

---

# Ex Ante Sustainable Development Appraisal of the South Yorkshire Integrated Development Plans

A Final Report for the South Yorkshire Objective One Team

---

ECOTEC  
Research & Consulting Limited

Priestley House  
28-34 Albert Street  
Birmingham B4 7UD  
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)121 616 3600  
Fax: +44 (0)121 616 3699  
Web: [www.ecotec.com](http://www.ecotec.com)

# Ex Ante Sustainable Development Appraisal of the South Yorkshire Integrated Development Plans

A Final Report for the South Yorkshire Objective One Team

C2011

ECOTEC Research and Consulting Limited

Priestley House  
28-34 Albert Street  
Birmingham B4 7UD  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 (0)121 616 3600  
Fax: +44 (0)121 616 3699

Web: [www.ecotec.com](http://www.ecotec.com)  
E-mail: [welcome@ecotec.co.uk](mailto:welcome@ecotec.co.uk)

13b Avenue de Tervuren  
B-1040 Brussels  
Belgium  
Tel: +32 (0)2 743 8949  
Fax: +32 (0)2 743 7111

19 Buckingham Gate  
London SW1E 6LB  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 (0)20 7630 6090  
Fax: +44 (0)20 7630 6339

31-32 Park Row  
Leeds LS1 5JD  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 (0)113 244 9845  
Fax: +44 (0)113 244 9844

## Contents

Executive Summary and recommendations .....	1
1.0 Introduction .....	3
2.0 Policy context for sustainable development.....	4
3.0 Sustainable development objectives and assessment criteria.....	5
3.1 The Regional Sustainable Development Framework.....	5
3.2 Aims.....	5
4.0 Cross cutting issues across the IDPs .....	8
4.1 Vision / Mission statement.....	8
4.2 Objectives / strategic themes .....	8
4.3 Assessment of the IDPs against each of the themes .....	10
4.3.1 Good quality employment opportunities available to everyone.....	10
4.3.2 Conditions which enable business success, economic growth and investment .....	10
4.3.3 Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population .....	11
4.3.4 Conditions and services which engender good health .....	11
4.3.5 Safety and security for people and property.....	11
4.3.6 Vibrant communities which participate in decision making.....	12
4.3.7 Culture, leisure and recreation opportunities available to all.....	12
4.3.8 Local needs met locally.....	13
4.3.9 Quality housing available to everyone .....	13
4.3.10 A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impacts	13
4.3.11 A bio-diverse and attractive natural environment .....	16
4.3.12 Minimal pollution levels .....	16
4.3.13 Minimal greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	16
4.3.14 A quality built environment and efficient land use patterns that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promote balanced development .....	17
4.3.15 Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	17
Annex 1: Individual appraisal of nine IDPs by the SD criterion .....	18
Annex 2: regional sustainable development aims and objectives .....	19

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This report reviews the seven IDPs against the fifteen Regional Sustainable Development criteria (RSDF) that were developed by Yorkshire and Humber's Regional Sustainability Commission. Policies articulated in Yorkshire and Humber's RES and RPG were also used.

The Vision / Mission statements of all seven of the IDPs are consistent with the broad aims of the RSDF though are clearly focused on attracting the attention of the investment community.

In general the strategic objectives are closely aligned to the built environment, economic and transport objectives articulated in the RSDF. The Strategic objectives have less to say on the natural environment, energy and natural resources. The projects commissioned under the IDP are likely to impact on these RSDF aims so the Strategy objective statements in the IDP should signal the importance of these issues.

Our analysis of the broad project outlines identified in the IDPs suggest the documents are in sympathy with the RSDF and significant efforts have been made to incorporate improvements in the IDPs to further enhance their performance.

Overall the specific projects and sites the IDPs are putting forward have the potential to encourage significant inward investment of high growth and high pay sectors into the South Yorkshire area. The implications for sustainable development of these broad objectives are clearly positive. They will provide good quality employment, business growth and investment, a catalyst of education and training and assist in the development of vibrant communities. How much P1 and P2 targeting can be achieved in practice is debatable - this may in part be reliant on the strength of the cluster plans in identifying spatial and physical demands and subsequently helping to bring these forward – more explicit linkages could be made here.

Our main reservations are with the M1 and M18 SEZs where further effort is needed to operationalise sustainable transport thinking into developments. Very significant efforts will have to be made to encourage the use of sustainable transport patterns at these sites. We however commend the proposed Integrated Implementation Plans (IIPs), which provide developers a platform for setting out site specific transport plans (and other issues).

We have a number of detailed recommendations to make the IDPs more consistent or to further enhance performance vis-à-vis the RSDF:

- ❑ We are concerned that the IDPs documents should not actively discourage firms outside the priority sectors from locating in new developments.
- ❑ We recommend that IDP zones develop information packs detailing the availability of training schemes to provide to project developers. We also recommend that the weighting system rewards projects providing work-trials or demonstrating a pro-active attitude to training of their employees.
- ❑ IDPs could characterise the baseline better and then set out how the local community fits into the wished for economic structure. At present it is unclear the extent to which skills within the local community compliment the skills being sought by the sectors South

Yorkshire is seeking to attract. These comments are consistent with the wider ex ante work that has been undertaken of the plans.

- The IDPs nearly all identify the lack of green space within the urban centre. Whilst we understand the difficulties on on-going revenue commitments, it would nevertheless, be useful if ideas were put forward to remedy this.
- We believe new projects should be asked to make contact with the Regional Supply Office in the first instance when deciding upon their choice of suppliers - that way more sustainable local supply networks can be developed where possible.

Many sustainable development issues are best addressed at the level of the individual project. We were attracted to the IIP concept set out in the Part B SEZ (Table 10.1: Main Elements of the Integrated Implementation Plan). The recommendations below should be assessed and scored from the IIP. The proposed IIPs will be submitted by developers and include details of the planned development including engagement with the local community, use of local labour, site marketing, childcare, energy efficiency, biodiversity, transport and waste management.

- Within the SEZ much thought has gone in transport issues however further measures are needed to facilitate the introduction of sustainable transport patterns. These are:
  - recognise and reflect the spatial framework provided in the RPG;
  - setting aside funds to subsidise the trialling of new bus routes / timetables or ‘works buses’ from particular communities;
  - restricting parking provisions on new sites;
  - providing cycle lanes, changing areas and cycle racks;
- We recommend that procedures are introduced to ensure that activities financed from the Environmental Fund are over and above statutory requirements set out by English Nature or any other competent authority.
- The SEZ IDPs suggest that all substantial projects should be subjected to a full Environmental Impact Assessment (for projects greater than £4 million). This seems a sensible strategy and we recommend this be extended to the City centre sites also. The local planning authority, in consultation with the competent environmental authority might recommend an EIA be carried out for other environmentally sensitive projects also.
- We recommend that new buildings are constructed to achieve BREEAM 98 (Building Research Establishment Environmental Appraisal Methodology) Very Good or Excellent standards in terms of their transport, energy and materials. This is an area where the wider ex ante appraisal identified scope for enhancement in most of the plans.

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

ECOTEC Research and Consulting were asked to undertake sustainability appraisals of the seven Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) produced for setting guidance for Objective 1 Programme funding for the South Yorkshire sub-region. This work complements, the wider ex ante appraisals of the IDPs ECOTEC is performing for the Objective 1 Directorate undertaken between December 2000 and May 2001 looking at economic, property, transport and cross-cutting issues (sustainability and environment, social inclusion and equality and ICT).

This report highlights our impressions of the Part A of the four Urban Centres (Barnsley, Rotherham, Doncaster and Sheffield), and the three SEZs ( Dearne Valley , M1 corridor and M18 corridor). The Part B “Delivery Plans” dated March 2001 were also briefly reviewed where more detail was necessary.

We have divided the appraisal into the following areas:

Section 1: this section: the introduction;

Section 2: the policy context;

Section 3: Regional Sustainable Development Framework (RSDF)

Section 4: In-depth sustainable development appraisal of the IDPs

Annex 1: Comments on each of the seven IDPs in terms of each the RSDF criterion

Annex 2: Aims and objectives of the RSDF

## **2.0 POLICY CONTEXT FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

Sustainable development is an over arching policy that balances economic, social and environmental objectives. Under the Treaty of Amsterdam, the Union’s fiscal instruments are required to work, simultaneously and in the long-term interest, towards economic growth, social cohesion and the protection of the environment, in other words sustainable development.

In this report the sustainable development appraisal uses Yorkshire and Humber’s Regional Sustainable Development Framework (RSDF) to judge the performance of the IDPs. The aims and objectives of the RSDF are used to appraise all the regional strategies most notably Yorkshire and Humber’s RES and the RPG.

As well as the RSDF sustainable development objectives, criterion and statements of intent appear in the SPD. In Part 3, Chapter 4, Programme Theme 5 “Sustainable Development” is identified as a “programme coherence topic”. Other Programme Themes: *1 Environmental Protection and Sustainability*; *3 Promoting Equal Opportunities for all* and *6 Promoting Employability in the labour market* also touch upon issues at the heart of sustainable development.

Programme theme 5 identifies that project selection will “...address sustainability through two approaches: particular actions ...and ...through appropriate selection and scoring methods for projects.” It recognises that although not every project will aim for integrating social and environmental goals the project should at the very least assess for the impacts on these issues whether positive, negative or neutral. The purpose of this broader assessment of effects is to ensure that social and environmental well-being is not sacrificed during economic regeneration. The importance of such issues appearing in the IDPs guidance documents is stressed: “applicants will need to recognise these issues during the planning, implementation and monitoring stages of projects. This process will require guidance to be produced for those preparing projects.”

The IDPs are fundamentally 15 year strategies and a 6 year delivery plans to guide the spatial development of seven discrete areas. Objective 1 rules more generally and Priority 5 rules more specifically restrict the type of projects that can be financed. For instance areas such as the provision of housing or general environmental improvement cannot be financed from Objective 1 money. The IDPs have to therefore set out a vision and objectives for an area such as mixed and affordable housing but also explain clearly which components of this vision can be supported by European financial assistance, alternative sources of funds or will have to be financed from private sources.

### **3.0 SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES AND ASSESSMENT CRITERIA**

#### **3.1 The Regional Sustainable Development Framework**

The Yorkshire and the Humber Regional Chamber appointed a Regional Sustainability Commission, which comprises of a representative group of regional stakeholders. The Commission through an extensive series of consultations with other stakeholders has produced sustainable development Aims and Objectives for the region, which have a high level of regional ownership. The Aims and Objectives are used to appraise policy strategies within the region.

Fifteen Yorkshire and the Humber sustainable development aims have been proposed. These regional aims have been reviewed to ensure they contribute to the four objectives of the UK national strategy. Table 1 shows how they relate to each other. A full list of aims and criteria is shown in Annex 2.

#### **3.2 Aims**

The table below lists Yorkshire and Humber's Sustainable Development Aims and relates these back to the UK's SD strategy. Altogether there are fifteen aims: 2 with economic objectives; 7 with social objectives; 4 with environmental objectives and 2 with resource efficiency objectives.

These aims cut across the subject matter of earlier assessments of the IDPs covering housing, economic, environment and social exclusion. This appraisal reinforces points made in ECOTEC's previous reports - the "Ex Ante Appraisals of the Urban Centre Integrated Development Plans (IDPs) for Priority 5 (Parts A and B)".

The IDPs are written to guide the Programme's Priority 5: Supporting Business Investment through Strategic Spatial Planning. Clearly with this purpose in mind, the IDP and hence this appraisal will focus more closely on SD Aims with a strong spatial planning impacts (Aim 10 transport, Aim 2 business success and Aim 14 efficient land use) than on concerns that are less directly influenced by spatial planning (Aim 4 health, Aim 5 crime). However an important strand in SD thinking has always been that issues cannot be compartmentalised; and that decisions on spatial planning have repercussions on crime and health because of the dynamics of communities and social infrastructure.

**Table 1: Relationship Between National and Regional Sustainable Development Aims**

<b>UK National Sustainable Development Strategy Objectives</b>	<b>Yorkshire and the Humber Sustainable Development Aims</b>
Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Good quality employment opportunities available to everyone</li> <li>2. Conditions which enable business success, economic growth and investment</li> </ol>
Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population</li> <li>4. Conditions and services which engender good health</li> <li>5. Safety and security for people and property</li> <li>6. Vibrant communities which participate in decision making</li> <li>7. Culture, leisure and recreation opportunities available to all</li> <li>8. Local needs met locally</li> <li>9. Quality housing available to everyone</li> </ol>
Effective protection of the environment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impacts</li> <li>11. A bio-diverse and attractive natural environment</li> <li>12. Minimal pollution levels</li> <li>13. Minimal greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change</li> </ol>
Prudent use of natural resources	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14. A quality built environment and efficient land use patterns that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promote balanced development</li> <li>15. Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste</li> </ol>

*Source: Regional Sustainable Development Framework (RSDF): Final Draft January 2001.*

*Note: Allocation of aims to the four UK strategic objectives provided by ECOTEC.*

### **3.3 Regional Planning Guidance**

The Secretary of State's proposed changes to the RPG was issued in March 2001. Many of its policies have a significant bearing, and often spell out in more detail regional policy on particular aspects of sustainable development as applied to the IDPs. These policies are given below. The list is slightly different from that in Figure 3.2 of the RPG because certain issues (e.g. Education and Health) are not a major preoccupation of the IDPs though of course they are important in the context of sustainable development more generally.

- S1 Applying the Sustainable Development Principles
- S2 Regeneration Priority Areas
- S3A Urban & Rural Renaissance
- S3B Wise use of non-renewable resources
- P1 Strategic patterns of development
- P1C Urban & Rural Design
- E2 Main Town and City Centres
- E4 Employment site selection & development criteria
- E3 Planning the overall provision of employment land
- E4 Employment site selection & development criteria
- E5 Managing the Employment Land Portfolio
- E6 Tourism
- T0 Land use & transport integration
- T1 Personal Transport
- N1 Biodiversity
- N3 Conserving & enhancing landscape character
- N4 Forestry
- N4A Agricultural & environmental support measures
- N5 Protection of coasts & estuaries
- N5A Development and Flood Risk
- N5B Water resources & drainage
- N6 Mineral extraction
- N7 Waste Management
- N7A Energy & heat generation & transmission

In this SD appraisal of the IDPs reference will be made to many of the above policies especially to provide greater detail any regional targets or standards that IDPs need to take account of.

### ***3.4 Regional Economic Strategy***

Yorkshire Forward have issued the Regional Economic Strategy. Sustainability and social inclusion are two of the RES's six objectives. Within this objective eight specific actions are identified including improved transport provision; strategic development of the Dearne Valley; optimal use of land; initiatives to improve the use of resources and enhanced regional environment.

## **4.0 CROSS CUTTING ISSUES ACROSS THE IDPS**

### **4.1 Vision / Mission statement**

The Vision / Mission statements of all seven of the IDPs were consistent with the broad aims of the RSDF though were clearly focused on attracting the attention of the investment community.

In general the Vision statements emphasised the desire to attract business especially in new and emerging parts of the economy (ICT; advanced manufacture; knowledge based services). The statements did not usually mention the natural environment, nor social issues; Barnsley: (“To create an innovative and supportive business environment that creates entrepreneur, fulfils lifestyle aspirations and will surprise, inspire and retain investors”). There were exceptions (Rotherham: “To develop strategic alliances and partnerships between public, private sector and the local community that will deliver economic, environmental and social improvement throughout the urban centre and its environs.”). As the wider ex ante appraisal picked up, the quality of the built environment was mentioned more often than the natural environment (Doncaster: “The Urban centre attracts significant visitors especially to its quality shops and leisure attractions”). The Long Term Aim statements in the SEZ IDPs were directed towards the investor community: Dearne Valley SEZ “...long term aim is to become a recognised knowledge economy location providing both lifestyle and work opportunities for the knowledge worker. It will contribute towards building a balanced, diverse and sustainable high growth economy...and offering opportunities to the whole community.”

In general the Vision statements were supportive of the RSDF’s two economic aims and either supportive or did not make reference to the social, environmental and resource agendas.

### **4.2 Objectives / strategic themes**

Most of the IDPs set out a statement of strategy or objectives in which they provided a more specific list of their how the Vision is to be achieved.

The table overleaf shows the extent to which the fifteen RSDF aims were picked up in the broad strategic themes or broad objectives of the IDP. In a number of cases IDPs identify both *Objectives* and *Strategic themes*. Where this is so both lists are used.

The IDP documents often articulated the need to change outside perceptions of the area in order that outside skills and finances might be attracted. The Doncaster IDP made a number of specific references to bringing in retail and especially high quality retailing space into the town centre.

The three SEZ identify a small number of high level objectives and a much larger number of more parochial short-term objectives.

**References to the RSDF aims in the IDP Strategic aims and overall objectives**

<b>Yorkshire and the Humber Sustainable Development Aims</b>	<b>Bar</b>	<b>Don</b>	<b>Roth</b>	<b>Shef</b>	<b>Dea- rne</b>	<b>M1</b>	<b>M18</b>
Good quality employment	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Business growth and investment	✓ ✓	✓	✓ ✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Education and training	✓	✓ ✓	✓				
Good health			✓				
Safety and security		✓					
Vibrant communities	✓	✓	✓				
Culture, leisure and recreation	✓		✓	✓			
Local needs met locally	✓ ✓	✓ ✓			✓	✓	✓
Quality housing	✓	✓	✓				
Transport	✓ ✓	✓ ✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Natural environment			✓				
Minimal pollution levels							
Minimal greenhouse gas							
A quality built environment	✓		✓ ✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Energy and natural resources					✓	✓	✓

Notes: -

- ✓ ✓ - aim is strongly made in the statement of strategy or objectives
- ✓ - aim is mentioned in the statement of strategy or objectives

In general the strategic objectives are closely aligned to the built environment, economic and transport objectives articulated in the RSDF. The objectives and strategic themes set out the desire to stimulate more and better paid employment; encourage business investment; improve the quality of the built environment; enhance access (especially using public transport). The objective / strategy generally emphasise the aim to meet *labour* needs locally, though it hardly every phrased like this.

The urban IDPs include many more ‘life-style type’ objectives stressing the aim to aid training, enhance community interaction and improve the quality of housing. Investments in such projects (especially housing) are not necessarily covered by Objective 1 and so it is neither necessary nor appropriate to mention such issues prominently. Energy and natural resource efficiency appears only patchily (in the SEZ IDPs only), natural environment, minimising pollution and minimising greenhouse gases do not appear at all. The relatively low profile of environmental issues is surprising since the type of projects that are likely to be stimulated as a result of Priority 5 spending, namely the development of brown and green-field sites, the provision of supporting infrastructure and site landscaping all have important implications on greenhouse gas emissions, energy use and the natural environment. **We would view it as important that the broad objectives/strategy statements in the IDP signal the importance of these issues**, in the context of the IDP document.

### **4.3 Assessment of the IDPs against each of the themes**

This section appraises the IDPs against each of the fifteen aims. This assessment is based chiefly on the type and profile of indicative projects set out in the Part A IDP document though reference will be made to the delivery plan where appropriate. It is worth making the point at the outset that by their very nature one could not expect the IDPs to address each of the fifteen RSDF aims with equal weight. A document that sets out the vision for an area's spatial development cannot be too prescriptive on issues of personal security or health. All it can reasonably do is recognise that these are important concerns within the region.

#### *4.3.1 Good quality employment opportunities available to everyone*

All the IDPs set out a mix of sectors they wish to attract into the area. In general these tend to be sectors that are believed to have better growth potential and offer staff higher wages (typically those targeted by Priorities 1 and 2 of the Programme). As has been observed in ECOTEC's concurrent *ex ante* appraisal the IDPs vary dramatically in the quality of the baseline data (Recommendation: "Supply chain and cluster issues could be considered in more depth"). The Barnsley IDP presents a good review of existing cluster strength. The other IDPs are less thorough in the baseline position and therefore the proposed targets appear more aspirational. This is particularly evident in the SEZ IDPs where it appears that a thorough change in the sector character of the region is wanted. In the Dearne Valley SEZ the sectors targeted for growth are: Cultural and creative firms, hi-tech manufacture; advanced producer services; business and finance; environment and bio-sciences. At present about half the employment in the Dearne Valley EZ is in call centres. The M18 Corridor IDP states that between 75% and 80% of the new space will be needed by incoming firms.

From a SD perspective the choice of sectors being targeted for expansion are clearly attractive. They offer high wages, have a good environmental performance and have the potential to grow and stimulate the local economy. How much P1 and P2 targeting can be achieved in practice is debatable - this may in part be reliant on the strength of the cluster plans in identifying spatial and physical demands and subsequently helping to bring these forward – more explicit linkages could be made here. **We are concerned that the IDPs documents should not actively discourage firms outside the priority sectors identified from locating in the sites.** Some of the phrasing of the IDP might be interpreted in this way.

#### *4.3.2 Conditions which enable business success, economic growth and investment*

The IDPs are generally strong at identifying and seeking to address this SD aim. The general approach taken is to provide a wide variety of different types of "incubator" site, office and manufacturing in units of different sizes or either refurbished or new sites. Assistance is also given to supporting transport infrastructure and landscaping. In the urban IDPs these developments are zoned (Rotherham: Business and Industry zone in Northfield and Don Island for instance). Several of the IDPs identify 'perception issues' as restricting investment into a region and seek to address this through marketing and communications strategy. A

number of IDPs identify abnormally high rates of new business failure (relative to the average for the UK) in the first three years and propose a system of support.

In general we feel the IDPs offer a balanced and appropriate of support to encourage business support success and economic growth and investment.

We would however recommend there might be opportunities to pool expenditure on marketing across the IDPs if there is an issue with perception for South Yorkshire as a whole – we understand that delivery issues are currently being considered in this context.

#### *4.3.3 Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population*

The issue of Education is not a central theme of Priority 5 funded projects but of course the success of the projects cannot be separated from the existence and maintenance of appropriately skilled staff locally. We were encouraged by the attention given in the Sheffield and Barnsley IDPs to programmes being run by Sheffield University on entrepreneurial skills. Most of the IDPs provided good information that would be of interest to investors and incoming firms on local LSC/ESF training. The SEZ IDPs mention other initiatives including pre-recruitment training and work trials both of which will benefit employees and local community ownership.

We recommend that IDPs develop information packs detailing the availability of such schemes to provide project developers. We also recommend that the weighting system rewards projects providing work-trials or demonstrating a pro-active attitude to training of their employees.

#### *4.3.4 Conditions and services which engender good health*

There is little explicit mention of health issues in the IDPs. It is expected that all projects comply with statutory and local health and safety mandates.

There are also safety aspects to the design of roads and we would expect projects to identify appropriate measures for traffic calming and protection of people, especially vulnerable people, from transport accidents. In practice there are already clear guidelines laid down by the Highways Agency, local authorities and other transport authorities.

#### *4.3.5 Safety and security for people and property*

Safety and security are mentioned in IDPs usually in the context of particular projects that have been undertaken to improve safety in public spaces. These have included the introduction of CCTV in public spaces and better security/lighting in car-parks. These seem sensible and we hope where relevant Priority 5 projects bring forward such ideas.

#### *4.3.6 Vibrant communities which participate in decision making*

This RSDF aim seeks to improve community participation in decision making, build up community confidence, improve the supply of community facilities and support the work of volunteers.

The projects likely to be put forward by in the context of the IDPs *have the potential to significantly enhance community participation and strength*. They can do this primarily by drawing on local communities for labour, and dialogue with community groups during the drawing up of the IDP documents.

Community life can also be enhanced during the project implementation phase by the inclusion of public amenities (seating, water fountains, toilets) in sites, design of public space in urban settings (parks, areas for communal interaction). Such ideas could significantly enhance the quality of life within the towns and contribute to the overall objective of changing perceptions about the South Yorkshire region and help draw in skilled technical and entrepreneurial talent from outside the sub-region.

One of the principal motivations for setting up the IDPs is to enhance the strength of communities by increasing the quantity and variety of employment opportunities in the areas. In this respect they have a clear and important beneficial role in enhancing community strength. To quite a large extent the IDPs are presenting a case for a radical change in the industrial composition of the sub-region bringing in high skill and high growth sectors following the reduction in size of traditional industry.

This is an ambitious ‘project’ and would be aided by a clear picture of the strengths and aptitudes of the local economy. The Barnsley IDP is to be commended on the good baseline data it supplies on the size and makeup of the existing economic base. The Dearne Valley SEZ also gives some detail on the existing types and patterns of employment. However all the IDPs could characterise the baseline better and then set out how the local community fits into the wished for economic structure. At present to IDPs appear to rely more on external entrepreneurs and capital rather than local communities making these changes. With a well set-out baseline data on current economic activities and skills it will be easier to propose an appropriate training to assist the local community.

On the issue of public consultation during the IDP development the Rotherham IDP appears to be more ‘strategic’ than community oriented. The Doncaster IDP effort is to be commended drawing up a summary leaflet of the IDP which is distributed to a 100 community organisations and including meeting with community groups early in the IDP development process.

#### *4.3.7 Culture, leisure and recreation opportunities available to all*

With the exception of Sheffield the IDPs all identify the limited number of cultural and leisure opportunities as being a concern within their area. However the response to this concern varies significantly between the IDPs. Most seem to focus on expanding the retail offer significantly and also a vision of the urban centres becoming a 24/7 city. It is unlikely that this strategy will provide recreation opportunities *to all*. This is recognised in the

Barnsley IDP “There is a growing perception that the evening economy in Barnsley town centre is the domain only of a young ‘pub and club’ culture”. The urban IDPs do typically identify one ‘cultural’ project though the details are left vague. For instance the Doncaster IDP talks about the provision of a new cultural venue for Doncaster within the Waterdale Area; Rotherham’s IDP talks of investigating a new museum.

The IDPs nearly all identify the lack of green space within the urban centre. It would be useful if ideas were put forward to remedy this. The SEZ IDPs are also silent on the cultural and leisure opportunities on offer. There is however mention of some of the sites having to be extensively landscaped to enhance their visual and recreational quality.

#### *4.3.8 Local needs met locally*

The issue of how to encourage new entrant firms to source locally (in terms of labour and material supplies) is a major challenge for the IDP process. The existing skills-base of workers in the region will have to be developed to meet the needs of the intended new employers. Several of the IDPs have undertaken ward level analysis to match the location of IDP aided projects to areas with high unemployment.

We are encouraged by the thought that many of the IDPs have given to this issue. The SEZ IDPs mention the Regional Supply Office as being set up to act as a clearing house to bring local suppliers into contact with new industries. In particular construction and landscaping contractors could be locally recruited.

We believe new projects should be asked to make contact with the Regional Supply Office in the first instance when deciding upon their choice of suppliers.

#### *4.3.9 Quality housing available to everyone*

The provision of housing per se is excluded from Objective 1 funding so in general the IDPs have little to say on the matter. A number of IDPs do identify the lack of suitable ‘executive’ style houses as being a possible constraint on attracting the appropriate staff. It is expected that land will be released for appropriate housing development. The issue of affordable housing at the other end of the spectrum does not appear to be addressed.

#### *4.3.10 A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impacts*

This aim stated in the RSDF is to enhance accessibility but also to reduce environmental and health and safety impacts. In practice this means increasing the use of public transport, cycles and walking; reducing the use of cars or at least encouraging multiple occupancy. As a general principle freight should be transferred to rail. These points are made in the RPG’s policy T0 which states: “..Development that generates a large number of passenger movements should be located at or close to sites which provide, or as a result of measures included as part of the scheme or where there are firm proposals in the LTP will provide, ready and convenient access on foot, by cycle and public transport.”

Development and the new employment opportunities brought about by the development are likely to increase the demand for transport. Some of the Priority 5 projects will actually directly contribute to new transport infrastructure.

The IDPs make little reference to freight though we accept that the types of industries being targeted are not likely to generate substantial volumes of freight traffic.

### SEZs

At face value, there is an inherent contradiction between the location of the M1 and M18 corridor SEZs and the transport aim of the RSDF. Policy E4 of the RPG suggests restrictions on the types of development occurring in SEZs “Pure office should first look to town and city centres”. Very significant efforts will have to be made to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes at these sites. Though efforts have been made to stimulate the use of public transport within the IDPs these do not go far enough. The geography of communities has been dictated by the needs of the mining industry giving a dispersed pattern of residential development. Provision of conventional public transport system (relying on scheduled bus services) can be difficult to make work. The necessary volume and quality of major development proposed therefore poses some major challenges.

In general the SEZ projects (with the possible exception of the Dearne Valley) are not well served by public transport. Few of the sites are within 1 km of a railway station. Many of the sites are served by buses but are not ‘hubs’ so the range of routes is likely to be restricted. These are substantial impediments to access by public transport and the authors of the IDPs doubt that the SEZ will attain the overall target of 60% commuting trips by car. The SEZ projects do propose a number of positive proposals to encourage public transport including a call for a serious attempt to have employers develop Green Transport Plans. However these appear ill defined compared to measures on roads such as the £0.5 million set aside to aid proposal development work.

To a greater or lesser extent the IDPs analyse the accessibility and transport implications of the projects set out. In general there are a number of fairly robust proposals for road related schemes including road widening e.g. A6192 in the M18 Corridor IDP, enhancement of capacity of M1 at J31, 32 and 33 (M1 Corridor IDP). In contrast the proposed enhancements to rail, tram and Supertram extensions appear more speculative and unlikely to be implemented by 2008 when the Objective 1 projects will be implemented. The improvements in the Sheffield Barnsley line, Sheffield Worksop rail lines or the outline light rail connection from Rotherham to Dearne mentioned in the SEZ documents are still at discussion stages. We welcome the expenditure on Quality Bus Routes and recognise this will make a positive contribution within the IDP timeframe.

The M18 corridor SEZ in particular puts a great deal of emphasis for the possible opening of Finningley airport (“If the current application for a civil airport at Finningley is turned down it would have a serious impact on Doncaster’s longer term economic regeneration programme.”). Air transport has significant environmental impacts in terms of carbon dioxide emissions, land use and noise and it is quite possible the current rate of growth in air transport will not be sustained. There is a debate the relative importance of access to airport for the success of the site. The size, scale and extent of services will obviously have a bearing. Many

of these issues will be resolved in the context of the emerging national regional airport strategy.

We believe more could be done to discourage individual car use and we suggest:

- ❑ regionally significant employment sites must recognise and reflect the spatial framework provided in the RPG. Failure to do so will generate significant impacts which are unsustainable, in particular, additional traffic, further exacerbating congestion on the strategic highway network, increasing the move to car based travel to work, reducing social cohesion and undermining investment in the urban and rural renaissance;
- ❑ setting aside funds to subsidise the trialling of new bus routes / timetables or ‘works buses’ from particular communities. Bus services so provided would need to be reviewed to ensure that there is sufficient patronage;
- ❑ restricting parking provisions on new sites (mentioned in the M1 SEZ for Waverley site) Table 7.4 of the RPG gives proposed maximum parking standards for the region;
- ❑ providing of cycle lanes and changing facilities; and
- ❑ proactive efforts by firms to encourage car-sharing, including changes to work times and practices to allow co-ordination between employees.

We believe much of these measures could be implemented within the proposed pilot Integrated Implementation Plans (IIP) being advocated in the SEZ IDPs. These IIPs provide an excellent template for developers to set out and detail their planned approach to encourage alternatives to single occupant car use.

#### City Centre sites

These locations are inherently easier to serve with public transport. Perhaps as a result, the discussion of measures on enhancing public transport use is less well thought through than the SEZs. Barnsley’s IDP is an exception to this rule; though the Sheffield IDP is also quite strong. One or other of the two provide good baseline data on bus patronage, the balance between long and short term parking spaces and the need for improved real time public information on buses and parking spaces.

The Doncaster IDP calls for more parking spaces without any demonstration that they are presently in short supply. This appears on the face of it directly contrary to the RSDF aims. The Rotherham IDP makes number of speculative suggestions about the super-tram and use of the riverside / canal as a transport corridor.

The absence of good baseline data makes appraisal difficult. Such an appraisal should really be done in the context of the LTP. However the following data would be of use in the IDP context:

- ❑ data on long and short term parking spaces, evidence of whether these are sufficient;
- ❑ information on congestion;
- ❑ access: travel times by car, bus and walking within the city at peak and off-peak times.

Measures to increase public transport patronage are like those for SEZ. Many of the IDPs recognise the need to improve inter-change / hub facilities and real time data on car park space and bus delays. IDPs have also identified the need to improve the signage in town and cities. We endorse this since it would improve traffic flows and also reduce stress and the reduce the number of accident on roads. All of these are important in the City centre context.

#### *4.3.11 A bio-diverse and attractive natural environment*

The IDPs in general have little to say on this issue. The main exception is the SEZ IDPs which are to be applauded for their explicit guidance on creating green corridors for the wild animals to move between habitats. The IDPs also set aside funds (5% of the SEZ budget some £3.5 million) for an Environment fund to support such expenditures.

**We recommend that procedures are in place to ensure that activities financed from this fund are over and above statutory requirements made by English Nature or any other competent authority.**

It is a matter of some concern that none of the City Centre IDPs are explicitly proposing projects to enhance green space within the city centres. The RPG makes the desire for greater urban green space quite clear under its policy PIC(g): "...recognise the particular importance of access to urban greenspace and to countryside at the urban fringe. Appropriate strategies should be developed between local authorities and relevant agencies to secure integrated management and enhancement of such areas." We note also the RPG under policy N4 specifically recommends greater afforestation: "Expanding the area of "woodlands by the motorway", concentrating on the motorways in South Yorkshire in the first instance."

#### *4.3.12 Minimal pollution levels*

Relatively little reference is made to pollution in the IDP documents. In general the IDPs tend to encourage industries that have good pollution performance and in several cases sites used for steelworks and coal mining are being reclaimed. Both of these actions are likely to improve pollution levels. The Sheffield IDP discusses the introduction of an Air Quality Management Zone.

The SEZ IDPs suggest that all substantial projects (>£5 million) should be subjected to a full Environmental Impact Assessment. This seems a sensible strategy and we recommend this be extended to the City centre sites also.

#### *4.3.13 Minimal greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change*

The location and design of new buildings has a substantial impact upon the energy efficiency hence greenhouse has emissions from a building. The SEZ IDPs mention that project proposals should be checked to ensure they meet energy efficiency standards.

We would go further and recommend that new buildings are constructed to achieve BREEAM 98 (Building Research Establishment Environmental Appraisal Methodology) *Very Good* or *Excellent* standards in terms of their *transport, energy and materials*. These standards award scores on the basis of location, lighting, thermal conductivity and materials used in construction. It is expected that the SEZ projects will score lower because of their location. The full BREEAM appraisal gives marks for “health & well being” and “site ecology”, which are outside the scope of this RSDF aim. It would be appropriate to include this issue within the detailed IIP mentioned above. We note that greenhouse gas emissions are amongst the primary headlines indicators in the Regional Economic Strategy.

*4.3.14 A quality built environment and efficient land use patterns that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promote balanced development*

In general the IDPs propose to make use of brown-field sites and resources are set aside for landscaping of sites. In general therefore the IDPs will have a positive role impact on the RSDF aim. The M18 Corridor is the exception in that it is making extensive use of green-field sites (53% green-field) because of the lack of suitable brown field sites within the area. This is a matter of some concern in terms of the RSDF and we would encourage the evaluation criterion to direct investment to the brown-field sites within the SEZ where-ever possible.

*4.3.15 Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste*

We feel that use of the BREEAM 98 would address most of the issues under this aim. We were encouraged by the suggestion in some of the IDPs to introduce waste handling and recycling measures. These are welcomed.

**ANNEX 1: INDIVIDUAL APPRAISAL OF SEVEN IDPS BY THE SD CRITERION**

**ANNEX 2: REGIONAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

<b>Sustainable Development Aim</b>	<b>Objectives</b>
1 Good quality employment opportunities available to everyone	• provide employment opportunities for local people
	• promote or support equal opportunities
	• increase or promote health and safety at work
	• support the voluntary sector and / or promote volunteering
	• maximise local skills
2 Conditions which enable business success, economic growth and investment	• support entrepreneurs and / or increase the business birth rate
	• encourage inward investment
	• enhance competitiveness through advice, mentoring and / or support
	• set up and support local and regional supply chains
	• increase investment in plant, machinery and R&D
	• support community based businesses and / or support help schemes e.g. credit unions
3 Education and training opportunities which build the skills and capacity of the population	• promote lifelong learning
	• provide appropriate on-the-job training
	• improve levels of basic skills and / or ICT skills
	• ascertain skills / skills training gaps and / or provide specialised training support for areas in transition
	• provide and promote sustainable development education
4 Conditions and services which engender good health <i>If health impacts are a significant result of the activity, consider a health impact assessment</i>	• improve access to health services
	• reduce the causes of ill health and / or accidents
	• treating ill health
	• provide health education
	• address health inequalities and / or undertake health improvement measures
5 Safety and security for people and property	• reduce crime through design measures

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• address the causes of crime and / or reduce crime through intervention</li> <li>• prevent re-offending</li> <li>• provide crime and safety advice</li> <li>• reduce fear of crime</li> <li>• improve transport related safety including standards of driving</li> </ul>
6 Vibrant communities which participate in decision making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• build community capacity and confidence</li> <li>• increase community participation in activities and / or in the democratic process</li> <li>• where appropriate devolve decision making to communities</li> <li>• support the community sector and volunteers</li> <li>• support civic engagement</li> <li>• improve and increase community facilities</li> </ul>
7 Culture, leisure and recreation activities available to all	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase provision of CLR activities / venues</li> <li>• increase non car based access to CLR activities</li> <li>• increase participation in CLR activities by tourists and local people</li> <li>• provide support for CLR providers and / or creative industries</li> <li>• preserve, enhance and promote regional culture and heritage</li> </ul>
8 Local needs met locally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide direct support for local traders and suppliers through advice, information and training</li> <li>• support formation, maintenance and use of local and regional supply chains for goods and services</li> <li>• ensure that essential services and resources to serve communities are within reasonable non car based travelling distance</li> <li>• provide appropriate housing for local needs</li> <li>• support the vibrancy of city, town and village centres</li> <li>• investigate ICT links to connect geographically remote and disadvantaged groups to services and resources</li> </ul>
9 A transport network which maximises access whilst minimising detrimental impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide / improve / promote alternatives to car based transport</li> <li>• support more efficient use of cars (e.g. car sharing)</li> <li>• make the transport environment attractive to non car users (pedestrians, cyclists etc.)</li> </ul>

*If transport impacts are a significant*

*result of the activity,*

*consider a transport impact assessment*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improve the environmental performance of road vehicles</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• encourage freight transfer from road to rail and water</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduce the need to travel by increasing access to key resources and services by means other than the car</li> </ul>
10 A quality built environment and efficient land use patterns that make good use of derelict sites, minimise travel and promote balanced development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improve the resource efficiency of buildings (water, energy, density, use of existing buildings, designing for a longer life-span)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase the use of sustainable urban drainage to reduce surface water run-off</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase safety and security in new buildings and developments</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ensure new developments are balanced, making essential services accessible without use of a car</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide sympathetic and appropriate landscaping around new development</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improve disabled access to the built environment</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• support local distinctiveness</li> </ul>
11 Quality housing available to everyone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• make housing available to people in need (location, type, affordability)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• enable people to obtain and maintain tenancies</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improve the quality of the housing stock (energy efficiency, safety and security, reducing unfit housing)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase use of sustainable design and building materials (recycled, locally produced and less polluting materials) in construction</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reducing number of voids and difficult to let properties</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase the amount of accessible housing and that built to "lifetime standards"</li> </ul>
12 A biodiverse and attractive natural environment <i>If environmental impacts are a significant result of the activity, consider an environmental impact assessment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protect and enhance existing priority habitats and species populations and provide for appropriate long term management of wildlife habitats</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protect individual features such as hedgerows, dry stone walls and ponds</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase understanding of ways to create new environmental assets and restore wildlife habitats</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• make use of opportunities to enhance the environment as part of other initiatives</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase the quality and quantity of woodland cover in appropriate locations and promote access to wildlife on appropriate sites</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promote, educate and raise awareness of the enjoyment and benefits of the natural environment and biodiversity</li> </ul>
13 Minimal pollution levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clean up legacy pollution</li> </ul>
<i>If environmental impacts are a significant result of the activity, consider an environmental impact assessment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduce actual pollution (water, land, noise and light) and the risk of pollution</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• raise awareness about pollution and its effects</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promote innovative uses of pollutants</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide support, advice and encouragement for the business sector to reduce pollution</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• research measures to reduce pollution</li> </ul>
14 Minimal greenhouse gas emissions and a managed response to the effects of climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transport (choice of mode of transport, reducing need to travel, environmentally friendly fuels and technologies)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduce methane emissions from agriculture and landfill</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduce the emission of industrial greenhouse gases</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase energy efficiency in all sectors</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• research and monitor the likely effects of climate change and provide advice on the predicted consequences for affected sectors and areas</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduce the impacts of climate change</li> </ul>
15 Prudent and efficient use of energy and natural resources with minimal production of waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase efficiency in water and energy use</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• develop renewable energy resources</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• make efficient use of land (appropriate density, protect good quality agricultural land, use previously used land before greenfield sites)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase reuse, recovery and recycling of waste rather than landfilling it</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• increase awareness and provide information on resource efficiency and waste</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reduce use of non renewable resources</li> </ul>
<b>Cross cutting themes:</b>	
I) social inclusion and equity across all sectors:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has the activity considered different ways to overcome barriers to communication and participation?</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does the activity consider the needs of disadvantaged and minority groups?</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does the activity consider the needs of older and younger people?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does the activity consider the needs of disabled people?</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does the activity promote religious and racial understanding?</li> </ul>
ii) a partnership and participative approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has the planning of the activity involved working in partnership and the involvement of affected groups?</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has the activity enabled less well resourced groups to take part</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has the activity taken steps to consult and involve "difficult to reach" groups</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does the management of the activity involve stakeholders?</li> </ul>
iii) geographic adaptation to the needs of rural and urban communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has the activity taken into account the varying needs of rural and urban communities?</li> </ul>
iv) creativity, innovation and the appropriate use of technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has the activity taken steps to increase innovation?</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has the activity taken steps to use technology appropriately?</li> </ul>