dlp planning consultants

dynamic development solutions

Ref: ME/SB/NYk2314/BMBCLet2
Date: 7th February 2014

For the Attention of Elaine Ward
Development Management
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
PO Box 604
S70 9FE

Dear Ms Ward,

RE: Strafford Arms Hotel, Park Drive, Stainborough
(App. Ref. 2013/1129 and App. Ref. 2013/1179)

Further to our telephone conversation last week and having discussed the proposed development with your colleague Kevin Ellam, I thought it may be worth outlining the position in respect of the Applicant (Punch Taverns PLC) on those outstanding matters. It is understand that there remain issues in respect of the following:

- Whether sufficient car parking is provided in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Guidance adopted by Barnsley MBC in March 2012

- Whether appropriate accommodation can be made in respect of servicing and delivery vehicles within the site.

- The benefits to the Listed Building.

It can also be confirmed that the proposal for French doors to be installed in the front elevation of the building have been removed from the development scheme in order to address those matters raised in respect to retaining the character of the building.

Car Parking Provision

On the first of these matters it is our view that the development proposals are in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Document (March 2012) on parking. Herein it is stated that the Maximum Number of Spaces Allowed for A3 restaurants and A4 are as shown in the extract in Figure 1 below.

It is important to recognise that Table 1 of the SPG clearly refers to these being the Maximum Number of Spaces Allowed rather than the required provision as seems to be being suggested in consultation responses. Also the provision of car parking space for fixed dining areas is merely an aspect which can be considered. It is clear that car parking spaces for fixed dining areas are an optional amount which can be considered. With this in mind and based on the

previous information given in the Agents email to you on the 2nd December 2013, the following is a summary of those figures as established at this stage.

1 space per 4m^2 of gross floor area for customers will be provided = 37 (based on 146m^2).

1 space per residential staff = 2.

1 space per 3 non-residential staff on duty at busiest time = 2 (based on 6 non-residential staff).

This would equate to 41 car parking spaces being the maximum allowed under the terms of the SPD. The development proposals are able to accommodate 50 car parking spaces as shown laid out on the latest Site Layout 2920 PL02 Rev C. This means there is a surplus of 9 spaces which can be accommodated by the optional amount of additional car parking offered to fixed dining areas.

Use	Barnsley Urban	Borough wide (excluding Barnsley Urban)	Threshold above which standard applies*
A3 Restaurants and cafes and A4 Drinking Establishments			
Licensed Restaurants/Public Houses	1 space per 4 m^2 gross floor area for customers 1 space per residential staff 1 space per 3 non-residential staff on duty at the busiest time. Where there are fixed seating areas for diners 1 space per 3 diners can be considered	1 space per 4 m^2 gross floor area for customers 1 space per residential staff 1 space per 3 non-residential staff on duty at the busiest time. Where there are fixed seating areas for diners 1 space per 3 diners can be considered	All development

Figure 1

It is also worth noting that the SPD on Parking may be considered out of date in respect of its conformity with national planning guidance as its preparation pre-dates the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) and refers throughout to the previous advice contained within Planning Policy Statements. While the development proposals are considered to be in accordance with the guidelines set out in Table 1 of the SPG, the weight to be attributed to The Framework in respect of favouring sustainable development must be substantial particularly paragraph 14. Paragraph 17 is also of noted in respect of those points made that planning should:

not simply be about scrutiny, but instead be a creative exercise in finding ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives; proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs.

Taking into account the above it is not considered reasonable to pursue a recommendation that planning permission be refused due to a reduction in the amount of car parking. The previous consultation on this matter (4th November 2013) set out that reducing the parking spaces from 45 to 40 would be unacceptable. This is no longer the case and the offer of 50 parking spaces would appear to meet the policy requirements, is within the maximum amount allowed and the development proposals offer an opportunity to materially benefit the existing public house.

Delivery and Service Areas

The Site Layout 2920 PL02 Rev C indicates car parking spaces laid out to the rear to the public house in an area which had previously been identified as the service and delivery yard area in the Existing Layouts.

It is understood that there are concerns in respect of Highway Development Control Officers that the newly proposed layout may result in deliveries not being able to be accommodated. To this end a management strategy ensuring that deliveries can use the area to rear of the public house at appropriate times is considered appropriate. This strategy could be made subject to a planning condition, requiring the submission of a strategy to show how this space would be managed.

Alternatively a condition to keep the area to the rear of the public house free of staff and patrons vehicles to allow deliveries could be imposed. Alongside a condition restricting delivery times to the public house a service / delivery yard would be kept available. It is understood that Highways Development Control Officers are concerned that such conditions would be difficult to enforce however this sort of management strategy is not uncommon in public houses, nightclubs and other entertainment industries in order to avoid anti-social disturbance with deliveries and refuse collections. Similarly the second condition would be monitored and enforced.

"No deliveries shall be taken at or despatched from the site after 6pm on weekdays nor at any time on Saturdays, Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority."

> *"No car parking to the rear of the property (spaces 41-49 as identified on Site Layout Drawing No. 2920 PL02 Rev C) shall be allowed before 6pm on weekdays, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority."*

The effect of these conditions would result in the area of car parking at the rear of the property being kept free for deliveries outside of peak hours of operation, while it could be used for parking during the busiest times, effectively as an overflow parking area. This would also relate well to the third criteria of car parking provision for A3 and A4 uses in the SPD as it refers to staffing levels at the busiest times. This recognises there is a fluid nature to the demand for parking.

Subject to these proposed drafted conditions it is considered that there would be sufficient control over the proposed car parking so as to properly operate a service and delivery area. This would mean the amount of car parking provided on site as proposed (50 spaces including 2 disabled bays) would increase the existing provision (45 spaces with no dedicated disabled bays) by 5 spaces. Although this is a relatively modest increase it cannot be considered that the redevelopment does not appropriately accommodate the level of car parking associated with the proposed extended use of the public house.

Benefits of the continued use of the Listed Building as Public House.

In respect of the provision for delivery vehicles, the need for a service area in addition to more parking spaces needs to be balanced with the benefits that the proposed development will bring.

Furthermore, the Applicant has agreed to amend the development by removing the French doors from the front elevation as proposed. Following discussions with yourself it is understood that this is considered to assist in retaining the character of the building and as such would contribute to those wider benefits in respect of heritage conservation.

In this respect the conservation, refurbishment and continued use of this Listed Building and the promotion of the public house as a community asset is a significant benefit.

The Framework identifies that it promotes this as per the following:

> *"the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship."* (paragraph 28)

And

dlp planning consultants

dynamic development solutions

Ref: ME/SB/NYk2314/BMBCLet2
Date: 7th February 2014

To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:

- *plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;*
- *guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community's ability to meet its day-to-day needs;*
- *ensure that established shops, facilities and services are able to develop and modernise in a way that is sustainable, and retained for the benefit of the community; and*
- *ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing, economic uses and community facilities and services.*

(paragraph 70, my emphasis)

The Framework supports enabling development that secures the conservation of heritage assets and at Paragraph 140 advises that:

"Local Planning Authorities should assess whether the benefits of a proposal for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with planning policies but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, outweigh the disbenefits of departing from those policies."

Given the proposed development at the Stafford Arms Hotel will facilitate the continued use and conservation of this Listed Building and promotion of the public house as a community asset, this should be balanced against other policy requirements and guidance. In this respect the material benefits that may be accrued from the development in respect of the heritage value of the site and the community value of the use are considered to outweigh even the perceived conflict with the car parking SPD.

Conclusion

I trust the above set out a means by which to provide an appropriately managed delivery area while offering car parking provision in accordance with the maximum number of car parking spaces allowed out in the adopted SPD.

While there may be some concerns in respect of the Highways Development Control Officers comments, the material benefits of securing the long term viability and continued use of this Listed Building is considered to be a compelling argument for allowing the development proposals.

dlp planning consultants

dynamic development solutions

Ref: ME/SB/NYk2314/BMBCLet2
Date: 7th February 2014

If you have any concerns in respect of the above or wish to discuss these proposals further please do not hesitate to contact me via the details below.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Edgar BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI
Director