although Council has a commitment to produce a planning brief for the site

Recommendation: Retain as employment development site

2009 Update:
Large brownfield industrial estate with plots available for development. The site is within Rotherham Urban Area and can meet the needs of local people in providing accessible job opportunities.
Site Name: Aldwarke York Water (west)

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 4.46

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score 2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site needs reclamation and is within the floodplain. Currently indicated as being in operational use by Yorkshire Water. Requires preparation for future development. Now surplus to operational requirements of Yorkshire Water. This is an approved Local Wildlife Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reasonable industrial surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change to previous survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes With E19 and vacant areas of E17</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change to previous survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surplus to requirements of Yorkshire Water,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>RIDO consider this site has high marketing potential given its proximity to adjoining industrial activities and being located with Rotherham Urban area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change to previous survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is adjacent to Alwarke Lane (A6123)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes the site is viable without public funding but would need preparing for future development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Land remaining in 2009 =**
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?
Committed to produce planning brief in light of objective 1 funded masterplan.

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Site has low marketing potential, needs reclamation and no planning applications have been submitted

It is considered that this site has high marketing potential given its proximity to adjoining industrial activities and being located with Rotherham Urban area.

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?
Bus stop on Aldwarke Lane has 2 bus services only

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
Site is approx. 750m from local center Doncaster Road/Aldwarke Lane

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No Within Aldwarke Lane Heritage Site (HS371) While the site includes vegetation, it is surrounded by industrial uses

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
JSA claimant rate is 5.48%

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

2009 Update:
No change from previous survey although the Heritage site now approved as a Local Wildlife Site. There are ponds between the Aldwarke Lane and the concrete platform. Development should avoid this area which would be better utilised as wetland / reedbed system.

2009 Update:
Greenfield - naturally regenerated.
Reasoning: The site is accessible by a limited bus service and its nearest centre is a local centre with a large food store and not a range of uses

No change from previous survey.

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Site is approx. 600m from housing in Parkgate area

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes HMRP, Aldwarke regeneration area, Objective 1 - P4b

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie
Potentially serves settlements identified as growth and key growth areas

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: The sites is within several strategically important areas and nearby settlements score high in Babtie study but is not that well related to a town centre

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:
Although Council committed to produce planning brief, site is currently unavailable.

2009 Update:

The site is within Rotherham Urban Area and can meet the needs of local people in providing accessible job opportunities. This is a designated Local Wildlife Site that will
Recommendation: Retain as employment development site
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Within Flood Zone 2. Yorkshire Water have indicated that this site is surplus to requirements. A Local Wildlife Site (LWS) has been designated here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reasonable industrial surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change from previous survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land now surplus to requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land can be made available for new development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change from previous survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible bio-diversity mitigation will be required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?
Committed to produce planning brief in light of objective 1 funded masterplan.

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Site has low marketing potential, needs reclamation and no planning applications have been submitted

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?
Bus stop on Aldwarke Lane has 2 bus services only

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
Site is approx. 540m from local center Doncaster Road/Aldwarke Lane

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
Yes Within Aldwarke Lane Heritage Site (HS371). Site includes vegetation. Potential biodiversity associated with areas of water

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
JSA claimant rate is 5.48%

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

2009 Update:
Objective 1 funding has now ended and the Aldwarke Masterplan has not progressed.

2009 Update:
No

2009 Update:
Site has some, but limited, market attractiveness.

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
SYPTE score this site low.

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
Now a designated Local Wildlife Site that will require mitigation / may prevent development in the future. Significant wildlife interest is focused around the ponds - approx. 5 hectares (including the ponds and a buffer) should be protected from development.

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
Reasoning: The site is accessible by a limited bus service and its nearest centre is a local centre with a large food store and not a range of uses

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Site is approx. 725m from housing in Eastwood

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes HMRP, Aldwarke regeneration area, Objective 1 - P4b

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie
Potentially serves settlements identified as growth and key growth areas

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: The site is within several strategically important areas and nearby settlements score high in Babtie study but is not that well related to a town centre

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:
Although Council committed to produce planning brief, site is currently unavailable.

2009 Update:
The site is within Rotherham Urban Area and can meet the needs of local people in providing accessible job opportunities. This is a designated Local Wildlife Site that will
require mitigation / may prevent development in the future.

Recommendation: Retain as employment development site
Site Name: Northfield 5

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 6.57

Market Attractiveness

Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?
Site is within the floodplain. Current applicant indicates high costs of providing infrastructure necessary for development.

2009 Update: No development has commenced yet on the remainder of the site

Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?
Industriail uses, car sales, near Retail World

2009 Update: No change to previous survey

Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?
No All adjacent sites developed

2009 Update: No change to previous survey

Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?
Yes

Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?
Medium - requires high value land use

2009 Update: High - development of frontage part of the site has improved the potential for developing the remainder of the site.

Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?
Access to A633 but often traffic associated with Retail World/Parkgate

2009 Update: No change to previous survey

Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes

2009 Update: No change to previous survey
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?
Planning permission for retail and business uses

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Site has medium marketing potential and has planning permission for retail/business use

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
Yes Adjacent to canal and railway

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?
Bus stop at entrance to site on A633. Walking on road not attractive to pedestrians. Can cycle along route near canal towpath. Footpath number 18 runs alongside site.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
Site is approx. 850m from Rotherham town centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
Yes Site includes part of Fitzwilliam Canal Heritage Site. Open ground naturally colonising, used by ground nesting birds. Ecological survey work, further investigation & landscape / mitigation measures being developed within 2004/1556. Drains around the site support good water vole population.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
JSA claimant rate is 3.26%

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

2009 Update:
Development has commenced on frontage of site and B & Q now located here.

2009 Update:

Site with development already underway or completed.

2009 Update:

Adjacent to railway

2009 Update:
Free circular bus service town centre - Parkgate shopping centre. SYPTTE score site high

2009 Update:
No change to previous survey.

2009 Update:
Presume that these issues have been dealt with and addressed as part of the planning permission already implemented.

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
No change
Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Is on main bus route to Rotherham and Parkgate/beyond and has potential for walking and cycling. Equal distance between Rotherham and Parkgate centres.

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Site is approx. 340m from housing off St Ann's Road, Rotherham

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?

Yes HMRP, Aldwarke regeneration area, Objective 1 - P4b

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie

Potentially serves settlements identified as key growth areas

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: The sites is within several strategically important areas and nearby settlements score high in Babtie study and is close to residential areas

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:

Potentially a good, accessible site

2009 Update:

A good, accessible site

Reasoning:

No change to previous survey

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Recreation associated with canal/dog walking along towpath

2009 Update:

No change to previous survey

Development of some industrial and retail warehousing units has been completed and are being marketed.
Recommendation: Retain as employment development site
Site Name: Northfield 10 (now Plot11)

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 2.69

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change to previous survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site within floodplain, reclamation required, poor access and overhead powerline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change to previous survey although site is adjacent to the canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounded by industrial development of low quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change to previous survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All surrounding sites developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Low - reclamation needed and poor access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>Access through industrial estate and onto Greasborough Road before access to major road network</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Needs reclamation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Land remaining in 2009 =
Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?  

No

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

| Reasoning: | Low marketing potential, site needs reclamation, access is poor and surrounding environment not attractive |

| 2009 Update: | No change to previous survey |

**Sustainable Development**

| Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses? | Yes | Adjacent to railway and canal |

| 2009 Update: | No change to previous survey |

| Nearest bus stops are on Rawmarsh Road or Greasborough Road. Canal towpath offers cycle and pedestrian routes. Permissive cycle route runs through the site. |

| Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce? |

| No | 2 |

| SYPTTE scored this site high, however despite being in the bus corridor it is not directly accessible due to the topography of the site. |

| Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site? |

| Site is approx. 610m from Rotherham town centre |

| Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself? |

| Yes | Sites includes vegetation. Potential biodiversity issues associated with canal |

| No | No change to previous survey |

| Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment? |

| JSA claimant rate is 4.68% |

| Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3? |

| Yes |

| 2009 Update: | Part brownfield / part green field following re-vegetation fo the site. |

| Overall sustainable development score: |

| Reasoning: | The site is not well related to a centre and has poor access by sustainable transport |

| 2009 Update: | No change to previous survey however the accessibility score has increased hence the increase in the overall sustainability score. |
**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

*Site is approx. 240m from housing off St Ann's Road, Rotherham*

**2009 Update:**

Site is not readily accessible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?

Yes    HMRP, Aldwarke regeneration area, Objective 1 - P4b

**2009 Update:**

HMR Pathfinder, Aldwarke Strategic Regeneration Area in the adopted Unitary Development Plan (1999)

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Potentially serves settlements identified as key growth areas

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:** The sites is within several strategically important areas and nearby settlements score high in Babtie study and is close to residential areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

**2009 Update:**


Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

*Site used for walking/dog walking along canal*

**Overall assessment score**

**1**

**Reasons for overall score:**

*Not an attractive site, however it does have canal freight potential*

**2009 Update:**

*Not an attractive site, however it does have canal freight potential and it has limited vehicular and pedestrian accessibility from nearby residential areas.*

**Recommendation:** Re-allocate to non-employment allocation
### Site Name: Eastwood Industrial Estate South

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Small area within floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Generally older, lower quality stock majority in employment use. Some limited potential for conversion of non-employment premises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard industrial estate, reasonable access and circulation, generally poor environment and frontage to Doncaster Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonable - industrial to north and east, residential to south and west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change to previous survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Signs on site provide evidence of some marketing of sites/premises within the industrial estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Reasonable access to road network</td>
<td>Adjacent to main road network</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability constraints?

Yes  No major constraints

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Some permissions for employment uses (extension to printing works, permission for B1 use) and outline hotel permission.

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No  Permissions are of a general industrial kind

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Mix of industrial uses with prospects likely to vary in the future

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Generally reasonable market attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTTE score this site high.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

458m

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Update:

Yes for those sites that have been cleared however other sites may require additional funding to bring them forward for development.

There have been several planning permissions granted for non employment uses.

Aspirations for a food and drink cluster possibly supported by the public sector could be viable

No change to previous survey

No change to previous survey

No

SYPTE score this site high.
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

**Overall sustainable development score:**
Reasoning: *Reasonably sustainable site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>A good sustainable site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

| 2009 Update: | |
|--------------||

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes  

**2009 Update:**

**Overall strategic planning score:**
Reasoning: *High scoring site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>No change from previous survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

**2009 Update:**

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**2009 Update:**

**Overall assessment score**
Reasons for overall score: *Reasonable general industrial site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Sustainable general industrial site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommendation:** *Retain current employment allocation*
**Site Name:** Eastwood industrial estate north

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Part of site in floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: Some new development has happened on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes: Some signs indicate marketing of premises/sites within the area</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change from previous survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable access to main road network, although western part of site can be accessed through a residential area</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change from previous survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?

Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Recent permissions have included general industrial units

Units and office block now completed.

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes Some evidence of food and drink and health and social care activities within the site

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Mixture of uses on site across a range of sectors

No change from previous survey

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Reasonable site although attractiveness perhaps let down by quality of environment and setting

No change from previous survey

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No Next to river but likely to be little potential to create access

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYTPE score this site high

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

580m to nearest local centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No No although does sit adjacent to the river

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

No change from previous survey
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**Reasoning:** Overall a reasonably sustainable site

2009 Update: A good well located and sustainable site

---

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Part of site is adjacent to residential area

2009 Update: High scoring in strategic terms

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes  UDP regeneration area, Pathfinder, Objective 1

2009 Update: HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Serves key settlements

2009 Update: No change from previous survey - within Rotherham urban area

---

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:** High scoring in strategic terms

2009 Update: High scoring in strategic terms

---

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Use of canal side

---

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:** Reasonably sustainable and market attractive site

2009 Update: A sustainable site attractive to the market.

---

**Recommendation:** Retain current employment allocation
**Site Reference:** 60  **Date of Assessment:** 19/06/2006  **Officer:** Rachel Overfield  
**Current users:** 2009  **Assessment Date:** 17/11/2009  **Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh  
**Site Name:** Fitzwilliam Road, Eastwood

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>'Residential allocation therefore only B1 uses would be acceptable, linear nature of site'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>'Mixed surroundings of variable quality'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some existing properties, although limited conversion potential</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>'No change'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>'Reasonable landscaping with frontage landscaping strip'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>'No change'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed surroundings of variable quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'No change'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'No change'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'RIDO indicate low marketing potential given nature of the site'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - having regard to main road location and proximity to town centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to main road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:**

- Residential allocation therefore only B1 uses would be acceptable, linear nature of site
- Mixed surroundings of variable quality
- Reasonable landscaping with frontage landscaping strip
- No change
- RIDO indicate low marketing potential given nature of the site
- No change
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability constraints?

No

No major constraints, but linear nature and mix of sites could limit market interest

2009 Update:

No change

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Current residential allocation therefore little employment development pressure

2009 Update:

Temporary permission for use as car park expires March 2010

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

No

2009 Update:

No change

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

2009 Update:

N/A although movement of Council offices may reduce demand for parking in the car parks in the future

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Overall variable market attractiveness scores

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

2009 Update:

No change

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE score site 3

2009 Update:

No change

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update:

No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

2009 Update:

No change

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:

3 3
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes    Majority brownfield although some sits within the area may be greenfield

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Reasonably sustainable site

2009 Update: Brownfield

2009 Update: High scoring site in sustainability terms

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: No change

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes    UDP regeneration area, Pathfinder, Objective 1

2009 Update: UDP regeneration area and HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Serves key settlements

2009 Update: Within Rotherham urban area

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Good strategic site

2009 Update: 3 3

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Potentially suitable for housing, some areas currently used for car parking

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Good strategic site and reasonably sustainable - some questions regarding market attractiveness

2009 Update: Sustainable site but limited market attractiveness

Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation
### Site Reference: Ridge Road, Rotherham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>This is a potential Conservation Area. There are a number of listed buildings in this area and the topography is fairly steep from Ridge Road to Doncaster Road.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>Some suitable for conversion to employment use.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>Reasonable quality of site environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Good quality surroundings except for land north of Ridge Road</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Reasonable but not outstanding potential</td>
<td>No change to previous survey</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Accessible to main road network, but potential bottlenecks in Rotherham town centre</td>
<td>No change to previous survey</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes Potentially suitable for financial and business sector uses

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Some office uses which are likely to see continued demand

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Generally moderate in market attractiveness terms

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

2009 Update:
Yes development is viable.

2009 Update:
Various planning permissions all for conversion to residential.

2009 Update:
There is limited car parking which may limit the attractiveness of the properties.

2009 Update:
No change to previous survey

2009 Update:
Generally moderate in market attractiveness terms, however a number of changes to properties over time to residential.

2009 Update:
No

2009 Update:
No change to previous survey

2009 Update:
SYPTTE score this site 3. This site will benefit from the planned Bus Rapid Transit route. Provided this scheme is completed then in the future the site will have an attractive public transport option.

2009 Update:
No change to previous survey

2009 Update:
No change to previous survey
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Generally sustainable site

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Well placed site in strategic terms

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Potential for buildings to return to residential use in future

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Scores high in strategic terms but less well for sustainability and market attractiveness

Recommendation: Re-allocate to non-employment allocation

2009 Update:
No change to previous survey

Original Score 2009 Score
Overall sustainable development score: 2 2
Strategic Planning 3
Overall assessment score 2 2

2009 Update:
No change to previous survey

2009 Update:
HMR Pathfinder

2009 Update:
Within Rotherham urban area

2009 Update:
No change to previous survey

2009 Update:
N/A

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
HMR Pathfinder

2009 Update:
Site consists of large former residential properties and scores reasonably for B1 business uses but there are clear moves back to residential uses.
### Site Name: Rawmarsh Road, Rotherham

**Market Attractiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>FLOOD ZONE CONSTRAINTS - PARTS OF THIS SITE ARE IN ZONE 3. PART OF CLARE COURT HAS BEEN DEMOLISHED AND IS BEING USED AS A CAR PARK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO CHANGE TO PREVIOUS SURVEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASHLEY COURT IS HIGH QUALITY ALTHOUGH SIGNIFICANT VACANCIES AT MOMENT, THE OTHER MIX OF USES ARE OF VARIABLE QUALITY IN THE WIDER AREA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO CHANGE TO PREVIOUS SURVEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO CHANGE TO PREVIOUS SURVEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASHLEY COURT VACANCIES CURRENTLY BEING MARKETED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td>RIDO HAVE SCORED THIS SITE WITH HIGH POTENTIAL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO CHANGE TO PREVIOUS SURVEY.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date of Assessment:** 23/06/2006  
**Officer:** Nick Ward

**2009 Assessment Date:** 12/11/2009  
**Officer:** Helen sleigh / Ryan Shepherd

---

**Site Reference:** 91
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
Some planning permissions

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Conditions likely to be good for most of the businesses - mix of uses including food and drink and business and professional services sectors

Reasoning: Attractive site for the market

Overall market attractiveness score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Potential canal access</td>
<td>Is canal access feasible? The Wharfage at Green Line Oils limits any further opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably close to bus and train stations</td>
<td>SYPTE score this site high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part of site close to town centre but northern end of site is becoming more remote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Update:
No change to previous survey

2009 Update:
Some planning permissions

2009 Update:
Ashley Court office units are close to the town centre

2009 Update:
No change to previous survey but note current significant level of vacancies at Ashley Court.

2009 Update:
No change to previous survey

2009 Update:
Is canal access feasible? The Wharfage at Green Line Oils limits any further opportunities.

2009 Update:
SYPTE score this site high.

2009 Update:
Part of site close to town centre but northern end of site is becoming more remote.

2009 Update:
3 3

2009 Update:
3 3

2009 Update:
2 2

2009 Update:
3 2
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Very sustainable location

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes  HMR Pathfinder, Objective 1, within Town Centre masterplan area

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Very well located in strategic terms

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Town centre masterplan indicates potential for housing

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Attractive brownfield location close to town centre

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation

2009 Update:
A sustainably located site.

2009 Update:
HMR Pathfinder, within town centre masterplanning area - although there are no strategies to guide development in this area.

2009 Update:
Within Rotherham urban area

2009 Update:
No change to previous survey

2009 Update:
This is a successful employment area and parts are within Flood Zone 3 therefore limited future opportunities for housing development.

2009 Update:
Attractive business park location close to the town centre.
Site Reference: 138  
Current users:  
Site Name: Land at Corus steel works, north of weighbridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td>Within Corus site and use is dependant upon the needs of Corus - may not be readily available. Topography, access, pylons and biodiversity interest are also constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site is to east of main steel works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No - due to topographical differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Site could have medium marketing potential if it came forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>On A630, accessible to HGVs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh
2009 Assessment Date: 17/11/2009

Original Score
2009 Update:
Site could have medium marketing potential if it came forward
On A630, accessible to HGVs
Site is to east of main steel works
No - due to topographical differences
Within Corus site and use is dependant upon the needs of Corus - may not be readily available. Topography, access, pylons and biodiversity interest are also constraints
N/A
N/A
Site is to east of main steel works
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Weighbridge still operational and land may not be available dependant upon operational needs of Corus

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE score site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Near to Dalton local centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes - likely to be biodiversity interest on the site

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:

Likely to be viable

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

Reasonable location but a number of constraints may limit attractiveness

Original Score 2009 Score

2 2

1
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Site is part of the Corus site and therefore need to establish whether there is prospect of the site being made available for new development

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:

Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site
Roundwood Colliery

Employment Land Review 2009

Site Ref No: ELR140_LFP14

Site Area: 6.16 ha

ELR140 6.16 ha

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey Mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty’s Stationery Office. (C) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright. Licence: 100019587

Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD

Rotherham MBC
Site Reference: 140  
Current users:  
Site Name: roundwood colliery, aldwarke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>Former colliery, infill and restoration to be complete by December 2010, adjacent to biodiversity interest and accessed through Corus land</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Industrial site within larger Corus steelworks complex, adjacent to green belt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No - reclamation currently underway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>RIDO indicate medium potential for marketing once restored</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Access is off Aldwarke Lane and through Corus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update:
Planning permission for reclamation to enable future development

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

2009 Update:
Yes - rail access may be possible

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

2009 Update:
PTE scores site

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update:
Remote from local facilities

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

2009 Update:
No, providing that redevelopment is undertaken sensitively

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

No

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:

Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site

2009 Update:

Location is remote from communities and facilities

Remote from existing communities

HMR Pathfinder, close to a neighbourhood renewal area

Within Rotherham urban area

Reasonable site within the Rotherham urban area

Reasonable site let down by access and distance from local facilities

Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site
## Site Name: Former Burberry Factory, Fitzwilliam Road, Eastwood

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>Vacant factory. Former pub adjacent to be redeveloped for housing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>Factory suitable for re-use or conversion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>Reasonable site environment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Reasonable surroundings - main road, roundabout, housing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>RIDO indicate site likely to have high marketing potential</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Adjacent to roundabout and main road network</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability concerns?

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

No

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Reasonably attractive location

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE score site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Reasonably close to local facilities

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

No

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

2009 Update:

Yes

2009 Update:

Yes

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

Reasonably attractive location

2009 Update:

N/A - currently vacant

2009 Update:

Reasonably close to local facilities

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

Yes
Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning:

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Given the site context housing could be an alternative use providing that sufficient landscaping is provided to the roundabout

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:

Recommendation:  Retain current employment allocation
Site Name: Parkgate Business Park South (MU14)
Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 1.57  Land remaining in 2009 =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No constraints identified on site

Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers? | 2              | 2          |

Adjacent to mix of retail units and industrial activity

Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site? | 2009 Update: | No change  |

No  Adjacent sites are already in use or the railway acts as a barrier to comprehensive development

Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use? | 2009 Update: | No change  |

No

Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential? | 2009 Update: | No change  |

High

Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas? | 2009 Update: | No change  |

The site has convenient access to the national road network through Parkgate business/retail park

Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability problem? | 2009 Update: | Site has not come forward for development, although no change|

Yes  Site has been prepared for development
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

Part of the site has planning permission for a new road and bridge over the railway which has not been implemented. Its implementation would reduce the developable area.

2009 Update: Permission for road scheme has lapsed

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Overall market attractiveness score: 3

Reasoning: The site could be developed and has high marketing potential and is not surrounded by significantly bad neighbouring uses

No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

Yes Site is adjacent to the railway

2009 Update: No change

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Site is well served by bus services to Rotherham and to Rawmarsh/Barnsley/Doncaster with bus stop on entrance to park on Great Eastern Way

PTE score site 3

2009 Update: 2 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Site is approx. 330m from Parkgate town centre

2009 Update: No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No The site has little vegetation of interest and is area of overgrown scrub

May need further consideration of potential biodiversity interest given length of time the site has been vacant

2009 Update: 2 2

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

JSA claimant rate is 3.26%

2009 Update:

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

2009 Update:
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: The site is reasonably well located and well served by bus services but development is likely to be accessed by cars associated with trips to adjacent business/retail park

2009 Update:

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: The site is within several strategically important areas and nearby settlements score high in Babtie study

2009 Update:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

One person was walking dog during site visit

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:

Suitable and available for development - although implementation of road scheme could limit development

2009 Update:

Suitable and available for development - although road scheme lapsed a similar scheme
potential on site. may well be required to address wider transport issues in Aldwarke and could limit development potential on site.

Recommendation: Retain as employment development site
**Site Reference:** 2  **UDP Reference:** E16  **Original Assessment Date:** 08/02/2006  
**2009 Update:** 17/11/2009

**Site Name:** Aldwarke (stadium developments)

**Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 14.3**  
**Land remaining in 2009 =**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>Site has access problems and needs new road and bridge. Part of site is within floodplain</td>
<td>Transport / highways issues are considered crucial to resolve in this area</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Adjacent to mix of retail units at Retail World and industrial units on E17</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Railway is a barrier to comprehensive development with adjacent sites but bridge over railway could improve links with E15</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Medium/Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>The site has convenient access to the national road network through Retail World. Part of site is adjacent to Aldwarke Lane</td>
<td>Heavily congested roads, and low bridges limit use by certain types of vehicle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No - funding likely to be required to resolve transport issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

Committed to produce planning brief in light of objective 1 funded masterplan. Council has resolved to approve application for a soccor dome/health and fitness/retail uses but S106 has not been signed. Part of the site has planning permission for a new road and bridge over the railway which has not been implemented.

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Although commitment has been made to production of a brief, no development has taken place. Site has access issues.

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

Yes Railway runs adjacent to the site on 2 sides

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Site is served by bus services with stops on Aldwarke Lane and at the entrance to Retail World

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Site is approx. 530m from Parkgate town centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No The site includes areas of vegetation towards Aldwarke Lane but majority of sites use for recycling and extraction of aggregates. Comments on previous application identified need for appropriate mitigation measures & landscaping.

2009 Update:

Masterplan produced but not progressed. Soccor dome application withdrawn. No planning brief has been produced. The new bridge/road link permission has not been implemented.

2009 Update:

Although commitment has previously been made to produce a development brief, no progress or development has taken place. Site has significant transport/access issues.

2009 Update:

Although close to railway lines topography could be an issue in gaining access

PTE score site 3, however continued accessibility by public transport could be dependent on the continuation of the free bus presently serving Retail World

Adjacent to Retail World hence score of 2

No change
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
JSA claimant rate is 3.26%

2009 Update: 2 2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

2009 Update: No change

Overall sustainable development score:

2009 Update: 2 2

Reasoning: The site is reasonably well located and well served by bus services but development is likely to be accessed by cars associated with trips to Retail World

2009 Update: No change

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Site is approx. 380m from housing in Parkgate area

2009 Update: No change

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?

Yes HMRP, Aldwarke regeneration area, Objective 1 - P4b

2009 Update: No longer within Objective 1 P4b area

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie

Potentially serves settlements identified as growth and key growth areas

2009 Update: Within Rotherham urban area

Overall strategic planning score:

2009 Update: 3 3

Reasoning: The sites is within several strategically important areas and nearby settlements score high in Babtie study

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

2009 Update:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Overall assessment score 3 3
Reasons for overall score:
Reasonable site, well located and potentially able to support large floorspace development (although development area would be reduced should the road scheme be implemented)

Recommendation: Retain as employment development site

2009 Update:
This is a large, strategic brownfield site. It is well located and potentially able to support large floorspace development (although development area would be reduced should the road scheme be implemented)
Site Reference: 9 UDP Reference: E62  
Site Name: Rotherham former Ent Zone Plot 31 (Barbot Hall)  

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 1.17  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Site within flood zone 3 rather than floodplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No easy access, site within floodplain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Standard industrial setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounded by industrial development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All sites developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - no easy access, only used by adjoining occupiers for expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access through industrial estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Resolving access may require assistance if site is to be developed for anything other than expansion land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

RB2005/2118 - permission for storage of manufacturing materials, covers majority of the site.

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Site had low marketing potential, while surrounding land has been developed this site could only be used for expansion of existing occupiers and therefore has limited market attractiveness

Site has limited marketing potential. Access is a significant constraint which without being addressed means that site could only be used for expansion of existing occupiers.

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses? No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Site is reasonably well served by bus service and bus stops on Mangham Road

PTE score site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Site is approx. 470m from Parkgate town centre

2 2

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes Site includes vegetation. Drain runs along west/south of site. Is adjacent to watercourse, will require landscaping measures for any areas of interest, also will need to maintain buffer habitat along river.

No change

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

JSA claimant rate is 3.26%

2 2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

No change

Overall sustainable development score:

2 2
Reasoning: Site is reasonably well related to a town centre and served by bus services

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Site is approx. 530m from housing in Parkgate

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes HMRP, Aldwarke regeneration area, Objective 1 - P4b

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie Potentially serves settlements identified as growth and key growth areas

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: The sites is within several strategically important areas and nearby settlements score high in Babtie study but is not that well related to a town centre

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:
Within existing industrial estate but access issues may restrict potential to come forward for development. Current permission for storage use associated with adjoining business.

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
**Site Name:** Bus depot, Dale Road, Rawmarsh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some mature trees on site. Surrounding residential use could limit future development options</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older buildings but could have potential for conversion</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable layout</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounded by residential use. Existing site screened therefore good quality environment</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium potential given site location and context</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to main road</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability constraints to development?
Yes  No excessive constraints to development

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Likely to be some continuing demand for current site use

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Reasonably attractive site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
<td>PTE scores site 3</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located on a quality bus corridor and has reasonable walking and cycling links</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Potential impact given mature trees on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Potentially some greenfield given presence of trees, although all likely to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be within the brownfield curtilage

**Overall sustainable development score:** 2 2

**Reasoning:** Reasonable site, although limited access to shops and services

**Strategic Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</th>
<th>3 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong> Pathfinder, Objective 1</td>
<td>Within Pathfinder area only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?</th>
<th>3 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>Within Rotherham urban area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall strategic planning score:** 3 3

| Reasoning: Good accessible strategic site | No change |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:</th>
<th>2 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for residential development given surrounding housing</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes? | 2 2 |

**Recommendation:** Retain current employment allocation
**Site Reference:** Ron Hull site, Barbot Hall industrial estate, Rawmarsh  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Flooding risk to small part of site but not a major constraint</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mixed quality of buildings on site includes new warehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mixed quality of buildings on site</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Generally poor</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reasonable view to south and greenbelt to north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Reasonable view to south and greenbelt to north</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Greenbelt land to north - however policy constraint to developing this land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Greenbelt land to north</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Good location and also represents a good sized site</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Close to main road network</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Likely to be continued demand for waste recycling

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Scores well overall in market attractiveness terms
No change 3 3

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
No

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:

Reclamation and decontamination likely to be required if site comprehensively redeveloped

2009 Update:

2006/1200 - permission for new warehouse and extension now implemented

2009 Update:

Yes - recycling is a major economic sector

2009 Update:

Likely to be continued demand for waste recycling

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

Any new development would need to have regard to the adjacent greenbelt to the north

2009 Update:

2 2
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3? Yes

**Overall sustainable development score:**

Reasoning: *Reasonably sustainable site*  

2009 Update: No change

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  

2009 Update: No change

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  

Yes  

HMR Pathfinder, Objective 1  

2009 Update: Within Pathfinder area only

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  

2009 Update:  

Within Rotherham urban area

**Overall strategic planning score:**

Reasoning: *Good strategic site*  

2009 Update: No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:  

*Maybe potential for residential, although employment uses exist to east and south*

2009 Update:  

Not considered suitable for housing given adjacent employment uses

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?  

2009 Update:

**Overall assessment score**

Reasons for overall score: *Good scores across all criteria*  

2009 Update: No change

Recommendation: *Retain current employment allocation*
Site Area: 10.71 ha

Barbot Hall Industrial Estate
Rother Court
Employment Land Review 2009

Site Ref No: ELR063

Site No: 0.71 Ha

Date: Nov 2009
Scale: NTS
## Site Reference: 63  Date of Assessment: 23/06/2006  Officer: Alan Bamforth

### Current users:

2009 Assessment Date: 19/11/2009  Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

### Site Name: Rother Court, Barbot Hall industrial estate, Rawmarsh

##### Market Attractiveness

| Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site? | 2009 Update: None |
| Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use? | 2009 Update: All suitable for employment use |
| Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)? | 2009 Update: Good site layout |
| Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers? | 2009 Update: General industrial estate environment |
| Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site? | 2009 Update: No |
| Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use? | 2009 Update: No |
| Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential? | 2009 Update: Small well located units |
| Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks. | 2009 Update: Close to main road network |

Original Score: 3  2009 Score: 3

### Market Attractiveness

- **Q1.1** Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?  
  - **None**
- **Q1.2** What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?  
  - **All suitable for employment use**
- **Q1.3** What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?  
  - **Good site layout**
- **Q1.4** Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?  
  - **General industrial estate environment**
- **Q1.5** Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?  
  - **No**
- **Q1.6** Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?  
  - **No**
- **Q1.7** Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?  
  - **Small well located units**
- **Q1.8** Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.  
  - **Close to main road network**

Original Score: 3  2009 Score: 3

### Notes

- **Q1.2** Suitable for a mix of uses - site includes some leisure/retail uses which may not easily be converted to employment use.
- **Q1.4** General industrial estate environment however the northern part of the site is retail/commercial in character.
- **Q1.5** Suitable for a mix of uses - site includes some leisure/retail uses which may not easily be converted to employment use.
- **Q1.7** Small well located units but users could conflict with potential employment activity on northern part of site.
- **Q1.8** Close to main road network.
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability concerns? Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal? Yes Small units have potential to support new or small businesses

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)? Mix of current uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall market attractiveness score:</th>
<th>Reasoning: Generally high scoring site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong></td>
<td>No change 1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sustainable Development**

| Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses? | **2009 Update:** No change |
| Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce? | **2009 Update:** No change |
| Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site? | **2009 Update:** No change |
| Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself? | **2009 Update:** No change |
| Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment? | **2009 Update:** No change |
| Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3? | **2009 Update:** No change |

---

**2009 Update:**

No change

**Score**

**2009 SCORE**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall sustainable development score:</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning: <em>Average in sustainability terms</em></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Planning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasoning:</strong></td>
<td>Original Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Planning</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?**

- Yes  
  *HMR Pathfinder, Objective 1*

**Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?**

**Overall strategic planning score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasoning:</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good strategic site, slightly limited by proximity to local residential areas</strong></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:**

- Location within industrial limits potential alternative uses

**Location within Rotherham urban area**

2009 Update: Location within industrial limits potential alternative uses although small units to the north are predominantly in retail/leisure use

**Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain current employment allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:**  
*Retain current employment allocation*
Employment Land Review Update 2009
Parkgate Business Park
Parkgate
### Site Name: Parkgate Business Park, Parkgate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some flooding risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings either in employment use or suitable for such use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally good layout and environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: Reasonably good setting, specifically Taylors Court is a good quality development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: Reasonably good setting, specifically Taylors Court is a good quality development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably good industrial setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2009 Update: No - sites all developed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2009 Update: No - sites all developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Some potential to link with MU14, however this not possible if the link road with planning permission is developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: Yes. Note that considerable office space at Taylors Court is available to let.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: Yes. Note that considerable office space at Taylors Court is available to let.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Evidence of signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good location and premises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to main road network although some local congestion on main road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update:
Several non-employment permissions and applications

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes  Units potentially suitable to support SME businesses

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Mix of current uses

2009 Update:
No change

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Overall generally attractive to the market

2009 Update:
No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

2009 Update:
PTE scores site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Close to Retail World although this has no service offer. Site is further away from Parkgate town centre

2009 Update:
No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No  No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Reasonable but not outstanding sustainability scores

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Yes

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes HMR Pathfinder, Objective 1

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Generally good although let down by proximity to residential areas

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Some small retail potential - many units east of Rotherham Road have a quasi-retail use already. Context limits other potential alternatives.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Likely to be attractive to the market, however scores less well in sustainability and strategic terms

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
Employment Land Review Update 2009

Aldwarke Road, Parkgate

Site Ref No: ELR065
Site Area: 0.66 ha

Site Boundary

0.66 Ha

Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD

Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
(C) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright. RMBC Licence 100019587.
Site Reference: 65  Date of Assessment: 23/06/2006  Officer: Alan Bamforth
Current users: 2009 Assessment Date: 17/11/2009 2009 Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

Site Name: Aldwarke Road, Parkgate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child day care centre on site but no other issues if this were to be relocated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely to be suitable for conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally poor site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable quality surroundings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Potential for development along with Naylor Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No  No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within residential area but partly fronts on to roundabout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to main road network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Update:

No change

Reasonable site environment

Road infrastructure prevents comprehensive development of adjoining sites

No change

Yes - vacant site
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Part vacant and part child day care centre

Overall market attractiveness score: Market attractiveness is limited
Reasoning: Market attractiveness is limited

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
Yes Part of site is scrubland and could provide some wildlife habitat

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:
Could require funding as site has been vacant for some time

RB2008/0794 - outline permission for housing on part of site

No change

Part vacant and part child day care centre

No change

Overall market attractiveness score: Market attractiveness is limited
Reasoning: Market attractiveness is limited

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
PTE scores site 3

No change

Part of site is scrubland and could provide some wildlife habitat

Likely to be only limited biodiversity impact

No change

Part of site is scrubland and could provide some wildlife habitat

No change

2009 Update:

Likely to be only limited biodiversity impact

No change

Part of site is scrubland and could provide some wildlife habitat

No change

2009 Update:

Likely to be only limited biodiversity impact

Part of site is scrubland and could provide some wildlife habitat

No change

2009 Update:

Likely to be only limited biodiversity impact

Part of site is scrubland and could provide some wildlife habitat

No change

2009 Update:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?</td>
<td>Site is a mix of green and brown field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Although part of site may be classed as greenfield (possibly a separate planning unit to the child care centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sustainable development score:</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning: Reasonably sustainable site</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>HMR Pathfinder, Objective 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall strategic planning score:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning: Well placed site in strategic terms</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within residential allocation - could potentially be developed for residential use</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall assessment score</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for overall score: Reasonably good site, particularly in strategic terms</td>
<td>Site unlikely to be available for employment use due to existing use on site and recent residential permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Ref No: ELR066
Site Area: 0.8 ha

Employment Land Review Update 2009

Naylor Street, Parkgate

Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD

(N)
**Site Reference:** 66  **Date of Assessment:** 23/06/2006  **Officer:** Alan Bamforth  
**Current users:**  
**2009 Assessment Date:** 17/11/2009  **2009 Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh  
**Site Name:** Naylor Street, Parkgate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Site fully developed at present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>All currently in employment use - some buildings may be suitable for conversion for other employment uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reasonable but not outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>General industrial and residential setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes Potential to link with Aldwarke Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited by location and context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reasonable access to main roads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update:

RB2007/0575 - permission granted for installation of waste oil storage tank

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Mix of uses - some likely to be in declining sectors

Reasoning: Generally limited market attractiveness

Overall market attractiveness score: 2

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Generally poor accessibility

PTE scores site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

No change

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

2009 Update:

No change
### Overall sustainable development score:

**Reasoning:** Fairly sustainable site

### Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes HMR Pathfinder, Objective 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babtie study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall strategic planning score:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasoning:</strong> High scoring site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall assessment score

**Reasons for overall score:** Good strategic site although with more limited market attractiveness and sustainability scores. Consideration could be given to allocating for B1 use to protect existing use of site.

**Recommendation:** Retain current non-employment allocation
Site Reference: 68  Date of Assessment: 23/06/2006  Officer: Alan Bamforth
Current users: 2009  Assessment Date: 19/11/2009  Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh
Site Name: School Lane B1 allocation, Parkgate

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally poor access to site</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Mix of ages, some could be converted to other employment uses - generally poor quality</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mix of ages, some could be converted to other employment uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td>Reasonable layout but not outstanding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable layout but not outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td>Fields to west and recreation ground to east, industrial uses to north and south</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields to west and recreation ground to east, industrial uses to north and south</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td>Yes Potentially greenbelt land to west and recreation field to east - although policy constraint limits development opportunity on green belt.</td>
<td>Potentially greenbelt land to west and recreation field to east - although policy constraint limits development opportunity on green belt.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Potentially greenbelt land to west and recreation field to east</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td>Limited by access and linear nature of site</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited by access and linear nature of site</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td>Reasonable access to main road network</td>
<td>Reasonable access to main road network</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable access to main road network</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Mix of employment uses currently

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Reasonable but limited market attractiveness

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
PTE scores site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
No

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:
Mix of users and landowners may require funding assistance if this area was to be comprehensively redeveloped

2009 Update:
No, however extension to the adjacent Ron Hull site encroaches into the site

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
Limited market attractiveness given nature of site

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
PTE scores site 3

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

Development would need to have regard to the adjacent greenbelt

2009 Update:

Original Score | 2009 Score
--- | ---
1 | 1
2 | 2
3 | 3
2 | 2
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**Reasoning:** *Reasonably sustainable site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

**2009 Update:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes  
**HMR Pathfinder, Objective 1**

**2009 Update:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

**2009 Update:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:** *High scoring in strategic terms*

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

*No obvious alternative uses*

*Part of this allocation is now within Ron Hull site - consider revision to boundaries*

**2009 Update:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**2009 Update:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:** *Reasonable employment site, although likely to have limited market potential*

**Recommendation:** *Retain current employment allocation*
Site Reference: 69  Date of Assessment: 23/06/2006  Officer: Alan Bamforth

Current users: 2009  Assessment Date: 19/11/2009  2009 Officer: H Sleigh & R Shepherd

Site Name: Westfield Road Craft Workshops, Parkgate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of this site? Listed building on site and surrounding housing could limit development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: No Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversion for employment use? Some variable age and quality, although some could be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>converted for alternative employment use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circulation issues)? Standard industrial estate quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Fairly poor site environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment to potential developers and occupiers? Surrounded by residential development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Surrounded by residential development and green belt to the west</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this site? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential? Units suitable to support SME businesses Units suitable to support SME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses, however RIDO indicate low marketing potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks. Access through residential area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Update:

Site Reference: 69  Date of Assessment: 23/06/2006  Officer: Alan Bamforth

Current users: 2009  Assessment Date: 19/11/2009  2009 Officer: H Sleigh & R Shepherd

Site Name: Westfield Road Craft Workshops, Parkgate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of this site? Listed building on site and surrounding housing could limit development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: No Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversion for employment use? Some variable age and quality, although some could be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>converted for alternative employment use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circulation issues)? Standard industrial estate quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Fairly poor site environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment to potential developers and occupiers? Surrounded by residential development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Surrounded by residential development and green belt to the west</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this site? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use? No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential? Units suitable to support SME businesses Units suitable to support SME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses, however RIDO indicate low marketing potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks. Access through residential area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No change

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal? Yes Units suitable to support small businesses

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Mix of current users

No change

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Scores reasonably well in market attractiveness terms

No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses? No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE scores site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site? No

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself? No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

No

2009 Update:

Given listed building on site any redevelopment of this site may require funding assistance

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

PTE scores site 3

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

Scores reasonably well however poor site environment and access

Scores reasonably well in market attractiveness terms

Scores reasonably well however poor site environment and access

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Scores reasonably well in market attractiveness terms

Scores reasonably well however poor site environment and access

No change

2009 Update:

Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Average in sustainability scoring

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  
Yes HMR pathfinder, Objective 1

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: High scoring in strategic terms

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Potential suitability for housing development given surrounding residential use

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Average site overall, although scores highly in strategic terms

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
Site Ref No: ELR163
Site Area: 1.59 ha

Employment Land Review Update 2009
Former T C Harrison showroom
Parkgate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>Update</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant buildings on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sites unlikely to be suitable for conversion given specific original use as car showroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonable site environment; potential for improvement as part of any redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjacent to roundabout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>No - land levels difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - marketed by Innes England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High marketing potential given location adjacent to roundabout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks. | | | | Good access to network, although some distance from motorways.
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
   
   **2009 Update:**
   
   "No"

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
   
   **2009 Update:**
   
   "Yes"

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
   
   **2009 Update:**
   
   "None"

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
   
   **2009 Update:**
   
   "Reasonable site"

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

Reasoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:**

"Previous car showroom closed; site is vacant"

**2009 Update:**

"Edge of Parkgate town centre"

**2009 Update:**

"No"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance?</td>
<td>Generally high sustainable development scores</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?</td>
<td>Within Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of</td>
<td>Within Rotherham urban area</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babtie study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall strategic planning score:</td>
<td>High scoring site</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general views on suitability for employment use:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used for informal recreation purposes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall assessment score</td>
<td>High scoring, large brownfield site in a strategic location</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for overall score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Ref No: ELR165
Site Area: 1.0 ha

Employment Land Review Update 2009
Former DC Cook site
Eastwood Industrial Estate
Site Reference: 165  Date of Assessment:  
Current users: 2009 Assessment Date: 19/11/2009 2009 Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

Site Name: Former D C Cook site, Fitzwilliam Road, Eastwood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Original Score: Not relevent - site cleared  
2009 Update: Mixed commercial / residential environment, adjacent to roundabout  

Original Score: No  
2009 Update: No  

Original Score: No  
2009 Update: Attractive site located on the roundabout  

Original Score:  
2009 Update: On main road, adjacent to roundabout
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

No

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

**Reasoning:**

**Sustainable Development**

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

No

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Site scores 3 from PTE

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
No

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

**2009 Update:**

Yes - site cleared with only hardstanding remaining

**Potential given site size and location on roundabout**

Car showroom use ceased; site now vacant

Good site in accessible location on major road route

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

**Strategic Planning**
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

**Overall strategic planning score:**
Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**
Reasons for overall score:

**Recommendation:** Retain as employment development site

**2009 Update:**

Scores well across all criteria

Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder

Within Rotherham urban area

Well located site in strategic terms

Consideration could be given to residential development but adjoining uses, ground levels and proximity to main road mean housing likely to be unsuitable

Well located brownfield site in a strategic location

Retain as employment development site
Site Name: Central Area Drummond St

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 0.53

Market Attractiveness

Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?

No although site topography is an issue to be overcome in any development

2009 Update: No change to previous survey

Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?

Facing residential on two sides

2009 Update: No change to previous survey

Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?

Yes No

2009 Update: Yes potentially developable with adjacent Civic area

Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?

No No. Currently being used as Car Park.

2009 Update: No change to previous survey

Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?

Within Town Centre location

2009 Update: No change to previous survey

Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?

Good access to both M1 and M18

2009 Update: Reasonable access to main road network but some distance from motorways.

Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

Yes

2009 Update: No change to previous survey

Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

Nothing Available

2009 Update: No change to previous survey


Score

Original Score

3

2009 Score

2

2009 Update:

Reasonable access to main road network but some distance from motorways.

No change to previous survey

No change to previous survey
Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No None

Overall market attractiveness score:

3

Reasoning: Good central site

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTPE scores good for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Within Town Centre location

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

No

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes No

Overall sustainable development score:

3

Reasoning: Good central site

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: No change to previous survey

3 3

2009 Update: Good central site

3 3

2009 Update: Yes the site is brownfield - currently in use as a car park

3 3

2009 Update: Good central site

3 3
Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes Objective 1

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Good central site

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
The site is currently being used as a Car Park and is close to a Residential Areas

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
No

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:
Good central site, although currently in use as car park

Recommendation: Retain as employment development site

2009 Update:
HMR Pathfinder, town centre renaissance

2009 Update:
Within Rotherham urban area

2009 Update:
Good central site

2009 Update:
No change to previous survey

2009 Update:
Good central site, although currently in use as a car park.

Site Name: Central Area Westgate

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 0.93  Land remaining in 2009 =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?
Part of the site boundary is along the river Don but it also overlooks heavy industrial areas

| 2009 Update:                                                                                             |                |            |
|                                                                                                          | No change      | 1          |

Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?
Yes  Recent application for development, although refused, incorporated sorting office and other land adjoining this site.

| 2009 Update:                                                                                             |                |            |
|                                                                                                          | Viability concerns for employment when considering redevelopment of wider area including the Post Office site. | 1          |

Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?
No

| 2009 Update:                                                                                             |                |            |
|                                                                                                          | No change      | No         |

Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?
Offers very good potential under the Design Code Report

| 2009 Update:                                                                                             |                |            |
|                                                                                                          | Plans for redevelopment over a number of years have not come forward | 3          |

Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?
Good access to both M1 and M18

| 2009 Update:                                                                                             |                |            |
|                                                                                                          | No change      | 3          |

Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes  However if comprehensive development incorporating the sorting office development is sought, then relocation of the sorting office could be an issue

| 2009 Update:                                                                                             |                |            |
|                                                                                                          | No change      | No         |
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?
Outline planning permission for range of uses, including offices. Is also within the Design Code area, adopted as an interim planning statement

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes Elements of existing planning permissions conform with design code in principle (including development of offices)

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Well located site

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?
SYPT scores good for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
Close to town centre, and other shops/services

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No, although river does run along side the site

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Well located site

2009 Update:
Permissions for a range of uses including offices granted in 2006/2007, however these have now lapsed.

2009 Update:
No - no extant permissions

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Strategic Planning</strong></th>
<th><strong>2009 Update:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Original Score</strong></th>
<th><strong>2009 SCORE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</td>
<td>Yes - new housing recently developed close to this site</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?</td>
<td>Within Pathfinder and Rotherham Renaissance areas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie</td>
<td>Within Rotherham urban area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall strategic planning score:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasoning:** *Well located site*

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

The site is currently being used as a car park and has a number of constraints:
- CC1997/0147 PL Water Protection Zone
- CC1990/0058 PL Planning Legal Agreement
- CC2006/0013 PL Design Code

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**No**

**Overall assessment score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reasons for overall score:</strong></th>
<th><strong>2009 Update:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Well located site suitable for mixed use as indicated in the Design Code</em></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:** *Retain as employment development site*
### Site Name: Former Guest and Chrimes

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Listed building, poor access, contamination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed building, poor access, contamination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Listed building previously had permission for conversion to office and residential. Warehousing on bottom part of site could continue in present use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority unsuitable (listed buildings have permission for conversion to offices and residential)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Generally poor, however potential for improvement given the construction of new civic offices on part of site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mix - riverside, railway line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix - riverside, railway line</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Evidence of marketing on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change, although the site is also being proposed as a location for a new football stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td>High. Civic offices under construction on part of site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

**Good access to main road network**

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability bottleneck?

**No - extensive contamination likely to inhibit employment redevelopment except for very high value uses**

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

**Permission for conversion of listed building partly to offices**

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

**Yes - Office use likely to grow in future**

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

**Warehousing on small part of site likely to require better location for such uses in the future**

**Reasoning: Reasonably attractive to the market**

**Overall market attractiveness score:** 2 2

**Sustainable Development**

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

**Yes**

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

**Distance from public transport**

**2009 Update:**

- Site has been de-contaminated. Funding may be required should development of the site require additional road access from Sheffield Road

- Permission for conversion of listed building partly to offices now lapsed. Planning permissions for site remediation and erection of civic offices both implemented.

**2009 Update:**

- Reasonably attractive to the market and has seen public sector investment in the site

- Canal wharfage and potential for rail access in the longer term (although this is perhaps unlikely)

**PTE scored 3**
Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No  No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Good site in sustainability terms

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes  Objective 1, Pathfinder, Town centre masterplan

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Reasoning: Good strategic site, well placed to serve potential increase in town centre population

Overall strategic planning score:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Potentially suitable for other commercial uses, housing, civic uses

2009 Update:

No change

Potential for some impact on green infrastructure corridor along River Don. Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat

New Objective 1, Pathfinder, Town centre masterplan

Within Pathfinder and Rotherham Renaissance areas

Within Rotherham urban area

Potentially suitable for other commercial / civic uses although flooding issues would need to be considered. Site is being considered as the location of the new Rotherham United community stadium
Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:** Good overall site

**Recommendation:** Re-allocate to non-employment allocation

**2009 Update:**

No change
### Site Name: Woodside NHS Offices, Moorgate

| Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site? | 2009 Update: No change |
| Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use? | 2009 Update: Good quality - currently in use and potential for further conversion |
| Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)? | 2009 Update: High quality site environment |
| Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers? | 2009 Update: Good quality setting |
| Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site? | 2009 Update: No |
| Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use? | 2009 Update: No |
| Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential? | 2009 Update: High quality environment and setting |
| Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks. | 2009 Update: Reasonable access to main road network |

**Site Reference:** 76  **Date of Assessment:** 22/06/2006  **Officer:** Allan Houtby

**Current users:** 2009  **Assessment Date:** 19/11/2009  **Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Market Attractiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:** No change

---

**Site Reference:** 76  **Date of Assessment:** 22/06/2006  **Officer:** Allan Houtby

**Current users:** 2009  **Assessment Date:** 19/11/2009  **Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Market Attractiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:** No change

---

**Site Reference:** 76  **Date of Assessment:** 22/06/2006  **Officer:** Allan Houtby

**Current users:** 2009  **Assessment Date:** 19/11/2009  **Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Market Attractiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:** No change

---

**Site Reference:** 76  **Date of Assessment:** 22/06/2006  **Officer:** Allan Houtby

**Current users:** 2009  **Assessment Date:** 19/11/2009  **Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Market Attractiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:** No change

---

**Site Reference:** 76  **Date of Assessment:** 22/06/2006  **Officer:** Allan Houtby

**Current users:** 2009  **Assessment Date:** 19/11/2009  **Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Market Attractiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:** No change
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes High quality setting suitable for financial and business growth sectors

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Financial and business sector identified for growth

Reasoning: High quality site attractive to the market

Overall market attractiveness score:

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
PTE scores site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

2009 Update:
No change

Only one minor permission for installation of disabled access ramp

1 1

Currently in use as NHS offices and this likely to continue

3 3

High quality site attractive to the market

3 3

No change

No change

PTE scores site 3

3 3

No change

1 1

1 1

2 2

2 2

2 2
Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Variable scores but overall a reasonably sustainable site

2009 Update:
Sustainable site only let down by distance to local services

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update:
No change

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

2009 Update:
No change

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update:
Within Rotherham urban area

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Reasonable but not outstanding in strategic terms

2009 Update:
Good site within strategically important location

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

2009 Update:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score: Reasonably good site, particularly in market attractiveness terms

2009 Update:
Good site in attractive setting, within strategically important area

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed building on part of site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good quality buildings suitable for further conversion to alternative uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality site and buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good quality setting surrounded by residential uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High potential given quality of site and setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable access to road network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual carriageway and junction have been improved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?

Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Permission on part of site for residential development

2009 Update:

Several minor permissions relating to current use of site. Previous permission for housing on part of site now lapsed

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes  Suitable for financial and business growth sectors given quality of site. Site suitable for continued research and development uses

2009 Update:

No change

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Financial and business sector identified for growth

Research and development should continue to grow too

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: High quality site attractive to market

No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

2009 Update:

No change

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE score site 2

2009 Update:

No change

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No change

2009 Update:

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

2009 Update:

No, however landscaping within the site could support biodiversity interest

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

No change

2009 Update:

2 1
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Reasonably sustainable site

2009 Update: Predominantly brownfield although part of site is green field

No change

2

2

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

No change

3

3

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

2009 Update:

No change

3

3

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

No change

2

2

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Reasonable but not high scoring in strategic terms

2009 Update:

Within Rotherham urban area

2

3

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Potentially suitable for housing - already permission on part of site

2009 Update:

Residential permission lapsed. Whole site could be suitable for housing if redeveloped however site performs a valuable research and development role

2

3

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score: Reasonable site which scores well in market attractiveness terms

2009 Update:

Attractive site in a strategically important area, performing a valuable research and development role

2

3

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
### Site Name: RCAT Howard Building, Howard Street, Rotherham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Potentially high given town centre location</td>
<td>Potentially high given town centre location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Reasonable access given town centre location</td>
<td>Reasonable access given town centre location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:**
- "Within town centre boundary and conservation area"
- Premises could be converted.
- "Within the town centre environment"
- "Potentially high given town centre location"
- "Reasonable access given town centre location"
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability?  
No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?  
No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?  
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?  
Site being retained by college

Overall market attractiveness score:  
Reasoning:

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?  
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?  
PTE score site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?  
Within Rotherham town centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?  
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  
No

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
No

2009 Update:
Yes

Original Score | 2009 SCORE
---|---
1 | 1
3 | 3
3 | 3
Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

**Overall strategic planning score:**
Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**
Reasons for overall score:

**Recommendation:** *Retain current non-employment allocation*
**Site Reference:** 151  **Date of Assessment:**  
**Current users:**  **2009 Assessment Date:** 14/12/2009  **Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

**Site Name:** RCAT Campus, Rotherham town centre

**Market Attractiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>No - site being retained by college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Site would have high potential given town centre location</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:**

- Allocated for community use
- Could potentially be converted however redevelopment likely to be more attractive
- Town centre setting therefore little landscaping
- Town centre environment
- No
- Reasonable access given town centre location

**2009 Update:**

- Could potentially be converted however redevelopment likely to be more attractive
- Town centre setting therefore little landscaping
- Town centre environment
- No
- Reasonable access given town centre location

**Original Score**

- 2
- 2
- 2
- 2
- No
- No
- No - site being retained by college
- Site would have high potential given town centre location
- Reasonable access given town centre location

**2009 Score**

- 2
- 2
- 2
- 2
- No
- No
- No - site being retained by college
- Site would have high potential given town centre location
- Reasonable access given town centre location
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal? No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Overall market attractiveness score: Reasoning: 2009 Update:

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses? No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce? No

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site? PTE score site 3

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself? No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment? PTE score site 3

Planning permission granted for redevelopment of campus for RCAT; plans being scaled back due to funding

Yes - office accommodation if site came forward

Site being retained by college

Good location however being retained by the college

2009 Update: Yes

2009 Update: 1

2009 Update: 1

2009 Update: 2

2009 Update: No

2009 Update: No

2009 Update: 3

2009 Update: 3

2009 Update: 2
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**Reasoning:**

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

No

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:**

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:**

**Recommendation:**  
Retain current non-employment allocation

---

**2009 Update:**

Yes

**2009 Update:**

**Highly sustainable location**

**2009 Update:**

Close to residential areas

**2009 Update:**

HMR Pathfinder, LAA Priority Area, RSS sub regional town, Rotherham Renaissance

**2009 Update:**

Within Rotherham urban area

**2009 Update:**

Good location within a strategically important area

**2009 Update:**

2009 Update:

**2009 Update:**

Good, sustainable location however site being retained by RCAT
Site Name: Forge Island, Rotherham Town Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Rotherham town centre. Within floodzone 2 and car park within zone 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket unlikely to be suitable for conversion for other employment uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor site environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good surroundings including the river and canal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High potential given setting and town centre location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good access given town centre location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning:

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:
Redevelopment likely to require some funding

Several minor permissions. Application to replace existing store remains undetermined

No, although site could support office uses given town centre location

Tesco previously indicated a desire for a larger store

Attractive location within Rotherham town centre

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning:

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE score site 3

Within town centre

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
No

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**Reasoning:**

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  
No

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  
No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:**

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:**

**Recommendation:**  *Retain current non-employment allocation*
## Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocated for community use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing office building; could be re-used although likely to require investment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town centre setting, no landscaping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Town centre environment adjacent to Centenary Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - civic buildings at Walker Place once site available and if road infrastructure altered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High potential given town centre location and access to Centenary Way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonably good given town centre location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability difficulty?

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Premises in process of being vacated, following which demolition will take place

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

**Reasoning:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
<td>PTE acores site 3. Site adjacent to bus station</td>
<td>Site on edge of Rotherham town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
<td>Site on edge of Rotherham town centre</td>
<td>Site on edge of Rotherham town centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

*Crinoline House currently being vacated, following which demolition will begin*

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:

Recommendation:  *Retain current non-employment allocation*
Site Name: RMBC Civic Buildings, Walker Place, Rotherham (inc. former ELR site 35)

Market Attractiveness

Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?

2009 Update: Community allocation greenspace and B1 office allocation (E68)

Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?

2009 Update: Existing office and community use buildings could be re-used however would require investment

Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?

2009 Update: Reasonable setting in town centre environment

Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?

2009 Update: Reasonable surroundings including green space, housing and Centenary Way

Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?

No

2009 Update: Yes - Crinoline House site once cleared and if the road infrastructure is altered

Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?

No

2009 Update: No

Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?

2009 Update: High potential given location in relation to road network and town centre

Original Score 2009 SCORE
2 2
3 2
2 2
3 3
0 0
3 3
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

2009 Update:

Reasonable access given town centre location

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

None

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

No, although refurbishment likely to require funding

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Sustainable Development

Q.2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q.2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE score site 3

Q.2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Adjacent to Rotherham town centre

Q.2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No - redevelopment may involve some loss of green space however likely to be limited biodiversity interest

2009 Update:

No - redevelopment may involve some loss of green space however likely to be limited biodiversity interest
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: 2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

2009 Update: Yes, although a small part is green field

Overall sustainable development score:

2009 Update: 3

Reasoning:

Highly sustainable location

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: 3

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

2009 Update: HMR Pathfinder, RSS Sub regional town, Rotherham Renaissance, LAA priority area

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update: Within Rotherham urban area

Overall strategic planning score:

2009 Update: 3

Reasoning:

High scoring strategic location

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

RMBC vacating buildings once new civic offices are occupied. Buildings will be demolished

2009 Update: 

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update: 

Overall assessment score

2009 Update: 3

Reasons for overall score:

Large, sustainable edge-of-centre location

Recommendation: Re-allocate to non-employment allocation
Employment Land Review 2009

Bailey House

Rotherham MBC

Site Ref No: ELR157_LDF0028
Site Area: 0.65 ha

Bailey House
(Council Offices)

0.65 ha

Site boundary

Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD

Rotherham Community Health Centre

Greasebrough Road

Centenary Way

Drummond Street

Employment Land Review 2009

RMBC Licence 100019587

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
(C) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright.
**Site Reference:** 157  **Date of Assessment:** 2009  **Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

**Current users:**  **2009 Assessment Date:** 14/12/2009  **2009 Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

**Site Name:** RMBC Bailey House, Rawmarsh Road, Rotherham

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community use allocation, within flood zone 2 and partly in zone 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonable landscaping and environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial surroundings, although new walk in medical centre has improved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>quality to rear of Bailey House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning:

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

2009 Update:

Yes

2009 Update:

Yes - office accommodation

2009 Update:

RMBC intend to vacate as part of office relocation, however building could still be retained for RMBC use

2009 Update:

Reasonably attractive location

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

Original Score

2009 SCORE

3

3

3

2
Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning:

2009 Update:

Highly sustainable location close to the bus and train stations

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update:

RSS sub regional town, HMR Pathfinder

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMR?

No

2009 Update:

Within Rotherham urban area

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update:

Site to be vacated as part of civic office relocation, however likely to remain in RMBC use

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning:

2009 Update:

Within Rotherham urban area and close to the town centre

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

2009 Update:

Site to be vacated as part of civic office relocation, however likely to remain in RMBC use

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:

Within Rotherham urban area

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:

2009 Update:

Well located site in a strategically important location

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
### Site Reference: 25 UDP Reference: E51  
**Site Name:** Swinton Meadows 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood risk. Near to sewage works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mainly industrial setting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>High potential, but owned by Morphy Richards who are unlikely to release land</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Reasonable access to main road network</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>No major constraints to development</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Expansion land for Morphy Richards</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?  
No

Overall market attractiveness score: 2  
Reasoning: Reasonable site but ownership and other constraints limit market potential

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?  
Yes  Potential for rail access

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?  
Well served by bus, rail and foot. SYPT scores good for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?  

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?  
No  No - although site currently scrubland and development may result in some loss of habitat

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes  Site reclaimed specifically for development

Overall sustainable development score: 2  
Reasoning: Distance from local services reduces score

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change
Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes  Within Pathfinder and Objective 1 P5 areas

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:  Site serves Swinton and Mexborough

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Only site left on this estate - presume ownership is reason for non-development

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
None

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:
Reasonable site, only plot left within this estate, ownership appears main constraint

Recommendation:  Retain current employment allocation

2009 Update:
Within Pathfinder area

2009 Update:
Serves a potential principal settlement

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
Reasonable site, only plot left within this estate, ownership is the main constraint to the site coming forward
Site Name: Canning Glass, Swinton

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Landfill gas consultation zone (includes the Hattersley building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Generally poor quality building, although only small part of overall site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very poor environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Generally poor surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium potential given site and context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Accessible only through residential areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:**
- Hattersley building is Listed
- Listed building is in reasonable condition; units currently in use or suitable for employment use
- Poor environment other than the listed building
- No change
- No change
- No change
- No change
- No change
- Accessed from Marriott Road
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

   Yes

2009 Update:

   No, although likely to require funding to improve the quality of development and ensure maintenance of the listed building.

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

   Some recent planning permissions

2009 Update:

   Recent permissions include RB2005/1528 - extension; RB2006/2360 - replacement roof on listed building; RB2009/0973 - single storey office building.

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

   No

2009 Update:

   No change

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

   Mix of current users

2009 Update:

   No change

Overall market attractiveness score:

   Reasoning: Reasonably attractive site

2009 Update:

   No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

   Yes   Adjacent to rail line

2009 Update:

   Adjacent to railway line however unlikely to be able to secure access

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

   SYPTE scores site 3. Absence of cycle lanes, train station nearby but not close

2009 Update:

   PTE scores site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update:

   No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

   No

2009 Update:

   No change
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: 2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

2009 Update: 2

Reasoning: Moderately sustainable site, although railway line represents a physical barrier

Moderately sustainable site

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: 2

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes Objective 1, HMR Pathfinder

2009 Update: HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update: Serves a potential principal settlement

Overall strategic planning score:

2009 Update: 3

Reasoning: Good site suitable to meet local needs

No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Not really suitable for alternative uses

2009 Update: No change

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update: No change

Overall assessment score

2009 Update: 2

Reasons for overall score: Reasonable score overall

No change

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
Former Canning Town Glass (UGC) site, Swinton Bridge

Employment Land Review 2009

Site Ref No: LDF0389 - ELR112

Site Area: 3.74 ha

Site boundary

LDF boundary

Site Area: 2.36 ha

ELR112/LDF0389

Site Ref No: LDF0389 - ELR112

Site Area: 3.74 ha

Site boundary

LDF boundary

Site Area: 2.36 ha

ELR112/LDF0389

Site Ref No: LDF0389 - ELR112

Site Area: 3.74 ha

Site boundary

LDF boundary

Site Area: 2.36 ha

ELR112/LDF0389
Site Reference: Bridge Street B1 site, Swinton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landfill gas consultation zone, water protection zone, multiple uses/ownerships</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use? | 2009 Update: | No change | 1 | 1 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Various buildings of differing quality, limited potential for employment use | | | |

| Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)? | 2009 Update: | Reasonably good layout and environment. The site is predominantly main road premises with some poor quality frontages. Also a number of small side roads | 2 | 1 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reasonably good layout and environment | | | |

| Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers? | 2009 Update: | Reasonable surroundings but not outstanding | 2 | 2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reasonable surroundings but not outstanding | | | |

| Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site? | 2009 Update: | Yes - may be some opportunities north of Bridge Street and South of Rowms Lane | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | | | |

| Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use? | 2009 Update: | No change | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | | | |

| Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential? | 2009 Update: | Reasonable potential taking account of constraints plus main road location | 1 | 2 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Low potential given constraints | | | |
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

accessible only through residential area

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No Redevelopment likely to require public funding

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Some minor permissions

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Mix of uses likely to have varying future prospects

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Constrained by linear nature and mix of ownerships and uses

Sustainable Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTPE scores site 3. No cycle lanes but fairly close to train station

PTE score site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No No

2009 Update:
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:

Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Moderately sustainable site

2009 Update:

Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Moderately sustainable site

2009 Update:

No change

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update:

Yes

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

2009 Update:

Yes Objective 1, HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update:

Serves a potential principal settlement

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: High scoring strategic site

2009 Update:

Reasonable location to serve local communities

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Potential for mixed use allocation given current situation

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Small section of open space adjacent to Dunn St

2009 Update:

No change

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score: Fairly good site although scores low for market attractiveness

2009 Update:

Fairly good site serving local communities

Recommendation: Re-allocate to non-employment allocation
### Site Reference: 113  Date of Assessment: 12/06/2006  Officer: Noel Bell

### Current users: 2009 Assessment Date: 14/12/2009

**Site Name:** Plot 16, Swinton

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</th>
<th><strong>Access major constraint, landfill gas, small site size</strong></th>
<th><strong>2009 Update:</strong> Trees also present on site</th>
<th><strong>Original Score</strong></th>
<th><strong>2009 Score</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td><strong>Poor quality of surrounding uses and environment</strong></td>
<td><strong>General industrial setting</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td><strong>No Only really suitable as expansion land for adjoining businesses</strong></td>
<td><strong>No change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site is being marketed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td><strong>Low given access constraints (for non-expansion development)</strong></td>
<td><strong>RIDO indicate medium marketing potential</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td><strong>Access via residential area</strong></td>
<td><strong>Site access from main road</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Very unattractive for market, except as expansion land

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses? Yes

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
SYTPE scores 3, but no cycle lanes and fairly close to rail station

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
Yes Existing grassland - potential for biodiversity enhancement
Potential biodiversity interest may limit development given lagoon to the north

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No
Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Generally low scoring in sustainability terms

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes Objective 1, HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Unsuitable for alternative uses - most appropriate for expansion of adjacent businesses

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Generally poor, small site only suitable for expansion of existing adjoining sites

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
### Site Name: Plot 20, Swinton

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill gas consultation zone, water protection zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A although some storage containers on site</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Generally poor surrounding environment</td>
<td>Generally poor surroundings, although canal and new housing opposite the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Access through residential area plus narrow bridge over canal</td>
<td>Close to main road, site has two accesses: from Bridge Street and from Whitelee Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability problem?
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Moderate site given its location

2009 Update:

2

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
Yes Some canal potential

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
SYPTPE scores 3, Close to train station, but no cycle lanes

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No Potentially some native species on site, potential for positive impact through mitigation

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:

Reasonable site given its location

2

Access to the canal is not possible

PTE scores site 3

No change

No biodiversity interest now as site is in use

2009 Update:
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Generally a good sustainable site

[2] 2

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

[3] 3

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes Objective 1, HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

[3] 3

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Well placed site to meet strategic needs

[3] 2

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Potential for housing development providing sufficient landscaping and location adjacent to canal

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

[2] 2

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Reasonable site well placed to meet strategic needs

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
**Site Reference:** 115  
**Date of Assessment:** 12/06/2006  
**Officer:** Noel Bell

**Current users:**  
**2009 Assessment Date:** 02/12/2009  
**2009 Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

**Site Name:** Plot 24, Swinton

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill gas consultation zone, water protection zone, access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small office and storage building - modern and could be converted for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative employment use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally poor environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Adjoining car park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium potential given site location and context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access through residential area plus narrow bridge over canal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Attractiveness Score 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Original Score:** 3  
**2009 Score:** 3

**2009 Update:** No change

**2009 Update:** Car park is well lit and appears well used

**2009 Update:** Yes - RIDO indicate site being marketed

**2009 Update:** PTE score site 2

**2009 Update:** Access through residential area plus narrow bridge over canal. Close to main road and accessed via Whitelee Road

**2009 Update:** Not applicable - building referred to above is not within this site

**2009 Update:** Standard industrial setting

**2009 Update:** Access through residential area plus narrow bridge over canal. Close to main road and accessed via Whitelee Road
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2 storey office and storage building on site, plus permission for 2 industrial buildings

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Moderately attractive site for the market

Attractive site for the market

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTPE scores 3, but no cycle lanes, train station relatively close by

PTE scores site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes Appears to be amenity grassland - potential for biodiversity enhancement

No change

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2 2

2009 Update:

No change

None 3 1

No change

No change

No change

2 2

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

No change

PTE scores site 3

No change

1 1

2 2
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Generally poor greenfield site in sustainable terms

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes Objective 1, HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Scores highly in strategic terms

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Little potential for alternative uses

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Reasonable site overall

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation

2009 Update:

Score

Reasoning:

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasonable greenfield site in sustainability terms

Strategic Planning

Overall strategic planning score:
Serves a potential principal settlement

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Reasonable site overall

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
**Site Name:** Croda, Kilnhurst

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>Landfill gas consultation zone, water protection zone, heavy contamination, access</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Residential development, railway line, reasonable surroundings - nice views to east</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No No</td>
<td>2009 Update: Yes - interest shown from adjacent Redirack site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No No</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Low given contamination constraints</td>
<td>2009 Update: Low given contamination and access constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Access via narrow road and through residential area</td>
<td>2009 Update: Access via narrow road, under bridge and through residential area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability No Not for employment. Viable for other uses (such as housing)

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal? No No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

No change

Reasoning: Large site however contamination issues and generally poor access limit attractiveness

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses? Yes Potential for both canal and rail access although railway higher then site

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce? SYPTE score site 3, but no cycle lanes and also access to train station limited by railway line PTE score site 3 2 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site? No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself? Yes Some loss of natural habitats likely to enable remediation, potential for positive impact if sufficient mitigation can be agreed

2009 Update: No change

Outline applications for remediation of site and for residential development remain undetermined

No change

No change

No change

2009 Update:

No change

1

1

Potential for canal access only

2009 Update:

As above, however for much of site little biodiversity evident. Site or buffer is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: 2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes. Brownfield but significant areas may have returned to greenfield over time

2009 Update: Brownfield

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Reasonably sustainable site with potential rail and canal access

No change

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Parts of site close to residential areas, however railway acts as significant barrier

2009 Update: 2

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes. Objective 1, HMR Pathfinder

2009 Update: HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Serves a potential principal settlement

3 2

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Well located site to meet strategic needs of the area

No change

3 2

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Housing may be acceptable as part of comprehensive development - potentially suitable for mixed use as well

Unlikely to be suitable for substantial employment development given access constraints.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Dog walking

No change

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score: Reasonable site however contamination and access issues significantly limit market interest in the site

2009 Update: Reasonable location for alternative development however contamination, location in respect of the strategic highway network and access issues significantly limit market interest in and viability of the

2 1
Recommendation: Re-allocate to non-employment allocation
### Site Name: Swinton Interchange B1 site

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Landfill gas consultation zone, water protection zone, overhead powerlines, railway station on site, linear shape, access constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Railway station only building on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasonable around rail station but poor at coach storage end, natural environment between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjacent to railway line and residential, low quality environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of site difficult to access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:**
- As above, plus the remaining undeveloped land is inaccessible other than from existing users at either end of the site
- Coach storage now replaced by caravan storage which has buildings of a reasonable quality
- Although adjacent to railway line overall the surrounding landscape is of reasonable quality
- Reasonable potential given site context
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.  

**Access through residential areas**  
No change 1 1

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?  

Yes Some development taken place already  

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?  

Permission for caravan storage  
Caravan storage permission implemented 2 3

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?  

No  

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?  

Continued demand for train station but likely to be limited future prospects for other current uses on site  
Continued demand for train station but likely to be limited future prospects for other current uses on site 2 2

**Overall market attractiveness score:**  
Reasoning: Poor market attractiveness given location and access  

Reasonable location although remaining land inaccessible 1 2

**Sustainable Development**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
<td>Yes rail potential</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjacent to railway line but site unlikely to be accessible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
<td>SYPTE scores 3. Adjacent to railway station.</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PTE scores site 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
<td>Yes Mature trees on site, middle section of site is natural grassland</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  

2009 Update: 2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes Predominantly brownfield although middle section is greenfield  

2009 Update: No change

Overall sustainable development score: 2

Reasoning: Reasonably good sustainable site although part greenfield and some biodiversity impact  

2009 Update: No change

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  

2009 Update: No change

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  
Yes Objective 1, HMRP Pathfinder  

2009 Update: HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  

2009 Update: Serves a potential principal settlement

Overall strategic planning score: 3

Reasoning: Good strategic site  

2009 Update: No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Possibly residential (although note recent withdrawn application and proximity to railway line), potential for southern section to return to greenspace

2009 Update: As existing uses likely to continue it seems unlikely that the remaining land will be developable unless as extensions. Consideration could be given to re-allocating the remaining undeveloped land as urban greenspace

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?  

2009 Update: 

Overall assessment score 1

Reasons for overall score: Whilst it scores high in strategic terms it has low market  

2009 Update: Reasonable location however remaining land only accessible as extension to
attractiveness. Generally a poor site with access constraints

Recommendation: Re-allocate to non-employment allocation
**Market Attractiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill gas consultation zone, water protection zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable quality, in use and could be re-used in future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable site, adjacent to Canal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable surroundings, canal and railway line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Croda site to north</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium potential given existing use and site context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only accessible through residential areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site Name:** Redirack site, south of Croda, Swinton
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability constraints to development?
Yes  
No excessive constraints to development

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
Recent developments

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes  Redirack may be specialist manufacturing and recycling is a growth sector

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Reasonable prospects for future

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Generally high scoring site but overall a moderately attractive site

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
Yes  rail and canal freight potential

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
SYPTPE scores site 2 but some distance from train station and no cycle lanes

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update:
Re-use may be viable however redevelopment of the site is likely to require remediation and could require funding

2009 Update:
RB2004/2421 - replacement of firedamaged building - implemented
RB2009/1252 - car park for recycling company - granted permission

2009 Update:
Reasonable prospects - recycling is a significant economic sector, supported by the recent grant of permission for a car park in conjunction with the operation here

2009 Update:

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Original Score 2009 SCORE
Yes  
No change

Q2.2 Original Score 2009 SCORE
SYPTPE scores site 2 but some distance from train station and no cycle lanes

Q2.3 Original Score 2009 SCORE
No change

2009 Update:
A moderately attractive site

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

2 2

Reasoning: Moderately sustainable site

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

3

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes  Objective 1, HMRP Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Serves a potential principal settlement

Overall strategic planning score:

3 2

Reasoning: Good site to meet local strategic needs

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Access issues may constrain opportunities for housing development

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score

Well placed to meet strategic needs but overall a moderate

Reasons for overall score

2 2

2009 Update:

No change

Original Score 2009 SCORE

No change

No change

No change

HMR Pathfinder

No change

No change

No change

Access issues may constrain opportunities for housing development

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
**Site Name:** North and South of Hooton Road, Kilnhurst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of this site? Landfill gas consultation zone, water protection zone, multiple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ownerships, possible access restrictions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor quality of environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive setting, good views, adjacent to river and canal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with this site? Yes But scheduled washland and greenbelt limits potential for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development No scheduled washland and greenbelt limits potential for development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential? Low potential given existing uses and constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDO indicate medium marketing potential - reflects fact that site almost fully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks. Poor access to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>main road network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

Yes  Development would be viable - comprehensive redevelopment might require subsidy

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update: Comprehensive redevelopment of the site would require funding assistance

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Generally limited prospects for most businesses

Overall market attractiveness score: 1
Reasoning: Low market attractiveness

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

Yes  Canal potential, existing rail sidings

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTSE score 2

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Active area, almost fully occupied; reasonable prospects for future

Overall market attractiveness score: 1
Reasoning: Low market attractiveness

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

Yes  Canal potential, existing rail sidings

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTSE score 2

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Site or buffer is adjacent to Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat

Overall market attractiveness score: 1
Reasoning: Low market attractiveness

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

Yes  Canal potential, existing rail sidings

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTSE score 2

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Reasonably sustainable site

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Yes

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes Objective 1, HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Meets strategic needs

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
May be suitable for housing in comprehensive development, canal and railway line act as reasonable barriers to existing settlement

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Well placed to meet strategic needs although scores very low in market attractiveness terms

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill gas consultation zone, water protection zone, existing businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also flood zone 3 along southern boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable quality buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately suitable landscaping but not outstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Environment not particularly attractive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable surroundings - open space, residential and business park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes BUT very limited opportunities in reality</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium potential given location and context</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access through residential areas and poor access to main road network</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
Permission for car park on part of site

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes Some high technology businesses on site at present

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Some businesses within successful and growth sectors
Reasoning: Moderately attractive site

Overall market attractiveness score: 2

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
Yes Rail potential and canal potential (although across the road from site)

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
SYPT scores site 2. No cycle lanes, distant from train station

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:
Re-use may be viable, however redevelopment may require funding to assist site clearance

Car park developed. Permission granted for MOT centre. 2 3

No evidence of high technology businesses

Reasonable prospects 3 2

No change 2 2

Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future development to include buffer habitat 2 1

Original 2009 Score SCORE
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: *Fairly sustainable site*

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: *Meets local needs*

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: *Reasonable site overall but score does not reflect strength of existing high tech occupiers.*

Recommendation: *Retain current employment allocation*
Site Ref No: LD0540-ELR127

Site Area: 7.57 ha

Employment Land Review 2009

Swinton Bridge

Queen Street East

Rotherham MBC

Envi & Dev Services
Rotherham South
Rotherham S60 1TD

(R) Crown Copyright, Un(authorised reproduction prohibited. Crown Licence 00001587)
Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?  

2009 Update:  
Disused rail line to north has been backfilled and its stability is unknown. Currently greenbelt. Recreation land and bungalow with associated open storage  

Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?  

2009 Update:  
N/A  

Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?  

2009 Update:  
N/A  

Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?  

2009 Update:  
Greenbelt land between two active rail lines and roads  

Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?  

2009 Update:  
No  

Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?  

2009 Update:  
No  

Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?  

2009 Update:  
Accessed from Swinton Bridge industrial estate, although separated by rail line. Not necessarily perceived as an extension to existing industrial premises  

Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.  

2009 Update:  
Access to local communities, but access to strategic
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE scores site 2. Site is 880m from train station, with public transport services running along Bridge street and Rowms Lane

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:

road network is more limited

No - likely to require long access road

2009 Update:

None

2009 Update:

No activity

2009 Update:

N/A

2009 Update:

Poor scoring site

2009 Update:

Yes - adjacent to 2 rail lines to Leeds and Doncaster

2009 Update:

Yes - number of mature trees and hedgerows on site

2009 Update:

Over 500m

2009 Update:

1

2009 Update:

1

2009 Update:

2
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
No

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**Reasoning:**

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  
No

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  
No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  
Yes

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:**

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Recommendation:** Retain current non-employment allocation
Site Name: Queen Street (west), Swinton

Market Attractiveness

Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?

2009 Update:
Greenbelt. Disused rail line to north has been backfilled and stability is unknown. Triangular site limits development opportunities

Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?

2009 Update:
N/A

Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?

2009 Update:
N/A

Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?

2009 Update:
Green belt between a road, railway line and Mexborough to the north

Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?

No

Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?

No

Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?

2009 Update:
Access is from Queen Street via the Bow Broom residential area. Remote and located between 2 residential areas
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

Access available to local communities but access to strategic highway network is limited

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability?

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No activity

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

Scores poorly in market attractiveness terms

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

PTE scores 1

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Over 500m

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Number of mature trees, shrubs and valuable hedgerows

2009 Update:

Access available to local communities but access to strategic highway network is limited

Yes - vacant, former allotment gardens

No activity

N/A

Scores poorly in market attractiveness terms

2009 Update:

PTE scores 1

Over 500m

Number of mature trees, shrubs and valuable hedgerows
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: No

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Overall sustainable development score:

No

Reasoning:

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: Close to the edge of the residential area but is physically separated

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update: Serves a potential principal settlement

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

2009 Update: Reasonable site on edge of built settlement

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update: Relatively well related to existing communities of Swinton and Mexborough. Access to strategic highway network is limited. Development could contribute towards coalescence of Mexborough and Swinton

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:

2009 Update: Greenbelt site which although reasonably located has some accessibility issues
Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation
**Site Reference:** 31  **UDP Reference:** E27  **Original Assessment Date:** 09/02/2006  **2009 Update:** 10/11/2009

**Site Name:** Templeborough 13

**Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) =** 2.03  **Land remaining in 2009 =**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of flooding and possibility of site contamination.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Update:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although within flood zone 3 the flood alleviation scheme adjacent to this site is now in place</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?** |                |            |
| **2009 Update:**                                                                  |                |            |
| Adjacent to wetland nature reserve created as part of the flood alleviation scheme | 2              | 3          |

| **Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?** |                |            |
| Yes Site ref 33 (E29) is available and suitable                                    |                |            |
| **2009 Update:**                                                                  |                |            |
| No - E29 no longer accessible                                                      |                |            |

| **Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?**                 |                |            |
| Yes Site Board                                                                     |                |            |
| **2009 Update:**                                                                  |                |            |
| RIDO indicate site not being marketed                                              |                |            |

| **Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?** | | |
| **2009 Update:**                                                                  | | |
| High potential given location, although this site is would not provide road frontage development given development of phase 1 | 3 | 3 |

| **Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?** | | |
| **2009 Update:**                                                                  | | |
| Good access to M1 & M18                                                           | | |

| **Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability** | | |
| **2009 Update:**                                                                  | | |
| No                                                                                | | |

**2009 Update:**

Although within flood zone 3 the flood alleviation scheme adjacent to this site is now in place (2)

Adjacent to wetland nature reserve created as part of the flood alleviation scheme (3)

No - E29 no longer accessible (3)

RIDO indicate site not being marketed (3)

No change (3)

No change (3)
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

2009 Update: Frontage developed. Planning permission for office floorspace on remaining land

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Overall market attractiveness score: 3

Reasoning: Attractive location with planning permission

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTPE scores moderate for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

1

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No Current application - plans submitted include survey and mitigation work including water storage area and native planting etc.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

3

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

2009 Update: No change
Overall sustainable development score: 2
Reasoning:

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
2009 Update: Reasonably sustainable site

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes Objective 1 - Ps.
Creative Digital
Within UP regeneration area

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie

Overall strategic planning score: 2
Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Very good Frontage development potential. Site is subject to PA RB2006/0072 for 6No 2 storey Office Blocks & car parking.- undetermined.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
No

Overall assessment score: 2
Reasons for overall score:
Reasonable site within regeneration area

Recommendation: Retain as employment development site
### Site Reference: 33 UDP Reference: E29  
### Site Name: Temple' Centenary Riverside

**Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 1.38**  
**Land remaining in 2009 =**

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of this site used to create wetland as part of flood alleviation scheme. Remaining land within flood zone 3 however alleviation scheme should enable development. Environment Agency require access strip for maintenance of defences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Flood risk and access to part of site may need consideration due to condition of bridge spanning river Don</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site adjacent to newly created wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole of site offers riverside boundary and part of site offers good frontage development but main site has old industrial environment views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No - E27 frontage now developed with separate access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes adjoining site ref 31 (E27) is suitable and available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>RIDO indicate site is being marketed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evidence of site boards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good access to M1 and M18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. Flood scheme implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes PA RB2005/0026- Flood Alleviation Scheme- granted conditionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

Car Sales & Showroom developments.

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No   Part of site has permission for development as wildlife wetland area within the Templeborough Flood Alleviation Scheme.

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:  Flood alleviation scheme should make the land not to be sacrificed to wetland developable

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No   No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Good bus, walking & cycling links.  SYPTE scores moderate for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Facilities & amenities are beyond 500m but still accessible within a relatively short distance.

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

No

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

2009 Update:

Access to flood alleviation area crosses site (permanent access yet to be constructed)

Remainder of site well suited to future industrial / business uses.

Site in attractive and popular location

PTE score site 3

No change

No change

No change

No change

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Reasonable brownfield site

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

*No change*

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?

*Yes Objective 1 - P5. BPFS*

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie

*No change*

**Overall strategic planning score:**

*Reasoning: Ability to provide jobs for local people limits score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Part of site as potential for good frontage development. Some recamation may be required.
Flood Alleviation Scheme granted conditionally RB 2005/0026.

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

*No*

**Overall assessment score**

*Reasonings for overall score:*

Reasonable site (that part not to be sacrificed to wetland) which could be developable following implementation of the flood alleviation scheme

**Recommendation:** Retain as employment development site

*2009 Update:*

Good employment site subject to resolving the flood alleviation issue with the Environment Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Name: Meadowbank Road

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 5.76

**Market Attractiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of site is on a steep slope overlooking/neighbouring a water treatment site and has landfill, overhead powerline constraints and Motoway buffer zone constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraints remain, with no progress on delivering planning permissions</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst the site is quite elevated it only affords views of the M1 viaduct, old cooling towers and extensive areas of what remains of heavy industry areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Oct 09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Large Development boards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - RIDO indicate site being marketed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Oct 09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable market attractiveness given location, although no progress on developing the site</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>Oct 09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good access to M1 and M18</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>Oct 09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No progress to date - site constraints could require assistance to bring development forward</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

2009 Update:
RB2007/1909 - details of the hotel, pub and D2 building granted permission. Retail permission technically implemented however no progress in bringing site forward

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Overall market attractiveness score:
2

Reasoning: Unattractive location with constraints but very close to transport network.

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No No

2009 Update:
No change

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?
It's steep location makes it less accessible to walkers and cyclists. SYPT scores good for access to public transport.

2009 Update:
No change

PTE scores site 3. This site will benefit from the planned Bus Rapid Transit route. Provided this scheme is completed then in the future the site will be have an attractive public transport option.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
Nothing in the locality

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No No. Some vegetation on site.

2009 Update:
No change

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:
No change

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No No

2009 Update:
Previously developed land - predominantly brownfield

Overall sustainable development score:
2

2009 Update:
No change
Reasoning:

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

*Only a very few (20) residential properties close to site.*

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?

*Yes Objective 1*

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie

**Reasonable site**

2009 Update:

*No change*

**Overall strategic planning score:**

2009 Update:

*HMR Pathfinder*

**Reasoning:**

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

*Part of the site is undevelopable due to its topography and the site has a number of constraints:
  CC2005/0168 Motorway widening buffer : 67m from centreline of motorway.
  CC2005/0169 Motorway widening buffer : 200m from centreline of motorway.
  CC2004/0185 Planning Legal Agreement (Section 106)
  CC1995/0232 PL Landfill Gas Consultation Zone.
  CC2003/0027 PL Overhead Powerlines*

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

*No*

**Overall assessment score**

2009 Update:

*Reasonable scores in strategic terms*

2009 Update:

*No change*

**Reasons for overall score:**

*Reasonable site, however various factors including topography limit site attractiveness*
Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
**Site Name:** Templeborough London Scan

**Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) =** 6.64  

**Land remaining in 2009 =**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this site in the short term?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access problems. Contamination. 2 capped shafts to SW of site, PYLON in SW corner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Gas Consultation zone. Funding issues to be resolved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway / Housing to western boundary. Urban Greenspace - River Rother/Centenary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way to east, London Scandinavian to north (a bit jaded now)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No NO</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential? LOW. Access and contamination problems. Owners unwilling to progress at</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national road network avoiding residential areas? YES - If access can be resolved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to A630 Centenary Way. 2 km to M1 J33</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RSY have agreed to consider funding from M1 SEZ, subject to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribution from London &amp; Scandinavian &amp; RMBC. Paul Woodcock in discussion with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSM. SYRIP now reduced. Alternative SRAO RSY funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Update: 10/11/2009

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: Site could have reasonable potential if constraints could be overcome

2009 Update: Funding likely to be required however in current climate unsure whether any public funding likely to be available
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

NO

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No NO

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

**Reasoning:** Various factors limit market attractiveness

**Sustainable Development**

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

Yes Possibly Rail (adjacent)

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Public footpath number 14 runs along site boundary. 25m to bus stop on Centenary Way. No 13 - 4 per day, No 3 - 1 per hour. Walking distance to Brinsworth - nearest distance 300m. SYPTE scores good for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Brinsworth shopping centre - 1145m, Rotherham Town Centre - 2 km

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

JSA claimant score of 4.68%

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes YES. (but no PP for hard after use)

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**2009 Update:**

No change

No change

Various factors including contamination and access constraints limit market attractiveness

Brinsworth shopping centre - 1145m, Rotherham Town Centre - 2 km

Yes. Appears vegetated & is adjacent to river rother. May be some wildlife issues. Would need survey prior to development

Yes. Appears vegetated & is adjacent to river rother. May be some wildlife issues. Would need survey prior to development

**Overall sustainable development score:**

1 1

3 3

3 2

2 2
**Reasoning:** Reasonable in sustainability terms

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Yes. 200m to nearest residential area (allowing for constraint of railway)

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes Templeborough Regeneration Area. HMRP, Objective 1 - P5.

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie Serves settlements identified as Key growth & Limited growth areas

**Overall strategic planning score:**

Reasoning: Could be well placed to support local communities

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

The site is well placed strategically and for sustainability. Access and contamination issues need to be resolved

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
Footpaths around the edges of the site adjoining the river and railway

**Overall assessment score**

Reasons for overall score:
The site is well placed strategically and for sustainability. Access and contamination issues need to be resolved

**Recommendation:** Re-allocate to non-employment allocation

---

2009 Update:

No change

**2009 Update:**

No longer Objective 1

Within Rotherham urban area

No change

The site is well placed strategically and for sustainability. Access and contamination issues need to be resolved or may prevent redevelopment for any use in the future

No change

**2009 Update:**

The site is well placed strategically and for sustainability. Access and contamination issues would need to be resolved to enable the site to be delivered

---

**Reasonable in sustainability terms, although site is now green field**

**2009 Update:**

No change

**2009 Update:**

Within Rotherham urban area

No change

The site is well placed strategically and for sustainability. Access and contamination issues would need to be resolved to enable the site to be delivered

---

**Reasonable in sustainability terms**
### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>Some limited potential for conversion</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>Reasonable but not outstanding</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Adjoins golf course, residential and electricity sub-station</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site? Yes</td>
<td>Land to south-east of site</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential? Reasonable potential given location</td>
<td>RIDO indicate medium marketing potential</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks. Close to main road network</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
2009 Update:
Several permissions, some implemented including office extension and additional reception area

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Likely to be continued demand for current occupier

Overall market attractiveness score: 2
Reasoning: Reasonably attractive site

2009 Update: No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
2009 Update:
PTE scores site 1. This site will benefit from the planned Bus Rapid Transit route. Provided this scheme is completed then in the future the site will be have an attractive public transport option.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

2009 Update: No change
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  

2009 Update: Yes

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  

2009 Update: Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Reasonably sustainable despite low scoring of some criteria

Scores poorly in sustainability terms

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  

2009 Update: No change

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  

2009 Update: Yes

Yes UDP regeneration area, Objective 1

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  

2009 Update: No change

Within Rotherham urban area

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Reasonably good strategic site

No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Some potential for housing as an alternative use given adjoining uses

This is the largest British Oxygen plant in the UK, a large local employer and owned by Linde. Should the site become available in the future it should be retained for employment use wherever possible, however it could be suitable for housing given adjoining uses.

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score: Reasonable all round site which is in use with no evidence of any

2009 Update: No change
likely change in user

**Recommendation:** Retain current employment allocation
### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Topography and nearby residential could constrain development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of buildings unsuitable for conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally poor site environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable surroundings, particularly given riverside location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium potential having regard to site, context and location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close to main road network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
Current application for residential development on part of site

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Hovis are main occupiers of site - likely continued demand, also potentially part of food and drink growth sector

Overall market attractiveness score: Overall a reasonably attractive site

Reasoning: Overall a reasonably attractive site

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
Hovis are main occupiers however only the distribution element of their operation now remains

PTE score site 3. This site will benefit from the planned Bus Rapid Transit route. Provided this scheme is completed then in the future the site will be have an attractive public transport option.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

2009 Update:
Given topography and Hovis site configuration funding assistance may be required to enable redevelopment

Outline permission (RB2006/0632) for residential on part of site - unimplemented

No change

No change

No change

No change

No change

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

Overall a reasonably attractive site

2009 Update:

No change

2

2

3

2

2

2
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Yes

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Generally sustainable site

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Yes

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes HMR Pathfinder, Objective 1

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Yes

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: High scoring strategic site

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Potential for various alternative uses including housing

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Employment use should be retained wherever possible. Job Lot provides valuable local convenience shopping provision. Potential for various alternative uses including housing

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Reasonable site overall which scores particularly well in strategic terms

2009 Update: Sustainable site which scores well in strategic terms
Recommendation: *Retain current employment allocation*
Site Reference: 80  Date of Assessment: 22/06/2006  Officer: Allan Houtby
Current users: 2009  Assessment Date: 11/11/2009  2009 Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh
Site Name: Land adjacent to Magna, Templeborough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>Land around has been developed; land remaining is ready for development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential contamination issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>Buildings unlikely to be suitable for conversion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A - site reclaimed and partly developed. New buildings are high quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>Generally poor site environments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generally good quality environment following adjacent redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Generally poor - particularly on opposite side of Sheffield Road, although to rear there is the landscaping undertaken as part of Magna development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generally poor on opposite side of Sheffield Road, however new development raises surrounding quality along with landscaping undertaken as part of the Magna development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Yes  Existing landscaped areas could be developed comprehensively</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Good location reasonably close to motorway</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Update:
- Land around has been developed; land remaining is ready for development.
- Buildings unlikely to be suitable for conversion.
- Generally poor site environments.
- Generally good quality environment following adjacent redevelopment.
- Generally poor - particularly on opposite side of Sheffield Road, although to rear there is the landscaping undertaken as part of Magna development.
- Yes  Existing landscaped areas could be developed comprehensively.
- Yes
- Good location reasonably close to motorway

2009 Update:
- N/A - site reclaimed and partly developed. New buildings are high quality.
- Generally poor on opposite side of Sheffield Road, however new development raises surrounding quality along with landscaping undertaken as part of the Magna development.
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

On main road and close to motorway

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Magna centre development, current application for employment development of adjoining land

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes Likely to meet growth of business and professional growth sector in particular - current application for business park development

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Generally good in market attractiveness terms

2009 Update:

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Reasonable accessibility by range of means of transport

PTE score site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

2009 Update:

Original Score 2009 Score

3 3

No change

No change

Adjacent land now developed - remaining land is ready for development

No change

No change as remaining land is still vacant

Good site in market attractiveness terms

2 3

No change

No change

PTE score site 3

2 3

No change

No change
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  

2009 Update: 3

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:  
Reasoning: Reasonably sustainable site although limited access to local services  

2009 Update: No change

Overall strategic planning score:  
Reasoning: Good strategic site scores well overall  

2009 Update: No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:  
Limited potential for alternative uses given adjoining uses  
Limited pedestrian access from Masbrough to the north

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score  
Reasons for overall score: Good employment site despite sustainability and some market attractiveness not scoring very highly  

2009 Update: Good employment site in strategic corridor between Sheffield and Rotherham  

2009 Update: No change
Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site
### Site Reference: 139  Date of Assessment: 10/11/2009  Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

### Current users: 2009 Assessment Date: 10/11/2009  Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

### Site Name: Land at Bawtry Road, Brinsworth

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Currently greenspace, topography, adjacent to British Oxygen which may limit potential uses, gas pipe runs along boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjacent to British Oxygen, residential areas and golf course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Good access to motorway but adjoining residential areas which may limit attractiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Close to M1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal? No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses? No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce? No

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site? N/A

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself? No

2009 Update:
Topography may require funding to enable development

2009 Update:
No, although RB2005/0377 storage of hazardous substances covers this site (likely to be due to adjacent gas pipe)

2009 Update: No

2009 Update: N/A

2009 Update:
No

2009 Update: PTE scores site 1. This site will benefit from the planned Bus Rapid Transit route. Provided this scheme is completed then in the future the site will be have an attractive public transport option.

2009 Update:
More than 500m

2009 Update: Yes - could be some impact on biodiversity
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  

2009 Update:  
No

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  

2009 Update:  
No - green field

Overall sustainable development score:  

Reasoning:  
Scores poorly across all criteria

Strategic Planning  

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  

2009 Update:  
Adjoins residential area

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  

2009 Update:  
No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  

2009 Update:  
Within Rotherham urban area

Overall strategic planning score:  

Reasoning:  
High scoring site within Rotherham urban area

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score  

Reasons for overall score:  
Reasonable site within the urban area

Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation
**Site Reference:** 146  **Date of Assessment:** 2009  **Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

**Current users:** 2009 Assessment Date: 09/11/2009  **Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

**Site Name:** Land north and south of M1 junction 33

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Access problems, topography, adjoins M1 and the Parkway, small area of site within flood zone 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor surroundings - motorway, parkway, pylons and electricity switching station. Topography limits wider views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: No, however site has planning permission for hotel and petrol filling station uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update: High score due to location on the road network. Likely to be attractive if barriers to development can be overcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Update: No, however site has planning permission for hotel and petrol filling station uses.
**Q1.8** Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

2009 Update:

Access to site is difficult, however scored 3 due to proximity to M1

**Q1.9** Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

**Q1.10** Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update:

Permissions granted for hotels and petrol filling station along with access road

**Q1.11** Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

**Q1.12** What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

2009 Update:

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

**Sustainable Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
<td>Over 500m</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Update:

PTE score site 1. Site relatively inaccessible by sustainable transport means

Reasoning:

Some criteria score highly however significant barriers to development remain

2009 Update:

Access to site is difficult, however scored 3 due to proximity to M1

Yes, although site constraints could limit developability

Permissions granted for hotels and petrol filling station along with access road

No - site unlikely to be viable / suitable for other employment uses

N/A

Over 500m
Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Not suitable for alternative uses. Could consider potential for inclusion as urban greenspace if planning permission is not implemented

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:
Potential for visual impact of any higher rise development

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
No - site not used recently and appears to be greenfield

2009 Update:
Poor site in sustainability terms

2009 Update:
Although reasonably near to housing no direct sustainable access to the site

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
Given barriers of M1 and the Parkway and the rail link, this site is effectively 'cut off' from existing communities

2009 Update:
Inaccessible to local communities

2009 Update:
Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:

2009 Update:
Although reasonably market attractive the site is inaccessible to communities

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
Site Name: Former Exel Logistics Site, Grange Lane, Brinsworth

Market Attractiveness

Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?
Original Score: 3
2009 Update: Electricity lines over part of site

Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?
2009 Update: Yes - permission for change of use to light industrial demonstrates convertibility

Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?
2009 Update: High quality environment

Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?
2009 Update: Good quality surroundings including golf course

Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?
No

Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?
No

Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?

No

Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.
2009 Update: Reasonable access
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability? 
No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)? 

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal? 
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)? 

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning:

Sustainable Development
Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses? 
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce? 

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site? 

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself? 
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment? 

2009 Update:
Yes - however if site needs to be reconfigured then assistance may be required

RB2007/1917 - change of use to light industrial use with ancillary B8 storage and distribution 

Yes - logistics site, however permission for change of use reflects ability of site to meet these needs as well 

N/A - currently vacant 

Generally well located site for access to national road network 

2009 Update:
2009 Update:

Original Score 2009 SCORE
PTE score site 1 1
More than 500m 1

No

No

No
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**Reasoning:**

2009 Update: Yes

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**Reasoning:**

2009 Update: Generally low scores, however this is a large brownfield site in a reasonable location

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

No

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:**

2009 Update: Close to housing but somewhat inaccessible

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:**

2009 Update: Site let down by poor pedestrian accessibility of site

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:**

2009 Update: Large brownfield site in a strategically important area

**Recommendation:** Retain current employment allocation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Site has some issues of access and topography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: One poor quality building on site, unsuitable for conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Railway tracks within embankments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Reasonable surroundings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Potentially high given location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update: Close to the Parkway and M1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

A number of issues limit market attractiveness

2

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Yes

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

More than 500m

1

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

No

2009 Update:

Yes, although contamination may be an issue

No

2009 Update:

N/A

2009 Update:

N/A

2009 Update:

Yes

2009 Update:

PTE scores site 1. This site will benefit from the planned Bus Rapid Transit route. Provided this scheme is completed then in the future the site will be have an attractive public transport option.

1

2009 Update:

More than 500m

1

2009 Update:

No

1
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: 2009 Update:
Limited accessibility however good rail access potential

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
2009 Update:

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?
2009 Update:

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: 2009 Update:
Not well placed to serve local communities

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Adjacent to Sheffield business park

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: 2009 Update:
Reasonable site in market attractiveness and sustainability terms, close to Sheffield business park and adjacent to rail freight distribution point

Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site

**Site Name:** Waleswood East Plot 8

**Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 2.86**  
**Land remaining in 2009 =**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Also drain and trees on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of Luk Uk's expansion land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Green Belt and Industrial - Luk UK Ltd modern factory in well tended grounds, and Vector 31 East recent prestige development. Some unsightly storage/ training facility on northern part of site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No NO</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No NO</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Low - committed by Luk UK Ltd for expansion land</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td>RIDO indicate site has high marketing potential if it was to come forward</td>
<td>1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>Adjacent to Mansfield Road to A57. 2.7km to M1 J31</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?
No. Only small extensions to Luk UK Ltd. Remainder of site developed

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:  Good location, attractive surroundings

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No NO

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?
Public footpath 12 runs to south of site. Bus stops close by on Mansfield Road (350m) Services Sheffield to Rotherham 21 (1/hr), 206/216 (1/hr), Dinnington to Sheffield 261 (1/hr), Dinnington to Rotherham 23AB (1/hr). SYPTPE scores moderate for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
Kiveton Park - 1.7km, Swallownest - 2.4km

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No NO. Adjacent to green belt, separated by tributary of Pigeon Bridge Brook (?) plus drain bisects the site. Appears vegetated.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
JSA claimant score of 1.63%

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

2009 Update:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Update:

Good location in attractive surroundings, however being retained as expansion land
**Reasoning:** Brownfield site with reasonable access to transport

### Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential areas in Wales within 800m of site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Objective 1 P4B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves settlements identified for growth and limited growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves a potential principal settlement for growth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expands a cluster of industrial activity promoted during the Objective 1 strategic economic zone period</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall strategic planning score:

**Reasoning:** Good location to serve local settlements

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

*Public footpath around perimeter of site*

### Overall assessment score

**Reasons for overall score:**

Apart from restriction of retention for expansion land, the site is well placed to serve local communities and with good communications

**Recommendation:** Retain as employment development site

2009 Update:

Site has limited sustainability credentials and is reserved as expansion land
Site Reference: 21 UDP Reference: E39  
Original Assessment Date: 10/02/2006  
2009 Update: 14/12/2009

Site Name: Waleswood West (Plot 13)

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 8.88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land settlement problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to Green Belt/ Wales Common and Industrial - Luk UK and Greencore Foods. Old Waleswood Colliery Industrial Estate presents an eyesore to the northerly access</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No. Greenbelt</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Vector 31 - Langtree, RiDO (signs?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently low. Potentially high in future once settlement problems are addressed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to Mansfield Road for A57. 2.5km to M1 J31</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Development will need to take into account settlement problems</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land remaining in 2009 = 8.88

2009 Update: Site is still developable but land stability needs to be tested and appropriate foundations may be required. Built development on frontage likely to be possible now.

2009 Update: Good quality surroundings

2009 Update: Development will need to take into account settlement problems

2009 Update: Note that development platforms have been put in.
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?
No

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No Lapsed outline RB1998/1274

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Good communications but some settlement problems

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?
Public footpath 10 runs through site but currently blocked (requires diverting). Bus stops close by on Mansfield Road (350m) Services Sheffield to Rotherham 21 (1/hr), 206/216 (1/hr), Dinnington to Sheffield 261 (1/hr), Dinnington to Rotherham 23AB (1/hr). SYPT scores moderate for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
Kiveton Park - 2km, Swallownest - 2.15km

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
Yes Adjacent to green belt to west and north. Possible biodiversity issues, Appears vegetated - early colonisation, nascent heathland/bird habitat.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
JSA claimant score of 1.63

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

Overall sustainable development score:

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

Overall sustainable development score:

2 1
**Reasoning:** Brownfield with reasonable access to transport

### Strategic Planning

**Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?**
Within 580m of residential area of Wales

**2009 Update:** No change

**Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?**
Yes Objective 1 P4B

**2009 Update:** No

**Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie**
Serves settlements identified for growth and limited growth

**2009 Update:**
Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**2009 Update:**
Expands a cluster of industrial activity promoted during the Objective one strategic economic zone period

### Overall assessment score

**Reason for overall score:**
Good communications and environment, serving local communities. Settlement problems need to be resolved

**2009 Update:**
Good environment serving local communities. Settlement problems being resolved

**Recommendation:** Retain as employment development site
Site Name: Eastern extension of E40, Waleswood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site? Greenbelt allocation, greenfield site</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td>Access is a significant constraint due to the topography and layout of existing development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers? Attractive surroundings, adjoining industrial estate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td>Yes - ELR141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential? Good location adjoining successful industrial estate, good access into existing estate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks. Good access to main road network</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

Yes

2009 Update:

Yes, however access is a major constraint and may not be achievable

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

No change

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes

Potential to provide premises for growth sectors, although existing units on Vector 31 are being let on open market

2009 Update:

No permission however potential to provide premises for growth sectors

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

2009 Update:

Varied scoring but overall a reasonably attractive site for the market, although access is a major constraint

Reasoning: Varied scoring but overall a reasonably attractive site for the market

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

2009 Update:

No change

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

2009 Update:

PTE scores site 1

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

No change

2009 Update:

1

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes

Former arable land therefore could be of limited ecological value (although some evidence of bird activity on site). Also drain within site of some value and should be protected and buffered if site developed

2009 Update:

Currently arable land therefore could be some limited ecological interest

Original Score 2009 SCORE
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Greenfield site which does not score well in sustainability terms

No change

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Although small population at Waleswood

No

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes Objective 1

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Some potential to meet local strategic needs

No change

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Little potential for other alternative uses

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation
<p>| Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site? | 2009 Update: | Green belt, in agricultural use, access from extension to existing industrial estate which has significant problems | 1 |
| Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use? | 2009 Update: | N/A | N/A |
| Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)? | 2009 Update: | Attractive setting even though adjacent to M1 | 3 |
| Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers? | 2009 Update: | Yes - ELR96 | |
| Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site? | 2009 Update: | Development would depend upon ELR96 coming forward first | 1 |
| Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use? | 2009 Update: | No | |
| Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential? | 2009 Update: | Close to road network however has major access issues | 1 |
| Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks. | 2009 Update: | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

**Reasoning:**

```
Limited attractiveness; access is a major constraint along with proximity to housing on Station Road
```

### Sustainable Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
<td>PTE scores site 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
<td>Yes - any future development would be an intrusion into open countryside. Site currently arable land - could have limited biodiversity value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning:

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

2009 Update: No

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update: No

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning:

Site serves a potential principal settlement for growth

Site expands a cluster of industrial activity promoted during the objective 1 strategic economic zone period

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Interest has been shown in developing this site

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Public right of way runs along the eastern boundary and within the site to the north

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:

2009 Update: Green belt, green field site with major access issues

Recommendation: Retain current non-employment allocation

Site Name: Cortonwood Business Park

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 7.16  Land remaining in 2009 =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>2009 Update: Shape of site also limits development opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography &amp; Powerlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2009 Update: Residential development also to east at a higher level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Retail Park &amp; Business Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
<td>A6195 to junction 36 of M1 - approximately 2.5 miles - does not cut through residential areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>2009 Update: No change</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Update: 01/12/2009

- Residential development also to east at a higher level
- No change
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

No applications received for development on vacant land

2009 Update: Application for housing development on site remains to be determined

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No No - see comments for 1.8 above

2009 Update: No change

Overall market attractiveness score: 1

Reasoning: Poor site due to topography and other constraints

No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

Yes Disused Elesecar Canal runs on the opposite side of the Dearne Valley Parkway. No railway lines within the immediate vicinity

2009 Update: No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Trans Pennine Trail runs near part of site. Bus services available to the retail park. SYPTPE scores access to public transport as good

2009 Update: PTE score site 2

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Less than 400m to the nearest allocated local centre but the services available at the Retail Park would be within easy proximity hence the highest score

2009 Update: No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes Mature woodland and grassed areas cover the site so potentially biodiversity interests could be found.

2009 Update: No change

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Claimant Rate 1.73%

2009 Update: 1

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No Landscape now considered to be part of the natural surroundings

2009 Update: No change

Overall sustainable development score: 2

Reasoning: Accessibility factors offset by biodiversity and greenfield

No change
nature of site

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Site immediately adjacent to existing established residential area in Brampton

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?

Yes Objective 1 - P5

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie Babtie scoring recommendations for settlements serving the site is for ‘key growth’

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:** Well placed to serve local community

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:**

Topography and linear shape of site would make any significant employment development extremely difficult.

**Recommendation:** Re-allocate to non-employment allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to adjoining residential areas is difficult by foot or cycle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMR Pathfinder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves a potential principal settlement for growth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably well placed to serve the local community, although with some limitations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Site Area: 0.49 ha

Manvers Wath West Industrial Estate

0.49 Ha
Site Name: Manvers Wath West Industrial Est

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 0.85

Market Attractiveness

Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?
Site currently used for caravan storage

Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?
No change

Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?
Yes

Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?
Yes

Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?
Medium - Small Scale of site, adjacent residential uses, awkward shape, existing caravan storage area on Site 1A & informal parking area on Site 6

Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?
A6195 to junction 36 of MI - approximately 3 miles - does not cut through residential areas

Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land remaining in 2009 =
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

- RB2000/1347 - Erection of factory unit & attached two storey office block
- RB2002/0840 - Concrete production depot & associated office, silos and plant
- RB2002/1437 - Use of land as coach depot & erection of garages
- RB 2003/0537 - Permission for use of land as coach depot & erection of garages (amendment to RB2002/1437)
- RB2003/1116 - Erection of a three storey building comprising ground floor café, first floor office and second floor nightwatchman accommodation.

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No - planning permissions identified above

Overall market attractiveness score: 2
Reasoning: Reasonable site

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No - not adjacent to railway lines or canal route

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Public footpath number 3 runs close to site. No cycle lanes on Derwent Way, Bus Stop on Pontefract Road. SYPTE scores moderate for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Over 800m to the nearest local centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Little evidence of existing habitats on site due to lack of vegetation

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Claimant Rate 1.73%

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No change

2009 Update:
None, although site is being used for caravan storage without planning permission

2009 Update: No

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: Pte score site 2

2009 Update: No change

2009 Update: No change
Yes Remainder of Site 1A not used as caravan storage is greenfield

**Overall sustainable development score:**

**Reasoning:** Poor site in sustainability terms

**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

*Site immediately adjacent to existing established residential area*

**2009 Update:** No change

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?

*Yes  Objective 1 - P5 Within Pathfinder Area*

**2009 Update:** HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie

*Babtie scoring recommendations for settlements serving the site is for ‘key growth’ and ‘growth’*

**2009 Update:**

Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:** Well located to serve local community

**Reasoning:**

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

*Site suitable for employment use although likely to be for small scale business units possibly for expansion of existing businesses nearby as opposed to new unrelated occupiers.*

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

*No evidence of it being used for recreational purposes*

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:**

Sites presently used for storing caravans and car parking for employees of adjacent businesses suggesting alternative

**2009 Update:** No change
arrangements would need to be found for each of these demands.

**Recommendation:** Retain current employment allocation
**Site Name:** Manvers Century Business Park

**Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) =** 6.73  
**Land remaining in 2009 =**

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead power line</td>
<td>No overhead line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century Business Park. West Wath Industrial Estate to the South. Development Site E5 to the north.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Opportunity to link into Site 6 of E2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Large billbord advert for Century Business Park. No onsite evidence of plots being available although RIDO suggest they are being marketed.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6195 to junction 36 of M1 - approximately 3 miles - does not cut through residential areas</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Reclamation work been undertaken - access road in place</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

RB2004/0357 - Erection of industrial unit consisting of 515m² B1 office use, 542m² B2 General industrial use and 78m² B8 Storage and distribution use

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes  RB2005/1781 - Erection of 6 industrial blocks (comprising 30 units) for use within classes B1 (Business), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage & Distribution)

Overall market attractiveness score: 3 3

Reasoning: Attractive site, currently on market

No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No  No - not adjacent to railway lines or canal route

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Public footpath number 3 runs alongside site. Cycle Paths. Numerous bus stops on Manvers Way. SYPTE scores moderate for access to public transport.

PTE scores site 1

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Over 900m to nearest local centre

No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No  No significant colonisation of vegetation following remediation works. Plot 2 has been ecologically surveyed for 2005/1781 & recommendations made for mitigation / landscaping. Rest of site should be treated in same way.

Site has revegetated therefore there may be some biodiversity interest on the site

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Claimant Rate 1.84%

No change

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No  No - Landscape now considered to be part of the natural surroundings

No change
Overall sustainable development score: 1
Reasoning: Generally poor in sustainability terms

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Significant portion of site adjacent to residential area

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes
Objective 1 - P5
Within Pathfinder Area
Contributes to ‘Creative and Digital Industries’

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie scoring recommendations for settlements serving the site is for ‘key growth’ and ‘growth’
Babtie scoring recommendations for settlements serving the site is for ‘key growth’ and ‘growth’

Overall strategic planning score: 3
Reasoning: Well placed to serve local communities

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
No evidence of it being used for recreational purposes

Overall assessment score 2
Reasons for overall score: Sustainable development score is low hence not given top rating
Recommendation: Retain as employment development site

2009 Update:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No longer Objective 1 - P5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within UDP strategic regeneration area and HMRP area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably located, large site ready for development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Reference: 42 UDP Reference: E4  
Original Assessment Date: 09/02/2006  
2009 Update: 01/12/2009

Site Name: Manvers Fitzwilliam Fields

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 4.3

Land remaining in 2009 =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>Site reduced now to just the football ground. Very poor access.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead Powerline. Formalised football pitch with floodlighting &amp; changing facility - Queens United</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential area to the South of the site. Vacant industrial &amp; business land plots on opposite side (northerly direction) of Manvers Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Urban greenspace to the east site of the site could potentially be developed but this would perhaps be undesirable in policy terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No evidence of marketing material on site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Reduced potential given poor access, adjacent to residential properties and current use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - although satisfactory access creation would not be straightforward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6195 to junction 36 of M1 - approximately 3 miles - does not cut through residential areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>Site used as football ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Site prepared for development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

RB2001/0827 - Erection of 8 floodlights approx 10metres high
RB2003/1284 - Outline application for the erection of residential development and open space including raising of site ground levels
RB2005/0250 - Reserved Matters Application for Residential Development and open space provision comprising 261 dwellings of which 88 are apartments (reserved by RB2003/1284)

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No - Granting of permission for Ben Bailey residential application will preclude significant industrial & business development.

Overall market attractiveness score:

2009 Update:

Reasoning: Generally attractive to market

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No - not adjacent to railway lines or canal route

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Various footpaths abut the perimeter of site. Part of footpath number 3 runs through site but no longer evident on ground. Cycle Paths. Numerous bus stops on Manvers Way & Barnsley Road. SYPTE scores moderate for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Nearest local centre approximately 400m

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes - Adjacent to urban greenspace which is in its natural state & site itself contains wood & shrub land areas. Developers have been conditioned to replace existing habitat with one of equal value - this is proving difficult.

2009 Update:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
Claimant Rate 1.73%

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No - Landscape now considered to be part of the natural surroundings

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Reasonable in overall sustainability terms

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Existing residential area immediately to the south of the site

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes Objective 1 - P5

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie
Babtie scoring recommendations for settlements serving the site is for 'key growth' and 'growth'

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Well placed to serve local community

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
Site utilised for formal recreation purposes - football.

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - greenfield site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable in overall sustainability terms</td>
<td>Poor overall in sustainability terms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>HMR Pathfinder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves a potential principal settlement for growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider re-allocation of site to urban greenspace to reflect the site’s current usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Update:
Access could be a constraint. Roundabout from Manvers Way is significantly higher than the recreation ground. Access from Barnsley Road would be between existing residences. Majority of site likely to be developed for residential development.

**Recommendation:** Re-allocate to non-employment allocation
Employment Land Review Update 2009
Fairways Business Park
Manvers

Site Ref No: LDF0351_ELRO43
Site Area: 12.34 ha

Rotherham MBC
Envt & Devt Services
Bailey House
Rawmarsh Road
Rotherham S60 1TD
Site Name: Manvers Fairways Business Park

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 13.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overhead powerline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Attractive setting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No adjacent uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Opportunity to link into development of E6</td>
<td>No - E6 being developed for housing and supporting commercial facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Marketing boards for Fairways Business Park</td>
<td>RIDO indicate site being marketed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6195 to junction 36 of MI - approximately 3 miles - does not cut through residential areas</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Site prepared for development</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB2003/0648 - Construction of access roads (application under regulation 3 &amp;</td>
<td>Site has permission for mixed use development including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9A of the Town & Country Planning General Regulations 1992
RB2004/2304 - Formation of golf course with associated driving range, clubhouse & greenkeepers store, erection of a boathouse, residential development (comprising 10 apartment blocks, 202 dwellinghouses & retirement village), public house/restaurant, extreme sports centre, bowling alley, bingo hall, hotel, health & fitness centre, day nursery, neighbourhood centre including medical centre, car showroom, petrol station, general industrial units and landscaping (including boardwalks & picnic areas)

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes See RB2004/2304 Express Parks application details although this remains undetermined but does contain general industrial units

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Attractive to market

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No - not adjacent to railway lines or canal route

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?
Public footpath number 1 runs alongside site. Cycle paths & numerous bus stops on Manvers Way. SYPTE scores poor for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
Over 800m to nearest local centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
Yes Close to Lakeside Landscaping Area to the east and Wetlands area to the North. Good natural regeneration & some use by ground nesting birds, have requested brown roof & retention of some habitats, inc. ponds in this area as part of wider response to whole site application.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
Claimant Rate 1.84%

2009 Update:
Outline permission granted for B1, B2 and B8 uses, along with full permission for a B2 unit

Score 3
3

2009 Update:
No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No - not adjacent to railway lines or canal route

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
Over 800m to nearest local centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
Yes Close to Lakeside Landscaping Area to the east and Wetlands area to the North. Good natural regeneration & some use by ground nesting birds, have requested brown roof & retention of some habitats, inc. ponds in this area as part of wider response to whole site application.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
Claimant Rate 1.84%
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No - Landscape now considered to be part of the natural surroundings

Overall sustainable development score: 1
Reasoning: Generally poor in sustainability terms

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Nearest residential area within approximately 300m

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes Objective 1 - P5
Within Pathfinder Area

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie
Babtie scoring recommendations for settlements serving the site is for ‘key growth’ and ‘growth’

Overall strategic planning score: 3
Reasoning: Would be well placed to serve surrounding communities

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Majority of site being developed for non employment uses. Land for employment is restricted to the north western area covering approximately 3.5 hectares

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
Used for informal recreation purposes such as walking and dog walking

Overall assessment score 2
Reasons for overall score: Sustainable development score is low hence not given top rating

2009 Update:

No change

Original Score 2009 Score SCORE

1 1

2 2

3 3

No change

Well placed to meet needs of existing and new communities
Recommendation: Retain as employment development site
Site Name: Manvers Station Road

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 5.6

Market Attractiveness

Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?

Existing uses on the west of the site. Awkward shape site. Access difficulties.

2009 Update:
Site adjoins Brook Dike and includes wetland areas, and part of site is in flood zones 2 and 3

Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?

Residential area to the south of the site and scrap yard to the north. Sewage works within the vicinity

2009 Update:
No change

Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?

Yes Opportunity to develop in co-ordination with scrap yard immediately to north of E7. Brook Dike which intersects the two sites could be a hindrance.

2009 Update:
No - Brook Dike seperates this from the adjoining site

Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?

No

2009 Update:
No

Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?

Medium - see constraints comments for justification

2009 Update:
No change

Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?

A6195 to junction 36 of M1 - approximately 3 miles - does not cut through residential areas. Station Road is however single carriageway

2009 Update:
No change

Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No Comprehensive development would require public funding

2009 Update:
No change

Land remaining in 2009 =
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

No development of any kind within last five years

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No - see 1.8 above

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Reasonable site but with some constraints

2 2

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No - not adjacent to railway lines or canal route

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Public footpath number 3 runs along site boundary. No cycle paths. Bus stops available on Station Road reasonable frequency of service. SYPT scores good for access to public transport.

PTE score site 3

3 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Approximately 400m to nearest local centre

No change

2 2

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Mature trees on the western end of the site and surrounding its perimeter. Brook Dike runs to north of site - will require protection from impact due to construction & operational pollution & landscaping / buffer along the watercourse. Appears to include range of vegetation.

May require ecologist's further comments on this site

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Claimant Rate 1.84%

No change

1 1

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No - majority of site is greenfield, however frontage to Station Road is brownfield
### Overall sustainable development score:

**Reasoning:** Limited in sustainable development terms

#### Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</th>
<th>Yes - adjacent to a residential area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?</td>
<td>Yes - Objective 1 - P5 Within Pathfinder Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie Babtie scoring recommendations for settlements serving the site is for ‘growth’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Overall strategic planning score:

**Reasoning:** Well placed to serve local community

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Not used for informal recreation purposes

#### Overall assessment score

**Reasons for overall score:**

**Reasonable site overall**

**Recommendation:** Re-allocate to non-employment allocation

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>Updated Reasoning:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited in sustainable development terms, although the site is reasonably close to Wath town centre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No longer within objective 1 P5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serves a potential principal settlement for growth</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used for informal recreation purposes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-allocate to non-employment allocation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment Land Review Update 2009

Manvers Brookfields Park

Site Ref No: LDF0344/345_ELR046
Site Area: 3.76 ha

Site Boundary

SCALE: NTS
DATE: Nov 2009
Site Name: Manvers Brookfields Park

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 28.47

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Possible contamination but remediation taken/taking place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Industrial uses to the east of the site. Call centres to the west of the site. Green belt to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No - areas to the east and west have already been developed and green belt policy may preclude encroachment northwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Yes - 85 acre commercial development - suitable for industrial warehousing &amp; offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sold to St Pauls Developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>A6195 to junction 36 of M1 - approximately 3 miles - does not cut through residential areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Reclamation work been undertaken - access road from roundabout on Manvers Way in place in anticipation of its extension onto the development site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land remaining in 2009 =
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

RB2005/0598 - Details of the erection of distribution centre comprising a warehouse and ancillary offices and new print works (reserved by the Enterprise Zone Planning Scheme)
RB2005/0718 - Details of the erection of offices, industrial units, distribution units falling within use classes B1, B2, and B8 and associated infrastructure reserved by (enterprise zone planning scheme)

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?


2009 Update: No change

Overall market attractiveness score:
3 3

Reasoning: Attractive site for the market

No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

Yes Possibility of linkage into rail network. No canal freight potential.

2009 Update: No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Cycle paths & numerous bus stops on Manvers Way. SYPT scores good for access to public transport.

2009 Update: PTE score site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Over 1000m to nearest local services

2009 Update: No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No - contamination of site and subsequent reclamation processes have stripped site of biodiversity. Potential impact on openness of adjacent greenspace could be mitigated with appropriate landscaping and siting of developments.

2009 Update: No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claimant Rate 1.84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Landscape cannot be said to have returned to be part of natural surroundings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall sustainable development score:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning: Reasonable in sustainability terms</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearest residential area over 800m away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Objective 1 - P5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Pathfinder Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributes to 'Advanced Manufacturing and Metals'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babtie scoring recommendations for settlements serving the site is for 'growth'</td>
<td>Serves a potential principal settlement for growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall strategic planning score:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning: Well placed to support community, although this is some distance away</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?</td>
<td>No evidence of it being used for recreational purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall assessment score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reasons for overall score: 
Extremely desirable industrial & business site as demonstrated by NEXT intending to develop warehousing and distribution centre.

Recommendation: Retain as employment development site

2009 Update: 
Well located to contribute towards local regeneration needs
### Site Name: Manvers Bolton Road

**Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 1.48**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to railway line. Tarmac production site adjacent to plot 1S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untenanted business units occupy area adjacent to Phase 2. Plot 1S also adjacent to business units to the north but also tarmac production site to the south. Green belt borders the whole of the east of the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - adjacent sites largely developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Marketing Board for Patrick Tobin Business Park. No obvious material related to the vacant plots. RIDO suggest plot 1S not on market.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - previous significant industrial &amp; business development suggests demand exists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6195 to junction 36 of M1 - approximately 3 miles - does not cut through residential areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Market Attractiveness**

**2009 Update:**
- Land off A6023 - access may be difficult to this site from Pioneer Close, but access may not be permitted from A6023
- No change
- No change
- No change
- No change
- No change
- No change
- No change
Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

Yes       Both sites in readiness for development

2009 Update:

However the site north of Hound Hill Park has naturally revegetated

Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

Significant industrial & business development including RB2004/0423 - Erection of 6 industrial units for use within classes B1(Business), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage & Distribution)

2009 Update:

No

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes       Creation of industrial & business units offer the possibility of meeting market requirements subject to occupants working within growth/target sectors

2009 Update:

No change

Overall market attractiveness score:

2009 Update:

2 2

Reasoning:       Reasonable overall

No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

Yes       Possibility of linkage into rail network. No canal freight potential.

2009 Update:

No change

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Cycle paths & numerous bus stops on Bolton Road & Manvers Way. SYPTE scores poor for access to public transport and good for the southern part of the site.

2009 Update:

PTE scores site 1

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Over 1000m to nearest local services

2009 Update:

No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No       Potential impact on openness of adjacent greenspace could be mitigated with appropriate landscaping and siting of developments. Phase 2 area previously vegetated.

2009 Update:

No change, although the phase 2 site is currently vegetated
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Claimant Rate 1.84%

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No - Landscape of vacant sites considered to be part of the natural surroundings

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Reasonable in sustainability terms

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Over 800m to the nearest residential area

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?

Yes Objective 1 - P5

Within Pathfinder Area

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie

Babtie scoring recommendations for settlements serving the site is for ‘growth’

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Well placed to support local community, although this is some distance away

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

No evidence of it being used for recreational purposes

Overall assessment score

2 2
Reasons for overall score:
*Reasonable site overall*

Recommendation: *Retain as employment development site*

2009 Update: *No change*

Site Name: Manvers Wath West Plot 8 (now 9)

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 1.26  Land remaining in 2009 =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone cable. Awkward shape of site. Building supplies company may be bad neighbour.</td>
<td>Access road is in very poor condition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyline building supplies to the east. Occupied industrial units to the south on the opposite side of Derwent Way</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No onsite evidence of plots being available although RIDO suggest they are being marketed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>No change, reflected in recent grant of planning permission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6195 to junction 36 of MI - approximately 3 miles - does not cut through residential areas. Pontefract Road is however single carriageway</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Site in readiness for development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

- RB2003/2177 - Use of land for storage of builders and construction material
- RB2004/2454 - Use of land as a haulage depot

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No  No existing planning permission

Overall market attractiveness score:

2

Reasoning: Various factors limit to only a reasonable site in market terms

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No  No - not adjacent to railway lines or canal route

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Public footpath number 3 runs near site. No cycle lanes on Derwent Way, Bus Stop on Pontefract Road. SYTPE scores poor for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Approximately 700m to nearest local centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes  Mature trees within and surrounding part of perimeter of the site. Site is vegetated rough grassland and scrub, defunct hedge along Pontefract Road boundary.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Claimant Rate 1.84%

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No  No - Landscape now considered to be part of the natural surroundings

2009 Update:

- RB2008/1845 - permission granted for open storage and new access road
- RB2008/1841 - outline permission granted for B1, B2 and B8 units

No change
Overall sustainable development score: 1
Reasoning: Scores poorly in all criteria

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Less than 100m to nearest residential area

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes Objective 1 - P5 Within Pathfinder Area

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie Babtie scoring recommendations for settlements serving the site is for 'key growth' and 'growth' 

Overall strategic planning score: 3
Reasoning: Well placed to support local community

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
No evidence of it being used for recreational purposes

Overall assessment score: 2
Reasons for overall score: Reasonable site let down by poor sustainability
Recommendation: Retain as employment development site
Site Name: Site 8 CORTONWOOD BUSINESS PARK

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 1.04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No physical or policy constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some standing water on the site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No development on adjacent sites recently (i.e.within last decade) taken place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evidence of signs/marketing material on site. Positive mark reflection of comments made by RIDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site is being marketed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6195 to junction 36 of MI - approximately 2.5 miles - does not cut through residential areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Site prepared for development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land remaining in 2009 =
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

RB2002/1379 - Details of the erection of a factory with ancillary offices (reserved by the Enterprise Zone Planning Scheme)
RB2005/0123 - Details of the erection of 6 No non-food retail units (reserved by outline R99/1523)

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes The erection of six non food retail units granted under the 2005 application detailed above suggests that it is unlikely to meet market requirements, whereas the 2002 permission may potentially house growth/target sectors

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Site attractive to the market

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

Yes Disused Elesecar Canal runs on the opposite side of the Dearne Valley Parkway. No railway lines within the immediate vicinity

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Trans Pennine Trail runs near part of site. Bus services available to the retail park

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Less than 400m to the nearest allocated local centre but the services available at the Retail Park would be within easy proximity hence the highest score

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No No evidence of vegetation on site therefore biodiversity impacts are likely to be minimal. Adjacent sites have also been developed suggesting impacts on surrounding areas will not be significant.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Claimant Rate 1.73%

2009 Update:

Retail planning permission has been implemented by provision of access road, although no built development has taken place

2009 Update:

Given the retail permission the site is unlikely to come forward for employment use

2009 Update:

Attractive location however the site now has a non-employment permission

2009 Update:

PTE scores site 1

2009 Update:

Some standing water on site could accommodate biodiversity interest

2009 Update:

1
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes  The site has been fully reclaimed and not as yet returned to its natural state

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Reasonably sustainable

2009 Update:
No change

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Well placed to support local community

2009 Update:
No change

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
No evidence of it being used for recreational purposes

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score:
Good site within existing developed area

2009 Update:
Good site within existing developed area, however the retail permission is likely to limit
Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
Site Reference: 52  UDP Reference: E6a  Original Assessment Date: 21/04/2006  2009 Update: 01/12/2009

Site Name: Manvers Parkside

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 1.95  Land remaining in 2009 =

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - although note the presence of two residential properties immediately adjacent to the site. Some standing water evident on site</td>
<td>Part of site within floodzones 2 and 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable views, mainly industrial but views across to lakeside area to north</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No No evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High - site prepared for development, located close to main road network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent to Manvers Way and reasonable access to main road network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Site prepared for development as part of Manvers regeneration scheme, including provision of new site access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

**Infrastructure to enable development**

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

2

**Reasoning:** Good site in market terms, but no current permissions nor is site being marketed

---

**Sustainable Development**

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Close to public footpaths, and cycletracks run adjacent to the site. SYPTE scores good for access to public transport for this part of the E6 allocation

PTE score site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

500m to Wath town centre

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes Land generally poor quality scrub as prepared for development. Standing water could provide habitat for wildlife such as great crested newts

No change, although further comments from the ecologist are likely to be required prior to any development taking place

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Job seekers allowance claimant rate of 1.84%

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

Yes

**Overall sustainable development score:**

2

**Reasoning:** Relatively poor in sustainability terms

---

2009 Update:

None

2009 Update:

No current planning permission

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No - site has revegetated and is considered green field

2009 Update:

No change
**Strategic Planning**

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

*Nearest residential area is more than 500m away*

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?

Yes  

*Objective 1 - P5, within Pathfinder area*

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie

*Serves settlements recommended as suitable for growth*

**Overall strategic planning score:**

**Reasoning:**  *Reasonably placed to serve local area*

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

*Site owned by RMBC*

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:**

*Good site let down by sustainability and local access criteria*

**Recommendation:**  *Retain as employment development site*
### Site Reference: 71  
**Date of Assessment:** 23/06/2006  
**Officer:** Alan Bamforth  
**Current users:**  
**2009 Assessment Date:** 01/12/2009  
**2009 Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh  
**Site Name:** Knollbeck Lane, Brampton

#### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>Poor access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>Poor buildings unlikely to be suitable for conversion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>Poor site quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Adjoins residential area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Greenspace area south-east of site</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Poor quality of site and access</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Reasonable access to main road network</td>
<td>No access to Dearne Valley Parkway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 Update:**
- Only likely to be suitable for current users
- Also very poor access and egress and road circulation within site
- Adjoins residential area but at different levels
- No
- No change
- No access to Dearne Valley Parkway
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability issues?
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Small scale engineering and vehicle storage - could face decline in the future

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Fairly poor in market attractiveness terms

2009 Update:
Redevelopment may require assistance

2009 Update:
No - only minor permission for replacement fence

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
Reasonable bus, walking and cycling access

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

Original Score 2009 SCORE

No change 1 1
No change 2 1

PTE scores site 3 2 3

No change 1 2

No change 2 1
Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: *Mixed but overall reasonably sustainable site*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance?</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes HMR Pathfinder, Objective 1, UDP regeneration area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: *Well placed to support local community*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly suitable for residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possibly suitable for residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: *Although it scores well in strategic terms it performs less well in sustainability and market attractiveness terms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well placed to meet local employment needs however very poor access likely to limit future opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation: *Retain current non-employment allocation*
Employment Land Review 2009

Site Ref No: LDR032-ELR073
Site Area: 7.85 ha

Site Area: 7.85 ha
### Site Reference: 73  Date of Assessment: 23/06/2006  Officer: Alan Bamforth

**Current users:** 2009  **Assessment Date:** 01/12/2009  **Officer:** R Shepherd & H Sleigh

**Site Name:** Station Road, Wath

**Market Attractiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooding risk and also adjoins sewage works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally poor quality and unlikely to be suitable for conversion for alternative employment uses</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally poor quality environment</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surroundings generally of poor quality</td>
<td>Reasonable surroundings, although close to sewage works</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes E7</td>
<td>No - E7 separated from this site by Brook Dike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited by sourounding uses and quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable access to main road network</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update:
Comprehensive development or redevelopment for employment purposes is likely to require public funding

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No  No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Range of uses, some of which could be subject to decline in the future

2009 Update:
Reasonably attractive in market attractiveness terms

Overall market attractiveness score:
2 2

Reasoning: Generally scores poorly, although its location adjacent to the main road could be helpful to market attractiveness

2009 Update:
Reasonably attractive in market attractiveness terms

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

2009 Update:
No change

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Reasonably accessible

2009 Update:
PTE scores site 3

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update:
No change

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

Yes  Brook dike and old railway line to north represent valuable ecological boundaries which would need to be recognised in any future development.  Brook Dike is home to water vole. Development could also lead to positive

2009 Update:
No change
biodiversity impacts

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?  
2009 Update: 1 1

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?  
Yes  Reclaimed to enable development  
2009 Update: Brownfiles, although reclamtion may be required if site was to be redeveloped for other uses

Overall sustainable development score:  
Reasoning: Mixed scoring but overall a reasonably sustainable site  
No change  
2009 Update: 2 2

Strategic Planning  
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?  
2009 Update: No change

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?  
Yes  HMR Pathfinder, Objective 1, UDP regeneration area  
2009 Update: HMR Pathfinder, UDP regeneration area

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?  
2009 Update: Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

Overall strategic planning score:  
Reasoning: Generally high scoring site in strategic terms  
3 3  
2009 Update: Generally a good site in strategic terms

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:  
Proximity to sewage works could limit development for alternative uses, as could presence of industrial uses and land to south

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?  
2009 Update:

Overall assessment score  
Reasons for overall score: Overall a reasonable but not outstanding site  
2009 Update: No change 2 2

Recommendation: Retain current employment allocation
Site Name: Land off Barnsley Road, Wath

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land has now been cleared and planning permission sought for alternative uses. Poor access for employment uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners indicate they are to stop use of land for employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some buildings could be re-used but none are of any great quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor site environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site surrounded by vegetation and relatively well enclosed, adjoins residential, recreation and employment land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Centenary business park adjoins but levels difference likely to preclude comprehensive development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low potential - located behind existing development with fairly poor access out on to main road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

Accessed through residential area - some visibility issues on egress to Barnsley Road

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update:

Permission for a Kingdom hall granted. Application for housing has been refused

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

Mixed but could be some future demand

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Generally low scores, plus significant ownership constraint

2009 Update:

No change

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTPE scores adjoining Fitzwilliam Fields site 2. Reasonable access, Pennine Walk runs along side of site

2009 Update:

PTE score site 1

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Over 500m

2009 Update:

No change
Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No Site already in use

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes

### Overall sustainable development score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasoning</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally low scoring and remote from services, although this represents a brownfield site with reasonable accessibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes UDP regeneration area, Objective 1 and HMR Pathfinder

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

### Overall strategic planning score:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasoning</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well located close to residential areas and potential to serve local community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Owners indicate that they will cease to rent out land for employment use, partly due to complaints from local residents

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Update:

- Generally low scoring and remote from services
- Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

2009 Update:

- No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall assessment score</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for overall score:</td>
<td><strong>Well placed to serve local community but whilst the site is reasonably sustainable it scores poorly in market attractiveness terms</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation:</th>
<th>Re-allocate to non-employment allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Well placed to serve the local community however site has poor access and non-employment use granted on part of site</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Adjacent to sewage works</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Yes - Yorkshire Water promoting site as surplus to requirements</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Accessible to Dearne Valley Link Road</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability?

No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?

2009 Update:

Yes

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning:

2009 Update:

Attractiveness limited by the sewage works, access and pylons

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

2009 Update:

No

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

2009 Update:

PTE score site 3

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

2009 Update:

No

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update:
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning:

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

No

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning:

2009 Update:

Serves a potential principal settlement for growth

Reasonable site in strategic terms

Reasonable site within current employment allocation

Recommendation:  Allocate as employment development site
Site Name: Waverley (Phase1) - advanced manufacturing park

Size of any land remaining to be developed (hectares) = 24.75

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent development of this site in the short term?</td>
<td>Site fully reclaimed now. (Landfill Gas consultation zone) No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3 Adjacent to Retail (Morrison), Urban Greenspace/Major Road Network (Parkway) and Industrial - reclamation site/Fearn. Landscaped bunds around the site. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Yes AMP Waverley Phase 2 (YF) - Ongoing reclamation of site to east of High Field Spring. Yes - land opposite side of Highfield Spring - resolution to grant permission for office floorspace targeting Government department relocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>Yes RiDO, YF etc. Prominent signs (blown down) Sites occupied recently/under construction - Miller Construction, CTI, TWI, ITC Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>High - Waverley Regeneration Area - Advanced Manufacturing Park No change 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network avoiding residential areas?</td>
<td>Adjacent to reconstructed B6066. 1.3 km to A630 Sheffield Parkway, 3.4 km to M1 J33 No change 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability</td>
<td>No Reclamation works completed No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Original Score | 2009 Score
--- | ---
3 | 3
3 | 3
3 | 3

Land remaining in 2009 =
Q1.8 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses / planning briefs)?

YES. Advanced Manufacturing uses Miller Construction, Castings Technology Industries, TWI Ltd, YF

Q1.9 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes  Waverley Regeneration Area  Advanced Manufacturing Park - advanced manufacturing and metals

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Accessible location, cluster industries, good environment

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

Yes  Sites on southern boundary of the area are adjacent to railway

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes to enable easy access for the workforce?

Various existing and proposed footpaths alongside site and within landscaped area. Includes proposed bridleway which cuts across site. New bus stops created on High Field Spring. Service A3/A4 Parkgate to Waterthorpe 2/hr, A1 Rotherham to Meadowhall/Sheffield 2/hr. SYTPE scores good for access to public transport.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Morrisons superstore - 700m, Treeton - 2km, Brinsworth - 1.9km, Rotherham - 5km. First plots much closer within walking distance of Morrisons

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside/natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No  Site recently reclaimed and restored. Landscaping bunds provide potential biodiversity habitats, but unlikely to be affected by new development. Wider Waverley Landscape plans are outstanding.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

JSA claimant score of 1.86%

2009 Update:

Several permissions plus development has taken place

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

Accessible location, regionally important cluster of industries, good environment,

2009 Update:

No progress on the creation of a station to south of AMP

2009 Update:

PTE score site 1 but acknowledge that this could improve in the future with public transport improvements associated with the development of a new community. This site will benefit from the planned Bus Rapid Transit route. Provided this scheme is completed then in the future the site will be have an attractive public transport option.

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

Also potential impact on skylarks that have been progressively moved down the reclamation site as development proceeds

2009 Update:

1 1

2009 Update:

1 1
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes  Reclamation of opencast site

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Reasonable overall

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Nearest residential area at Catcliffe 825m from centre of site, however the first plots to be developed are considerably closer within walking distance

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? (e.g. delivery of RSS, RES, HMRP)?
Yes  Waverley Regeneration Area. Advanced Manufacturing and Metals cluster industries

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie
Serves settlements identified as Growth/limited growth areas

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: A number of factors limit the score

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:
Development continuing apace on the development of the Advanced Manufacturing park (4 plots). Remove landscaped bund from the developable area

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?
Footpaths and dog walking around the perimeter of the site in the landscaping bund

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
Poor scores although acknowledge that scores likely to improve in the future with the development of a new community

2009 Update:
Score would improve with the development of new housing at the new community

2009 Update:
Waverley proposed as an extension to Rotherham urban area

2009 Update:
Score likely to increase to 3 with the development of new housing as part of a new community

2009 Update:
Waverley area identified as a potential strategic employment location in the Core Strategy Revised Options (May 2009). Linear site to the south has been removed from original record for site 50 and now recorded as site 168 due to its inclusion within the new community proposal

2009 Update:
Also bridleways and possible links to trans pennine trail. There are plans for an iconic bridge linking to High Hazels Park
Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:
Major regeneration area - will need to be considered in relation to proposed new community at Waverley

Recommendation: Retain as employment development site

2009 Update:
Regionally important cluster, continues to be successful
Site Reference: 121  Date of Assessment: 05/07/2006  Officer: Phil Turnidge

Current users: 2009 Assessment Date: 09/11/2009 2009 Officer: R Shepherd & H Sleigh

Site Name: Waverley Regeneration Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration in progress on part of site, no obvious constraints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable quality buildings already in employment use or readily convertible for such use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immature restored landscape but potentially ok in long term. Need for screening of Poplars industrial estate/JTF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immature landscape potentially good in long term. High quality buildings on adjacent Advanced Manufacturing Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes - site being marketed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes  Waverley mixed use community (proposed development)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No  No - although adjacent AMP is being marketed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High, particularly once fully restored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good access to A630 (Parkway) and M1 J33, although congestion may limit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
capacity/phasing of development on the site

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability?
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
Waverley Masterplan produced by UK Coal

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
Yes  Adjacent to AMP and potential for development which meets future market needs

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
Existing businesses in traditional sectors but good prospects in longer term

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Major regeneration area with good market potential

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?
SYPTE scores site 3. Cycle lanes present

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?
Whilst Morrisons is close by there are no allocated local or town centres close

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
Council resolved to grant outline permission for office floorspace intended to target government department relocations. Council also resolved to grant permission for a new community including residential

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
Major regeneration area with good market potential, although part of site proposed for housing

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
PTE scores site 1. This site will benefit from the planned Bus Rapid Transit route. Provided this scheme is completed then in the future the site will have an attractive public transport option.

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change
Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and
natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
Yes Significant biodiversity impact - existing development around Highfield
Spring has identified protected species. Whilst mitigation of impact will be
required there is potential for overall positive impact on biodiversity on site.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?
1

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
Yes Brownfield following recent clarification of PPG3 definition by ODPM

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Reasonably sustainable site with potential for
mitigation/enhancement through development proposals

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Potential to serve surrounding communities, although none closer than 500m

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example
to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes Objective 1, UDP regeneration area

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable
Communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?
Serves settlements identified for growth

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Generally well placed in strategic terms however some concern
over proximity of nearby residential areas

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general
views on suitability for employment use:
Could be scope for mixed use development as identified in the Waverley
Masterplan

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for
informal recreation purposes?

2009 Update:
Site buffer overlaps Local Wildlife Site: future
development to include buffer habitat

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:

2009 Update:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall assessment score</th>
<th>2009 Update:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for overall score: Site scores well across all criteria - this is a well located site with good market potential</td>
<td>Reasonably good site let down by current sustainability scores, but likely to improve if a new mixed use community goes ahead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation: Allocate as employment development site
### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td><strong>Greenbelt allocation, airport approach/lights,</strong> <strong>Parkway/M1 J33 capacity problems,</strong> <strong>stability/proximity to deep rail cutting on north east boundary</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td><strong>Nearby airport business park is high quality and visually prominent from Parkway</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>Yes <strong>Adjacent non-greenbelt land available for development</strong></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No <strong>although general marketing for adjacent Sheffield Business Park</strong></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td><strong>High potential if allocated for employment</strong></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.

Very good access to A630 (Parkway) and M1 J33, although congestion may limit capacity/phasing of development on the site

Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability

No Funding likely to be required to address Parkway/M1 J33 capacity issues

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employement uses/planning briefs)?

Development on nearby business park and permission for development on land immediately north

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?

Yes Scope for high quality/specialist uses serving growth/target sectors

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?

N/A - although adjacent business park has high potential given existing occupiers

Overall market attractiveness score:

Reasoning: Potentially very attractive to market, although current greenbelt allocation and nearby highway capacity issues

Sustainable Development

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?

No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

SYPTPE scores site 3.

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Whilst Morrisons is close by (although other side of Parkway) there are no

2009 Update:

No change

PTE scores site 1. This site will benefit from the planned Bus Rapid Transit route. Provided this scheme is completed then in the future the site will be have an attractive public transport option.

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change

2009 Update:

No change
allocated local or town centres close

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?

No

Some mitigation may be required for loss of habitat although site has undergone ground levelling. Any current biodiversity enhancements need to be maintained and enhanced.

Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

No

Some mitigation may be required for loss of habitat although site has undergone ground levelling. Any current biodiversity enhancements need to be maintained and enhanced.

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Greenfield (although note recent earth moving)

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning: Although accessible by public transport site access likely to be predominantly by car. Isolated from facilities and services. Greenfield site which contributes to Parkway’s "green corridor".

Access likely to be predominantly by car. Isolated from facilities and services. Greenfield site which contributes to Parkway’s "green corridor".

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Whilst Catcliffe is within 500m of the site there are significant barriers which prevent access.

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

Yes

Objective 1

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Site serves Catcliffe (a potential local service centre) rather than Rotherham urban area.

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning: Strategically significant area but is a peripheral out of centre site relatively remote from residential communities.

Peripheral out-of-centre site relatively remote from residential communities.

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Market aspirations for re-allocation although development would aggravate road capacity constraints. Could prejudice Waverley development. Unlikely to be suitable for other uses, although additional planting on southern boundary would re-inforce "Parkway" corridor.

2009 Update:

No change
Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

**Overall assessment score**

**Reasons for overall score:** Potentially very attractive to market and whilst site scores reasonably well in strategic terms it is poor in sustainable terms.

**Recommendation:** Retain current non-employment allocation

**2009 Update:**

Potentially very attractive to the market but is poor in sustainability terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall assessment score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Site Name: Land at Orgreave Lane, Rotherham

### Market Attractiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td>Access, linear nature of site</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td>Views to Waverley Hill and surrounding trees and vegetation, although also adjacent to railway</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td>Low - poor access and linear nature of site</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td>Poor site access, but reasonably close to main road network</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
Yes

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
No - application for industrial development refused (and appeal dismissed)

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
N/A

Overall market attractiveness score:
Reasoning: Constrained linear site with poor access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Former sidings - potential rail access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTE score site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No bus stops nearby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Potential impact on views from adjacent waverley reclamation and also loss of existing vegetation on site (including trees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?
No Greenfield site

Overall sustainable development score:
Reasoning: Low scoring greenfield site

Strategic Planning
Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?
Some parts of site closer to residential areas, but railway acts as significant barrier

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?
Yes UDP regeneration area, Objective 1

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

Overall strategic planning score:
Reasoning: Limited potential to contribute towards strategic needs

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score
Reasons for overall score: Greenfield site, poor scores in market attractiveness and sustainability terms.

Recommendation:

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change

2009 Update:
No change
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**Site Name:** Land part of proposed Waverley new community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Attractiveness</th>
<th>Original Score</th>
<th>2009 Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1.1 Are there any physical or policy constraints that could prevent the development of this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long, linear site adjacent to railway line, pylon, existing mature trees, footpath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.2 What is the age / quality of any existing buildings? Would they be suitable for conversion for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.3 What is the quality of the site environment (landscaping, public realm, parking/circulation issues)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.4 Does the surrounding landscape and/or buildings provide an attractive visual environment to potential developers and occupiers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractive surroundings</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.5 Are adjoining sites potentially suitable for comprehensive development along with this site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.6 Is the site currently being marketed for employment use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.7 Does the site currently or potentially have high, medium or low marketing potential?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially high given location and adjacent to Advanced Manufacturing Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1.8 Does the site offer easy and convenient access for new businesses to the national road network (for example proximity to a good road network, motorway junctions) avoiding residential areas? Note any known bottlenecks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Update:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good access to Parkway and close M1 J33</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1.9 Is development viable without public funding, or if public funding is committed (including reclamation works) will this overcome any viability
No

Q1.10 Has there been any development in the last 5 years (including permissions for quality employment uses/planning briefs)?
No

Q1.11 Is any existing planning permission likely to meet market requirements, does this site have the ability to support any particular economic activity/specialism or is the site part of a comprehensive regeneration proposal?
No

Q1.12 What are the market conditions for current occupiers (will there be continued demand in the future)?
N/A

**Overall market attractiveness score:**

**Reasoning:**

**Sustainable Development**

Q2.1 Does the site offer rail and/or canal freight potential to future businesses?
No

Q2.2 Is the site well served by sustainable transport modes (including bus, walking, train, cycling) to enable easy access for the workforce?

Q2.3 Are local services and facilities within easy proximity to the potential development site?

Q2.4 Will new development negatively impact on the surrounding countryside and natural environment, or the biodiversity potential of the site itself?
No

2009 Update:

Clearance of site could require assistance however resolution to grant housing permission on site as part of Waverley new community

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

No

2009 Update:

N/A

2009 Update:

Yes, although no progress on creation of a station to the south of the AMP

2009 Update:

PTE scores site 1. This site will benefit from the planned Bus Rapid Transit route. Provided this scheme is completed then in the future the site will be have an attractive public transport option.

2009 Update:

Some distance from local services

2009 Update:

Yes - mature trees on site
Q2.5 Is the site well located to address local unemployment?

2009 Update: 

Q2.6 Is the site brownfield, having regard to the definition provided in draft PPS3?

No

Overall sustainable development score:

Reasoning:

Strategic Planning

Q3.1 Could the site provide local jobs for local people?

Q3.2 Is the site within an area identified as of strategic importance? For example to the delivery of the RSS, RES, HMRP?

No

Q3.3 Does the site have potential to contribute towards the creation of sustainable communities, having regard to the recommendations of the Babtie study?

2009 Update: 

Overall strategic planning score:

Reasoning:

Any other comments - i.e. note sale/sign boards, current site activity, general views on suitability for employment use:

Additional recreation information - is there evidence of the site being used for informal recreation purposes?

Overall assessment score

Reasons for overall score:

2009 Update: 

Site is within the proposed housing area of the Waverley new community for which the Council has resolved to grant permission, therefore is unlikely to be available for
Recommendation:  Re-allocate to non-employment allocation