
2021/1660

Applicant: SYPTE

Description: Widening of highway including Old Mill Lane Bridge from three lanes to five lanes to include provision of bus lane and widened paths. Alterations to bridge structure to support extension to bridge deck. Realignment of riverside access track and repositioning of access stairs. Relocation of gas governor, memorial, bus shelter and Asda recycling centre. Removal of trees covered by Tree Preservation Order.

Site Address: Old Mill Lane including Old Mill Lane Bridge to the east of the Asda Store. Old Mill Lane bridge crosses over the River Dearne

2no. letters of objection have been received.

Site Description

The Old Mill Lane Bridge is located to the north of Barnsley Town Centre and forms part of the A61 leading to Wakefield Road. The bridge is part of the route connecting Barnsley Town Centre to Wakefield to the north and the M1 to the south, which forms part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) for a short stretch between the A616 and the M1 junction 36 at Tankersley.

To the north of the site are large retail units including Greggs and the Salvation Army donation centre. Further large retail units including Aldi and Wickes are also located to the east of Old Tannery Road to the east side of the A61 Old Mill Lane. The River Dearne passes under the Old Mill Lane bridge from west to east, with extensive tree planting lining the River Dearne corridor.

To the south of the site is a large retail unit containing a B&M Store, to the west is an Asda Superstore and its associated car park, a McDonalds Drive through restaurant and further tree planting. The site includes the north eastern corner of the Asda car park, which leads to an access track onto the riverside path, a gas governor, pedestrian access and egress onto Old Mill Lane.

Background

The application site forms part of the A61 corridor, which is a strategic route linking Barnsley to Wakefield and the M1 motorway. The route currently suffers from congestion, significant delay and journey time variation for buses and general traffic.

Arup undertook a feasibility study in 2017 to assess the impacts of a range of potential interventions along the A61 corridor in Barnsley. The study found that the Old Mill Lane bridge is a bottleneck for southbound traffic (towards the town centre), and that the benefits of other junction improvement schemes along the corridor would only be realised once the bridge widening scheme is in place. The bridge widening is therefore considered to be a crucial starting point to deliver other potential interventions in the future.

Proposed Development

The applicant seeks permission to widen the existing highway at Old Mill Lane, including the Old Mill Lane Bridge. The existing bridge currently comprises three lanes, with a pedestrian footway on either side of the carriageway.

The proposals would widen the highway to provide five lanes each measuring 3.5m in width. This would include four lanes and a separate bus lane. A widened path would be provided on either side of the carriageway. The bridge would be widened by approximately 7m to accommodate the additional lanes, resulting in a total width for the bridge of approximately 25m.

Alterations would be made to the bridge structure to support the proposed extension. Access stairs leading from the bridge to the Trans-Pennine Trail (TPT) below would also be repositioned to take into account the relocated edge of the widened bridge. The widening of the A61 would require the relocation of the existing bus stop and bus shelter, an existing gas governor and a memorial

located within landscaping between Old Mill Lane and the Asda car park. A number of trees would be lost including trees covered by a TPO on the northern bank of the River Dearne.

Policy Context

To the extent that development plan policies are material to an application for planning permission the decision on the application must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless there are material considerations that indicate otherwise (section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

The Local Plan was adopted by the Council in January 2019 and the Council has also adopted a series of Supplementary Planning Documents which are other material considerations.

The National Planning Policy Framework represents up-to-date government planning policy and is a material consideration that must be taken into account where it is relevant to a planning application

The site is located within and in close proximity to a number of designations and constraints.

Greenspace known as 'Fleets Dam' and 'Dearne Valley Old Mill' is identified on the Council's policies map within the Dearne Valley river corridor. This land is also identified as a Local Wildlife site recognised as having biodiversity and/or geological value (Old Mill Lane). It is designated for a Daubenton's bat roost within a culvert to the east of Old Mill Lane. The greenspace is also within the Green Belt, defined as land to be kept mainly free from development. Land east of Old Mill Lane is defined as a Nature Improvement Area on the Council's policies map.

Flood risk maps identify the site as being within Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3) because the Old Mill Lane bridge crosses the River Dearne.

To the north-west side of the application site is a group (G1) of trees covered by Tree Preservation Order (TPO) No. 38. To the north-east side of the site is a mixed deciduous woodland (W1) covered by TPO reference no. 5.

Therefore the following policies are relevant:

Policy AQ1 Development in Air Quality Management Areas

Policy LG1 The Location of Growth

Policy T1 Accessibility Priorities

Policy T4 New development and Transport Safety

Policy BTC9 Cycling

Policy BTC10 The Green Sprint

Policy SD1 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development

Policy GD1 General Development

Policy GI1 Green Infrastructure

Policy GS1 Green Space

Policy GS2 Green Ways and Public Rights of Way

Policy G12 Canals – Safeguarded Routes

Policy GB1 Protection of Green Belt

Policy D1 High Quality Design and Place Making.

Policy HE6 Archaeology

Policy Poll1 Pollution Control and Protection

Policy BIO1 Biodiversity and Geodiversity

Policy CC2 Sustainable Design and Construction

Policy CC3 Flood Risk

SPD's

Those of relevance to this application are as follows:

- Sustainable Travel
- Trees and Hedgerows
- Biodiversity & Geodiversity

NPPF

The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. At the heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole; or where specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted or unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Paragraphs of particular relevance to this application include:

Para 7 - The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

Para 11 – Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Para 92 - Planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places

Para 98 – Access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well being of communities, and can deliver wider benefits for nature and support efforts to address climate change.

Para 100 – Planning policies and decisions should protect and enhance public rights of way and access, including taking opportunities to provide better facilities for users, for example by adding links to existing rights of way networks including national trails.

Para 105 - The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health.

Para 111 - Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

Para 126 - The creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of

sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

Para 147 – Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Para 150 – Certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These include [b] engineering operations and [c] local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location.

Para 174 – Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment.

Para 180 - When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles: [...]

d. development whose primary objective is to conserve or **enhance biodiversity** should be supported; while opportunities to **improve biodiversity in and around developments** should be integrated as part of their design, especially where this can secure **measurable net gains for biodiversity** or enhance public access to nature where this is appropriate

Consultations

Air Quality Officer – No objections

Biodiversity – No objections subject to s106 and conditions

Conservation Officer – No objections

Drainage – No objections subject to a condition

Environment Agency – No objections subject to obtaining Environmental Licence

Highways – No objections subject to conditions

Natural England – No observations made

Pollution Control – No objections

PROW – No objections

SYMAS – No objections subject to conditions

The Coal Authority – No objections subject to conditions

Tree Officer – No objections subject to conditions

Yorkshire & Humber Drainage Boards – No objections

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust – No objections subject to conditions and licences

Representations

Letters were sent to 18no. neighbouring properties, a site notice was erected within the area and a press notice was published in the Barnsley Chronicle. 2no. letters of objection have been received. The main points of concern are;

- The signalised junction at the South side of the site need modifying
- Loss of trees, some with Tree Preservation Orders
- Detrimental impact to wildlife
- Potential knock on effect to surrounding road network
- Planned/future development within the area would have a detrimental impact in the future

Assessment

Principle of development

Part of the site is located within the Green Belt. NPPF Paragraph 147 states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. However, paragraphs 149 and 150 set out certain forms of development which are not inappropriate within the Green Belt where they would preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Parts b and c of paragraph 150 include engineering operations and local transport infrastructure as not being inappropriate, as such, in principle the works subject to this application would not be inappropriate within the Green Belt or require special circumstances to be justified. Furthermore, the scheme would not conflict with the purposes of including the land within the Green Belt.

Commented [B,A(LDMA1)]: I would expect that we'll be able to say that there is no conflict with the purposes of including land in the GB either

Commented [H,J(PPM2R1)]: I've added an additional sentence to that effect.

Policy LG2 encourages development in Urban Barnsley as the main focus for housing, employment, shopping, health, leisure, business and public services in the region. The A61 currently forms a key route connecting Barnsley Town Centre south to Wakefield and north to the M1. The development proposals will help to address existing issues along this section of highway. The policy also outlines the importance of Barnsley Town Centre and the proposed works will provide a sustainable transport solution by helping to encourage future development in Urban Barnsley and support its role as a sustainable location and focus for growth.

The development provides accessibility improvements to Barnsley Town Centre and will help to fulfil its sub regional role to support existing town centre uses and encourage new retail and town centre development. The transport improvements will help to maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, improving the attractiveness of town centre facilities and services in accordance with Policy TC1 of the Local Plan.

The Accessibility Priorities Diagram accompanying Policy T1 identifies Urban Barnsley within the Accessibility Improvement Zone (AIZ). The proposals are supported by modelling evidence which demonstrates that the development will improve sustainable transport and circulation in the AIZ and part of the core bus network. In particular, this will provide improved journey times, bus connections which are more reliable and will encourage more sustainable travel through walking and cycling. Accordingly, the development helps to achieve the accessibility priorities set out in Policy T1 of the Local Plan.

In terms of Local Plan policy T5 'Reducing the Impact of Road Travel' the scheme will provide improvements for a range of modes of travel and ensuring the road system is used more efficiently. In particular, the bus will become a more attractive option, supporting a transition from reliance on the private car and reducing the overall impact of road travel. The scheme will also enable potential for further improvements to the A61 corridor in the future.

The area in which the bridge is located is within the Dearne Valley Green Heart Corridor which forms part of Barnsley's Green Infrastructure network. Policy GI1 of the Local Plan seeks to protect open space within these corridors. Whilst the proposals would widen the Old Mill Lane bridge which crosses the Green Infrastructure asset, the scheme does not intend to significantly affect the use of the space for a range of opportunities including recreation and biodiversity enhancement.

Residential Amenity

Although there are residential properties within the area these are generally a significant distance from the application site. The uses immediately adjacent to the proposed improvement works are generally more commercial in nature. In any case, the improvement works are not anticipated to generate additional traffic but to allow the existing traffic to flow through the area better, as such, arguably the proposed works would be of benefit to local residents and neighbouring land users, in accordance with Local Plan policy GD1.

There will be noise and disturbance during construction but this will be controlled through method statements and suitably worded conditions.

Commented [B,A(LDMA3)]: Nightworks?

Commented [H,J(PPM4R3)]: I have asked Dan Elis for comments on construction/phasing/working patterns etc.

Visual Amenity

The bridge deck will be precast concrete with a 1.5m high vehicle parapet with mesh infill. The deck will be supported by 900mm diameter reinforced concrete piles. The carriageway proposes a widened highway finished with a black bituminous footway and cycleway.

The proposals would impact on existing landscape features alongside Old Mill Lane in order to deliver the physical works and enable construction. This includes the loss of trees alongside the Asda car park and the bridge, including the loss of trees forming part of the protected group to the northern bank of the River Dearne. However, earthworks will tie the proposed development into existing levels adjoining the site. This will enable soft landscaping and replacement planting along the western extent of the development which will provide a high-quality environment following completion of the works and once established. In addition, the works will be viewed against the backstop of the majority of the trees and vegetation that would be retained in the immediate area. As such, the proposed works would not have a significantly detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the streetscene in accordance with Local Plan Policy D1.

The Barnsley Landscape Character Assessment from 2002 identifies the site within the C3 character area. The 2016 review confirms that the character area is largely unaffected since the 2002 assessment. Key characteristics of the C3 Landscape Character area include that transport and communication routes. Bridges over the valley floor are recognised as a key feature of the landscape within the Landscape Character assessment. There will be some loss of mature trees to accommodate the widened bridge, although the bridge will continue to be viewed in the context of the existing highway infrastructure. The group of trees to the north of the bridge will largely be retained and will continue to provide a transition to the Dearne Valley Green Heart Corridor along the river valley.

The impact on Biodiversity and trees will be explored further under the headings below.

Highways

As outlined above, the proposal stems from a feasibility study undertaken in 2017 to assess the impacts of a range of interventions along the A61 corridor, a strategic arterial route linking Barnsley to Wakefield and the M1 motorway. The study concluded that the Old Mill Lane bridge is a bottleneck for southbound traffic and notwithstanding the benefits that this scheme brings, the benefits from other junction improvements along this corridor would only occur once this scheme has been implemented. The overall aim of the proposal is to reduce congestion and delay and improve journey time reliability along this key route.

Transport modelling has been undertaken to identify resultant journey time **benefits** and a Transport Statement has been submitted in support of the application. In addition as part of the submission and continued design refinement both Stage 1 and Stage 2 Road Safety Audits have been undertaken and reviewed by the Local Highway Authority as well as the requisite Approval in Principle (AIP) for both existing and proposed bridge structures, accepted by BMBC, as the Technical Approval Authority.

The Transport Statement that has been submitted with the application is summarised below in terms of highway safety and highway capacity:

Highway Safety

Personal Injury accident data was reviewed for the five year period 2016-2020 covering a study area of the proposed scheme and 150 metre approaches to and from A61 and A635. A total of 26 collisions occurred within the study area during this period, of which 8 were "serious" and 18 "slight". Of the 26 collisions, 5 occurred within the scheme extents. The review concluded that there are not any road safety concerns on the highway network that are likely to be exacerbated by the proposal. Notwithstanding this conclusion, the scheme is subject to full independent road safety audit process in accordance with the requirements contained within DMRB GG119.

Highway Capacity / Scheme Impact Assessment

Commented [B,A(LDMA5)]: I am thinking that these should be quantified somewhere

Commented [H,J(PPM6R5)]: There is a table provided showing different scenarios at different times and is quite complex to summarise simply. There are no real headline figures, the report just concludes that 'The highway improvement scheme on Old Mill Lane helps to alleviate the existing inbound bottleneck by creating additional capacity. The PM peak assessment results show the proposed scheme to have a minimal impact on journey times due to a dominant outbound flow. However, for the Saturday peak, the results show that the scheme achieves its objectives by significantly reducing inbound journey times for buses and general traffic.'

Commented [B,A(LDMA7)]: Do we know when the memorial death was?

The performance of the scheme and local highway network was undertaken using an Aimsun microsimulation model covering Old Mill Lane and A61 to the south, Bar Lane and A61 Wakefield Road to the north and B6132 Carlton Road to the east. This covers periods of greatest traffic impact namely weekday PM peak (16:30-17:30) and Saturday peak (12:15-13:15) identified from baseline traffic survey data. A number of assessment scenarios were used for the local highway network covering 2023 and 2040.

To assess the impact of the scheme on the performance of the highway network, model outputs were produced including vehicle journey times for a number of routes (*subpaths*) through the model as well as system statistics outputs for the model as a whole. The results demonstrate that the additional capacity provided by the scheme helps to alleviate congestion and delay at this bottleneck on the network. Whilst these are minimal in the PM peak (due to the dominance of the outbound traffic flow), the Saturday peak results show significant journey time savings for both bus services and general traffic. Furthermore, the flow statistics indicate a significantly higher number of vehicles are able to pass through the modelled network as a result of the **scheme**.

Therefore in highways terms, the proposed development provides improvements to the capacity of the local highway network and this locale and network resilience for the future. Accordingly there are no objections to the proposed development from a highways perspective subject to suitably worded conditions and informatives being applied to any subsequent planning consent.

Loss of Parking Space

The proposal results in the loss of 13no. spaces within the Asda car park. These spaces are under utilised at present and are located in one of the furthest points from the store entrance, as such, the loss is not considered to have a material impact on the operation of the car park nor operation of the highway network.

Trees

An Arboricultural Report and Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted alongside the application.

There are 2no. Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) in force on this site, a woodland TPO (Ref: 5, number W1) to the East of the site and a group TPO (Ref: 38, number G1) to the West of the site. The presence of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) represents the Local Authority's desire to retain trees within the landscape. As such, trees covered by a TPO are generally more likely to require retention within a proposed scheme and this should be taken into account during the design process. In some cases, the removal of TPO trees may be agreed upon, providing the benefits of the proposed development are deemed greater than the material loss of the trees.

It should be noted that there is little room for the proposed road layout without the removal of trees. 6no. category 'B' trees/groups/woodlands and 1 category 'C' tree are proposed to be removed which include a section of the woodland TPO.

Ultimately in order for the road improvements to go ahead the tree removals highlighted are required. Whilst the removal of these trees will be of detriment to the arboricultural values of the site, it is recognised that the retention of trees is only one consideration in the planning decision process. The loss of these trees must be weighed against the benefits of the proposed development in the usual manner.

Throughout this report the benefits of the road widening scheme have been highlighted, particularly in the principle and highways section above. As such, on balance, although the loss of trees is regrettable it is not a significant enough reason to outweigh the benefits brought by the scheme. The Councils Tree Officer has been consulted on the application and has, on balance, no raised objections subject to a suitably worded landscaping condition for replacement and conditions for the protection of the retained trees during construction.

Biodiversity

Commented [B,A(LDMA8)]: How about the construction phase? Methodology, timescales, duration? lane closures? Nightworks?

Commented [H,J(PPM9R8)]: I have asked Dan Ellis for these details

The application is accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and Otter and Bat Surveys which consider the effects of the proposed development on protected species. The assessments demonstrate that protected species would not be harmed as a result of the development. Mitigation measures are proposed, including obtaining Natural England licences and carrying out construction works at times of the year when the impacts on biodiversity can be minimised. These mitigation works would be secured using suitably worded conditions.

The latest Biodiversity Net Gain Metric and associated report submitted with the application indicate a loss of 2.27 Habitat Units (61.33%) and 0.05 River Units (15.22%). As such, the applicant will need to enter a section 106 agreement with the Council to pay a tariff which would be used for appropriate off-site mitigation projects. The tariff is currently £25000 per unit, as such, the payment in this instance would equate to £58,000.

The Biodiversity Officer has raised no objections to the proposal subject to the s106 agreement and suitably worded conditions requiring a Biodiversity Enhancement Management Plan (BEMP), a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and a Bat Method Statement.

Coal Mining

The application site falls within the Coal Authorities defined Development High Risk Area; therefore within the application site and surrounding area there are coal mining features and hazards which need to be considered in relation to the determination of this planning application.

Coal Authority records indicate that part of the site is in an area of likely historic unrecorded coal mine workings at shallow depth. If shallow coal workings are present, they may pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety.

The planning application is supported by a Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Desk Study Report, dated 24th July 2018 and prepared by ARUP and a Ground Conditions and Contaminated Land Assessment Report, dated 5th April 2019 and prepared by ARUP. Both of these reports have content which considers the potential risks posed by coal mining legacy issues to the development proposed.

The Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Desk Study Report concludes that coal seams may be present at shallow depth and that any voids or workings present may be within influence of the foundations. They note that this should be confirmed by ground investigations.

Section 6.2 of the Ground Conditions and Contaminated Land Assessment Report addresses issues of coal mining legacy. The report makes reference to ground investigations carried out in 2018 with coal seams encountered at depths of 17.5m and 38.9m with no evidence of workings. The report authors state that the shallowest seam has a low likelihood of workings due to its limited thickness and poses a very low risk to the development with no further works necessary. In respect of the deeper coal seam the report authors comment that this lies at sufficient depth such that it also represents a very low risk to the development and that no further works in this respect are necessary. It is assumed that the report authors are satisfied that the investigatory works carried out are adequate to properly assess the risks posed by past coal mining activity.

On the basis of the information submitted, and the professional opinions of the report authors, the Coal Authority and SYMAS have raised no objections to the proposed scheme.

Drainage

A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted in support of the application. The site location is within fluvial Flood Zone 2 and 3 with a high risk of flooding. Due to the project being deemed *essential infrastructure*, an Exception Test has been conducted and showed the wider benefits to the community outweigh the change to flood risk. The development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Fluvial flooding is the largest risk to the site. The river cross section will remain as existing. The existing and extended section of bridge will remain as a clear span deck constructed between the abutments, therefore, no additional supports etc. will be located below the bridge soffit level causing intrusion, potential blockage or interference with continuity of flow in the watercourse.

Impacts in all events modelled do not impact any sensitive receptors. The increase in peak flood extent does not encroach on any property or receptors, there is no additional hazard to any roads and it does not significantly increase flood risk to third parties.

The mitigation measures proposed include increasing the steepness of embankments at the base of the bridge on the upstream side. This prevents additional water being held in storage upstream or downstream and prevents increase to fluvial flood risk. It also negates the addition of a retaining wall in the scheme.

The Environment Agency, Yorkshire & Humber Drainage Boards, Yorkshire Water and the Councils drainage team have been consulted on the application and not raised objections, subject to suitably worded conditions.

Air Quality

An Air Quality Management Area (Barnsley AQMA No. 4) is located to the south of the site. An Air Quality Assessment has been prepared which includes a review of existing air quality conditions in the vicinity of the proposed development and provides an assessment of the potential changes in air quality arising from the construction and operation of the proposed development.

There is no predicted change in traffic movements from the widening and re-decking of the A61. The proposed scheme will relieve congestion and the effect of the proposed scheme on local air quality is therefore not considered to be significant. The Councils Air Quality Officer concurred with the findings and raised no objections to the proposal.

Contamination

The applicants have submitted a Ground Conditions and Contaminated Land Assessment Report alongside the application. The report concludes that there is no evidence of significant ground contamination, however, they acknowledge that sampling was limited due to access issues and therefore recommend a supplementary ground investigation to be carried out during site enabling works to confirm the anticipated ground conditions. This will be subject to a suitably worded condition.

Archaeology

An archaeological desk-based assessment and monitoring of preliminary ground investigation works has been undertaken and accompanies the application. An assessment of the significance of any recorded heritage assets within a 500m zone has been undertaken, together with an assessment of any potential impacts. A map regression exercise and walkover survey identified remains relating to a 19th-century water management system to the north of the river.

The desk-based assessment established that there is potential for buried archaeological features of interest to be encountered during the proposed works. These are likely to relate to mill buildings that previously occupied the site, as indicated by the remains of the mill race noted immediately to the west of the proposed development area.

Given the potential archaeological implications South Yorkshire Archaeological Service (SYAS) have not raised objections to the proposal but have requested a suitably worded condition requiring the submission and approval of a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).

Public Rights of Way

The plans show a diverted public right of way to join onto Old Mill Lane adjacent to the corner of Asda Car Park, with low level fencing provided to segregate the route from the car park. The applicants have been liaising with the Councils Public Rights of Way (PROW) team to agree a mutually acceptable design and layout.

The PROW team have raised no objections to the current proposal but have reiterated that the only way that a PROW can be moved is via a formal diversion order, which is an entirely separate

Commented [B,A(LDMA10)]: Would it have a beneficial impact on the AQMA? What does the AQ report say?

Commented [H,J(PPM11R10)]: It states that there will be no change in movements but will relieve congestion resulting in a change in vehicle speeds, however, that is not a criterion for an air quality assessment of traffic emissions. As such, the report conclusion is 'the effect of the proposed scheme on local air quality assessment is therefore considered to be not significant'. The AQA focuses more on dust during construction.

process to planning and subject to its own consultations and fees. Applications have to pass through both informal (i.e. pre-legal order) and formal consultation stages before a temporary closure is granted to enable works to start.

Summary

Part of the site is located within the Green Belt where NPPF Paragraph 147 states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. However, paragraph 150 parts b and c goes onto state engineering operations and local transport infrastructure are not inappropriate development, as such, the works subject to this application would not be inappropriate within the Green Belt or require special circumstances to be justified. Furthermore, the scheme would not conflict with the purposes of including the land within the Green Belt.

The Accessibility Priorities Diagram accompanying Policy T1 identifies Urban Barnsley within the Accessibility Improvement Zone (AIZ). The proposals are supported by modelling evidence which demonstrates that the development will improve sustainable transport and circulation in the AIZ and part of the core bus network. In particular, this will provide improved journey times, bus connections which are more reliable and will encourage more sustainable travel through walking and cycling. Accordingly, the development helps to achieve the accessibility priorities set out in Policy T1 of the recently adopted Local Plan.

In terms of Local Plan Policy T5 'Reducing the Impact of Road Travel' the development would put measures in place to enable the road system to be used more efficiently, providing sustainability benefits to a range of road users and associated benefits on the local environment. In particular, the bus will become a more attractive option, supporting a transition from reliance on the private car and reducing the overall impact of road travel. The scheme will also enable potential for further improvements to the A61 corridor in the future.

Policy LG2 encourages development in Urban Barnsley as the main focus for housing, employment, shopping, health, leisure, business and public services in the region. The A61 currently forms a key route connecting Barnsley Town Centre south to Wakefield and north to the M1. The development proposals therefore will aid to address existing issues along this section of highway. Furthermore, the development provides accessibility improvements to Barnsley Town Centre and will help to fulfil its sub regional role to support existing town centre uses and encourage new retail and town centre development. The transport improvements will help to maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre, improving the attractiveness of town centre facilities and services in accordance with Policy TC1 of the Local Plan.

The application is also considered acceptable in relation to the other considerations set out in the assessment section of the report including visual and residential amenity, drainage, contamination risk, coal mining risk, Air Quality, Archaeology and the relationship with the adjacent Public Right of Way subject to appropriately worded conditions.

As outlined in the report, the development accords with the majority of local and national policies, however, there is some conflict. The area in which the bridge is located is within the Dearne Valley Green Heart Corridor which forms part of Barnsley's Green Infrastructure network. Policy GI1 of the Local Plan seeks to protect open space within these corridors. In addition, policy BIO1 expects development to conserve and enhance the biodiversity and geological of the borough. Whilst the proposals would widen the Old Mill Lane bridge which crosses the Green Infrastructure asset, the scheme does not intend to significantly affect the use of the space or the protected species within it. It is noted there would be a net loss of biodiversity across the site, however, the moderate loss, on balance, would not outweigh the described benefits of the scheme. In addition, the application is subject to a s106 agreement for compensation payments to be made for off-site mitigation.

Similarly, it is also noted that there will be a loss of trees, including some subject to Tree Preservation Orders as a result of the development. Again, the moderate impact, is unfortunately unavoidable and, on balance, is outweighed by the wider benefits of the scheme.

Taking into account the relevant development plan policies and other material considerations the application is predominantly in accordance with the development plan. Where the development

Commented [B,A(LDMA12)]: The draft conditions appear to cover a lot of bases on first glance but I couldn't find anything PROW related. I'm not sure that the main layout plan contains detailed construction specifications for the new linkages

Commented [H,J(PPM13R12)]: I didn't put anything in against the diversion order as it is covered by separate legislation and the applicants are aware through discussions with Rik. The colour general arrangement drawing shows the PROW link to be the same construction as the footway with the diverted section a segregated part of the existing tarmac access.

Commented [B,A(LDMA14)]: I would expect that we'll be able to say that there is no conflict with the purposes of including land in the GB either

Commented [H,J(PPM15R14)]: Sentence added to that effect

Commented [B,A(LDMA16)]: How about policies T1 'Accessibility priorities' and T5 'Reducing the impact of road travel'? Both of those look to be something that we should be attributing significant weight to. Especially the parts about implementing measures to ensure that the road system is used efficiently, improving sustainable transport and circulation in the accessibility improvement zone, enhancing the non car role of the transport corridor, promoting high quality public transport to other neighbouring towns including Wakefield. Also is there anything in the NPPF that we can make reference to? Surely there are some positive policies to make reference to concerning highway and public transport improvement works?

Commented [H,J(PPM17R16)]: Reference to T1 and T5 added and I have amended the ending of the summary to reference the conflicts/balance as well as para 105 of the NPPF.

conflicts with these policies, the moderate impact is considered unavoidable and, on balance, is outweighed by the wider benefits of the scheme as a whole. Furthermore, compensation arrangements and mitigation measures will be put in place to minimise these impacts.

In National Planning Policy terms (NPPF) the presumption in favour of sustainable development is considered to apply also (para 11) which is that proposals that accord with an up to date development plan should be approved without delay. Paragraph 105 also applies which states the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health.

The recommendation is one of approval therefore subject to a S106 agreement the conditions listed below.

Recommendation

Grant subject to a S106 agreement and conditions