
Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 13 June 2018

Site visit made on 13 June 2018

by Elizabeth Pleasant DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 July 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/W/17/3188501

Land South of New Smithy Avenue, Thurlstone, Sheffield S36 9QZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Phil Mullins against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/0088, dated 17 January 2017, was refused by a notice dated 30 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is outline planning application for residential development, with all matters other than access reserved.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for residential development, with all matters reserved other than access at Land South of New Smithy Avenue, Thurlstone, Sheffield S36 9QZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2017/0088, dated 17 January 2017, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Procedural Matters

2. The application is for outline planning permission, with all matters except for access reserved for future consideration. Drawings showing an indicative site layout and typical street scene were submitted with the application and I had regard to these in determining the appeal.
3. A completed deed of planning obligation made pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) has been submitted and includes obligations to come into effect if planning permission is granted. I will address this matter later on in my decision.

Planning Policy

4. The development plan for the area comprises the saved policies of the Barnsley Unitary Development Plan, adopted December 2000 (UDP) and the Barnsley Local Development Framework Core Strategy, adopted September 2011 (CS).
5. The Barnsley Local Plan Publication Draft was published in December 2016 (BLP). Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that decision makers should give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to: (1) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan; (2) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant

policies in the emerging plan; and (3) the degree of consistency of relevant policies to the policies in the Framework. The BLP is at a fairly advanced stage, given that it has now gone through some elements of the independent examination, albeit the Local Plan Inspector's final report has not yet been issued. Even though further work will be required to resolve the remaining issues and ensure the Local Plan strategy is sound (as set out in the Examining Inspector's recent post Hearings letter¹), I consider that the relevant policies in the emerging BLP for this case are broadly in accordance with the Framework and should carry at least moderate weight.

Background and Main Issues

6. There is no dispute between the main parties that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year land supply. The latest housing land supply report produced by the Council in August 2017 demonstrates that 8,056 new dwellings can be delivered against the target which equates to 4.01 years.
7. Paragraph 49 of the Framework says that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, and relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites.
8. The UDP Proposals Map identifies the appeal site as safeguarded land. Policy GS10 of the UDP states that in areas shown as safeguarded land on the proposals map existing uses will normally remain during the plan period and development will be restricted to that necessary for the operation of the existing uses. Otherwise, planning permission for the permanent development of such land will only be granted following a review of the UDP which proposed that development on the land in question.
9. Policy CSP 8 of the CS says that priority will be given to development in Urban Barnsley and the principal towns of Cudworth, Wombell, Hoyland, Glodthorpe (Dearne Towns), Penistone and Royston. It goes on to state that development will only be allowed in villages if it is consistent with Green Belt policy or is necessary for the viability of the settlement and to meet local needs.
10. The appeal site is currently agricultural land and within a village. The appeal proposal would not be for a development that would be consistent with Green Belt policy and I have not been provided with any substantive evidence that would lead me to conclude that the development is necessary for the viability of the settlement or to meet local needs. As such, the appeal proposal on safeguarded land would conflict with the development plan and in particular with Policy GS10 of the UDP and Policy CSP 8 of the CS.
11. However, the Council accept that the strict application of these policies would prevent improvement to the shortfall in the supply of housing and consequently only limited weight can be afforded to the proposal's conflict with those policies.
12. Furthermore, since the Council's decision to refuse the application, and as part of the evidence base to support the BLP, a further assessment of the Borough's villages has been undertaken. The Council now consider Thurlstone to be a

¹ Barnsley Local Plan Examination – Post Hearings, dated 24 May 2018.

sustainable village and do not dispute that the site lies in an accessible location.²

13. Accordingly, the remaining main issues in this case are:

- Whether the proposed development would prejudice the future development of adjoining safeguarded land; and
- The effect of the proposed development on highway safety, with particular regard to the efficient operation of the highway network in the vicinity of the appeal site.

Reasons

Whether the proposed development would prejudice the future development of adjoining safeguarded land.

14. The appeal site lies within the village of Thurlstone. It is approximately 0.9 hectares in area and comprises open grassland which is sandwiched between existing residential development on New Smithy Drive and High Bank. The existing and proposed means of access to the site is from New Smithy Avenue.
15. The land to the West of the appeal site and adjoining it is also designated as safeguarded land. Policy H7 of the UDP states that residential development should safeguard access and service opportunity for adjacent land which is allocated for housing or protected under Policy GS10 and GS11.
16. The proposed access to the site would be a single estate road extending from New Smithy Avenue through the site to terminate in a turning head at the end of the cul-de-sac. Layout for the proposed development is reserved for subsequent approval. However, a plan³ accompanying the appeal documents demonstrates that the proposed estate street could be extended to provide access to the remaining safeguarded land to the West. Furthermore, it has been suggested that a condition could be attached to any grant of outline planning permission that would require the layout the subject of reserved matters, to safeguard a means of access to the adjoining land.
17. The Council consider that the appeal site and the adjoining safeguarded land should be developed in a comprehensive manner. In addition, they believe the proposed development would be piecemeal development that would prevent full consideration of the existing parking constraints on the adjoining highway network.
18. I have not been provided with any substantive evidence to demonstrate that there is currently a desire to develop the wider area of safeguarded land, or that the proposed development would prevent such development. In addition, the size and shape of the appeal site is such, that even if it the site was to be developed as part of a wider scheme, alternative layouts would be limited. Moreover, Policy H7 only requires that access and service opportunities for adjacent land be safeguarded. It does not require the proposed development to resolve any on-street parking concerns on adjoining streets.

² Paragraph 5.13, Hearing Statement submitted on behalf of the Local Planning Authority.

³ Illustrative layout showing means of access to West, Ref: 17/227-100

19. I am satisfied that should the proposal be acceptable in all other respects, a suitably worded condition could be imposed on a grant of planning permission to require any layout submitted, as part of the reserved matters, to safeguard a means of access to the adjoining safeguarded land. The condition would be reasonable and necessary to ensure that the appeal proposal would not prejudice the future development of the remaining land and there would be no conflict with Policy H7 of the UDP.
20. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposed development would not prejudice the future development of adjoining safeguarded land. It would comply with the development plan and in particular I find no conflict with Policy H7 of the UDP.

Highway safety and the efficient operation of the highway network in the vicinity of the appeal site.

21. The proposed means of access to the site would be from New Smithy Avenue. The indicative layout shows that 21 dwellings would be served from a new internal access road that would be laid out to meet the standards set out in the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide, 2011 (SYRDG). The level of parking provision would also be in accordance with the Council's development plan requirements and provide at least one space per dwelling for those with one or two bedrooms and two spaces for dwellings with three or more bedrooms. A turning head would be provided to allow service vehicles, including refuse lorries, to enter and leave the site in a forward gear. The Council has not raised any concerns regarding the proposed internal site access arrangements or parking provision.
22. There is no dispute between the main parties that based on a proposal for 21 dwellings using data from the national TRICS database, the proposed development is anticipated to generate appropriately 12 trips during the morning peak (0800-0900 hours) and 13 trips during the evening peak hours (1700-1800 hours). It is estimated that the development would generate a daily trip rate of around 110 vehicle movements. Whilst at peak times, including during school dropping and picking up times, there is some localised congestion on Towngate and at its junction with Manchester Road, the main parties agree that this junction does not raise any capacity issues.
23. The Council's concerns, which are reinforced by third parties, relate to the geometry of the junction of Manchester Road with Towngate and its operation. Furthermore, existing on-street parking on New Smithy Avenue restricts the width of the carriageway to a single lane. On street parking also restricts forward visibility around the left hand bend on New Smithy Avenue which impacts upon the efficient flow of traffic. The efficient flow of traffic is also impeded by on-street parking and the vertical and horizontal alignment of Towngate just to the north of its junction with Manchester Road.
24. The junction of Towngate with Manchester Road has an acute angle. This means that unless vehicles approaching the junction from Towngate position themselves towards the centre of the road, then turning left onto Manchester Road can be awkward and result in vehicles crossing the centreline markings on Manchester Road.
25. Despite some dispute over whether or not the required visibility standards should be those set out in Manual for Streets 2 or the Design Manual for Bridges and Roads, it was agreed at the Hearing by both main parties that in

view of the traffic speeds along Manchester Road, which are within the 30mph speed limits, that the existing visibility is suitable for this junction. Some on-street parking immediately to the West of the junction does impede visibility at times; however in view of the low vehicle speeds this does not raise a highway safety issue.

26. It is clear from the photographic evidence provided by AECOM on behalf of the Council⁴, and from third parties, that the acute angle of this junction creates a situation where in some instances cars encroach over the white line marking in the centre of both Towngate and Manchester Road. During my visit to the site I also observed some encroachment, although for the most part cars did not stray from their carriageway. Although third parties advised at the Hearing that there had been of a couple of minor collisions at this junction involving street furniture, there have not been any recorded accidents. From the evidence I have before me and my own observations on site, I would concur with the main parties that despite the occasional need for some awkward manoeuvres and reliance on the courtesy of other drivers, in view of the low vehicle speeds in this location the junction operates safely. I have not been provided with any substantive evidence to demonstrate that the additional traffic associated with the proposed development would materially affect the continued safe operation of this junction.
27. The vertical and horizontal alignment of Towngate just to the north of this junction is such that when vehicles are parked along its eastern side between the junction of Manchester Road and The Crystal Palace Public House, inter-visibility between drivers travelling in either direction along a short section of road is restricted. However, this is for a very short section of the highway. Vehicles are either approaching or just leaving the road junction and consequently vehicle speeds are very low. It is clear that drivers of vehicles need to exercise care along this section of the highway, however in view of the low traffic speeds I do not consider that highway conditions are unsafe.
28. The layout and design of existing residential development on both New Smithy Avenue and New Smithy Drive is such that the majority of the properties do not have off-street parking space within their curtilages. Instead, off-street parking is provided in a couple of garage courts to the rear of the houses and there is a parking layby on New Smithy Drive. Whilst evidence provided with the appeal documents⁵ states that 23 of the 29 available garages are rented by occupiers of New Smithy Avenue and New Smithy Drive, it is clear that many occupiers choose to park closer to their homes or in some instances own more than one vehicle. Consequently, on-street parking is prevalent along the northern side of New Smithy Avenue and the carriageway restricted to a single lane.
29. High levels of on-street parking are not unusual on residential streets. The existing carriageway is generally 4.8m wide with 1.9m footways on either side and complies with the conventional street requirements provided with within the SYRDG⁶ for roads with speeds of 20mph and less. Anecdotal evidence was provided by third parties suggesting that on occasions the presence of on-

⁴ Hearing Statement, Prepared by AECOM, dated 26 March 2018

⁵ Paragraph 2.2.4, Highways Proof of Evidence, Paragon Highways, November 2017

⁶ Paragraph B.2.1.6 of the South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide, 2011

street parking has prevented the refuse vehicle from collecting bins. I accept that the congested street is not convenient for existing residents and that traffic flows may be impeded from time to time. However, I have not been provided with any substantive evidence that would lead me to conclude that the existing situation is unsafe for drivers, nor does it prevent day to day access for service vehicles, including access by emergency vehicles. In addition, the proposed development would provide sufficient parking within the appeal site for future occupiers and would not therefore contribute to any additional on-street parking on New Smithy Avenue.

30. Parking on the bend along New Smithy Avenue does however impede forward visibility for drivers of vehicles travelling in a westerly direction along the street. This leads to a situation where drivers may be required to undertake reversing manoeuvres along the street to allow other vehicles to pass. The proposed development would increase the frequency of such manoeuvres and exacerbate the existing unsatisfactory road conditions.
31. Policy CSP.26 of the CS states that new development will be expected to be designed and built to provide safe, secure and convenient access for all road users. It further advises that if development is not suitably served by the existing highway, or would create or add to highway safety problems or the efficiency of the highway for all road uses, developers will be expected to take mitigating action or to make a financial contribution to make sure the necessary improvements go ahead. Any contribution will be secured through a planning obligation or condition.
32. To provide mitigation for the additional traffic movements, the appellant proposes to provide a parking layby alongside New Smithy Avenue. There is sufficient highway land adjacent to the bend in the road to construct a parking layby which would provide space for up to three cars to park parallel to and clear of the highway. I accept that creating a widened carriageway in this location may result in cars straddling the pavement on the opposite side of the road and on-street parking would still occur. However, the formation of a layby in this critical location would substantially improve forward visibility and the need for vehicles to reverse would therefore be significantly reduced.
33. I am satisfied that the proposed layby would provide adequate mitigation for the increase in traffic along New Smithy Avenue, both during the construction period and for future occupiers of the proposed development. The layby could be secured by a Grampian style condition.
34. The appeal site is located in an accessible location with pedestrian links to public transport, opportunities to cycle along the Trans Pennine Way and within walking distance of local schools and other facilities. I recognise that the adjoining streets suffer from some parking stress; however from what I saw on site and the evidence before me, should existing residents so choose, there are opportunities and space within the neighbouring parking courts to relieve congestion on the streets. Furthermore, the proposed extension to New Smithy Avenue would provide additional turning space for service vehicles and improve manoeuvring space for neighbouring residents on New Smithy Avenue.
35. The presence of on-street parking, in particular along New Smithy Avenue, clearly impedes the free flow of traffic. However, in this residential area where traffic speeds are low, the parked vehicles do not give rise to issues of highway safety. The traffic generated by the proposed development would not be

significant and paragraph 32 of the Framework makes it clear that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe. The impact of the proposed development on the efficient operation of the highway network would not be severe in this appeal case.

36. I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on highway safety and the efficient operation of the highway network. It would not conflict with the development plan and in particular with Policy CSP 26 of the CS the aims of which are set out above. I also find no conflict with paragraph 32 of the Framework.

Planning Obligations

37. The completed, signed and dated deed of planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended), includes obligations to provide six affordable houses on the site and financial contributions towards education and open space provision.
38. Consideration of planning obligations is to be undertaken having regard to paragraph 204 of the Framework and the statutory requirements contained in Regulation 122 and 123 of The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations, 2010.
39. Policy CSP 15 of the CS states that housing development of 15 or more dwellings will be expected to provide affordable housing. 25% affordable housing will be expected in Penistone and rural west where the appeal site is located. The planning obligation would provide six of the units as affordable dwellings on the site which would equate to at least 25% based of the total number of units proposed. Accordingly, I consider this obligation would be fairly and reasonably related to the development proposed and that it passes the statutory tests.
40. A CIL Regulation Compliance Statement has been provided by the Council. The justification for the infrastructure contribution secured demonstrates that there is considerable pressure on secondary school places. Penistone Grammar School which is the local school will be heavily oversubscribed for a number of years. The proposed development would generate three secondary pupils and based on calculations set out in the Council's adopted Planning Advice Note 33, the obligation would provide a contribution of £42,306 towards the provision of secondary school places at Penistone Grammar School or any other secondary school, should one be developed within a three mile radius of the site.
41. In addition, as the site would not afford an opportunity to accommodate a green space of sufficient size, in accordance with the Council's Supplementary Open Space Provision of New Housing Development, Supplementary Planning Document, March 2012, the obligation would provide a financial contribution towards off-site public open space improvements with two kilometres of the boundaries of the Site. It is noted that Thurlstone Recreation Ground is located close to the site and the proposed development would increase the demand for the use of this facility.
42. In these circumstances, I consider that the obligations would be directly related to the development proposed, are fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind, and are necessary to make the development acceptable. The Compliance

Statement also confirms that the financial contributions secured are compliant with the provisions concerned the pooling of infrastructure monies. I conclude that the obligations, which have policy support, would comply with the requirements of Regulation 122 and 123 of the CIL Regulations and the tests in the Framework.

Other Matters

43. I have had regard to third party concerns regarding the accessibility of the site for pedestrians, and I accept that throughout the village there are areas where pavements are fragmented or difficult with pushchairs. However, overall the services and facilities within the village and neighbouring Penistone are within walking and cycling distance of the site and accessible by public transport. Furthermore, there is no dispute between the main parties that the appeal site is sustainable in location terms, given the distance between it and a variety of services and facilities. From the evidence before me I see no reason to disagree.
44. The site lies outside but adjacent to Thurlstone Conservation Area. The significance of the conservation area is in my view derived from the appearance of the traditional vernacular architecture and external facing materials of the buildings within it and their relationship to the adjoining highways and public spaces. The Council do not consider that the proposed development would affect the setting of Thurlstone Conservation Area and neither do I.
45. I have considered third parties concerns with regard to flooding. However, the application is accompanied by a drainage appraisal and it is clear that the site can be suitably drained by sustainable drainage methods. Furthermore, no objections have been raised by statutory consultees in this regard and I have not been provided with any substantive evidence to lead me to conclude that existing utilities within the village are at capacity.
46. I understand that there is concern from neighbouring residents on High Bank regarding the future maintenance of their property in view of its position adjoining the appeal site. However, these are private legal interests which are not for my consideration in this appeal.
47. The proposed layout is not a matter for consideration in this appeal. Any future concerns regarding the layout, scale and appearance of the development and privacy distances to neighbouring residents would be a matter for consideration at reserved matters stage.

Overall Planning Balance

48. As set out in the background and main issues section of this decision the proposal would be contrary to the development plan and in particular contrary to Policy GS10 of the UDP and Policy CSP 8 of the CS. However, the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land which is a material consideration of substantial weight in this appeal. The strict application of Policies GS10 and CSP 8 would prevent improvement to the shortfall in the supply of housing and because of this I attribute limited weight to the conflict with these policies.
49. The site is in an accessible location and I have found that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on highway safety or the efficient

operation of the highway network. Furthermore it would not prejudice the future development of adjoining safeguarded land.

50. In terms of a social role, the proposed development would provide up to 21 new dwellings. New homes at a time when the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing is a significant benefit. Furthermore, the planning obligation would provide for six affordable homes and financial contributions towards education and the maintenance of open space. These are significant benefits of the scheme.
51. There would be a modest benefit to the local economy through the creation of temporary jobs during the construction phase and an increase in local household spending which would help to support local shops and services. Again these are benefits that weigh heavily in favour of the development.
52. In terms of the environmental role, there would be some loss of open countryside and agricultural land which would cause modest harm. That is tempered however, by knowledge that such harm would be inevitable on an edge of settlement site in this area. Whilst I have not been provided with any evidence that would suggest that the change in the landscape would have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the countryside, that absence of harm does not carry any positive weight in the planning balance. There would, however, be some environmental gain through landscaping and ecological enhancements set out in the appellant's Ecological Appraisal.⁷
53. In the overall balance, the adverse impacts identified would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the social and economic benefits set out above. The presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in paragraph 14 is a material consideration which outweighs the conflict with the development plan as a whole.

Conclusion

54. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

55. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered against advice in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. As a result I have amended some clarity and amalgamated others.
56. In addition to the standard conditions relating to the submission of reserved matters and commencement of development it is necessary to specify the approved plans as this provides certainty.
57. A pre-commencement condition requiring details of surface and foul water drainage is necessary in order to safeguard the environment. The submission and approval of a Construction Method Statement and a requirement to carry out a highway condition survey prior to the commencement of development is also necessary to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring residents and in the interests of highway safety.

⁷ Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, Prepared by Brooks Ecological, R-2736-01, October 2016.

58. In the interests of visual amenity, biodiversity, and the protection of wildlife, conditions requiring an arboricultural method statement, landscape management plan and ecological enhancements are necessary.
59. A condition requiring the submission of a layout that would secure access to site SAF21 is required to ensure that the future development of this safeguarded land would not be prejudiced.
60. A condition securing details of existing and proposed ground levels is necessary to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring residents and in the interest of visual amenity.
61. A condition requiring the provision of a parking layby on New Smithy Avenue and conditions to specify the number of dwellings, provide on-site parking, manoeuvring and visibility spays are required in the interests of highway safety. A condition requiring details of cycle parking is required to encourage sustainable travel.
62. I have not imposed conditions specifying landscape maintenance or protection of retained trees as these details relate to landscape proposals which have been reserved for subsequent approval.

Elizabeth Pleasant

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) Details of the appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale, (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.
- 2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than 3 years from the date of this permission.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan: Ref 17/227-01.
- 5) No development shall take place until:
 - a) Full foul and surface water drainage details, including a scheme to reduce surface water run off by at least 30% and a programme of works for implementation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority;
 - b) Porosity tests are carried out in accordance with BFE 365, to demonstrate that the subsoil is suitable for soakaways; and
 - c) Calculations based on the results of these porosity tests to prove that adequate land is available for the construction of the soakaways.

Thereafter no part of the development shall be occupied or brought into use until the approved scheme has been fully implemented. The scheme shall be retained throughout the life of the development.

- 6) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide for:
- i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
 - ii) means of access for construction traffic;
 - iii) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
 - iv) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development, including details of the sales cabin;
 - v) wheel washing facilities;
 - vi) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
 - vii) delivery, demolition and construction working hours.

The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development.

- 7) No development shall commence on the construction of the dwellings until a scheme to include a parking lay-by accommodating three parking spaces on New Smithy Avenue has been carried out in accordance with details that have previously been submitted to and approved in writing with the local planning authority. The scheme shall be based on the details shown on Paragon Highways drawing no. 1216 04 dated May 2017, submitted as part of the planning application.
- 8) Prior to any works commencing on site, a condition survey (including structural integrity) of the highways to be used by construction traffic shall be carried out in association with the local planning authority. The methodology of the survey shall be approved in writing by the local planning authority and shall assess the existing state of the highway. On completion of the development a second condition survey shall be carried out and shall be submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority which shall identify defects attributable to the traffic ensuing from the development. Any necessary remedial works shall be completed at the developer's expense in accordance with a scheme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
- 9) No development or other operations being undertaken shall take place until the following documents in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction-Recommendations have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- Arboricultural method statement.
- 10) Any application for reserved matters shall include the recommendations and ecological enhancements suggested in sections 39-42 of the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Brooks Ecological, October 2016). Thereafter the development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details.

- 11) The layout details submitted pursuant to Condition 1 shall make provision for an access road to the wider safeguarded land to the West (site - SAF21).
- 12) The site shall be developed for a maximum of 21 dwellings.
- 13) Detailed Plans including the following information shall accompany the reserved matters submission and shall be approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - i) a full site survey showing: the datum used to calibrate the site levels; levels along all site boundaries; levels across the site at regular intervals and floor levels of adjoining buildings;
 - ii) full details of the proposed finished floor levels of all buildings and hard landscaped surfaces.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 14) Before the development is first occupied or brought into use a landscape management plan, including long term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved.
- 15) No dwelling shall be occupied unless and until related provision for off-road parking and cycle parking/storage has been provided in accordance with details that shall previously have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Once provided, such facilities shall be retained thereafter for their intended use.
- 16) Pedestrian inter-visibility splays, having dimensions 2m x 2m shall be safeguarded at the drive entrance/exit such that there is no obstruction to visibility at a height exceeding 1m above the nearside channel level of the adjacent highway.

End of Condition Schedule

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Christopher Darley	Lichfields
Mrs Aisling Kelly	Lichfields
Mr Phil Mullins	Appellant
Mrs Jill Mullins	Appellant
Mr Leigh Ogden	Paragon Highways
Mr Paul Howarth	Paragon Highways

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mrs Laura Bennett	Development Management Planning Officer, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council (BMBC)
Mrs Helen Willows	Planning Officer- Policy, BMBC
Mr Stephen Moss	AECOM

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Councillor David Griffin	Penistone Borough Councillor
Councillor Hannah Kitching	Penistone Borough Councillor
Mrs Sarah Barnett	Local Resident
Mr Andrew Barnett	Local Resident
Mr Peter Bevis	Local Resident
Mrs Jay Johnson	Local Resident

DOCUMENTS submitted at the Hearing

- 1 Barnsley Local Plan Examination – Post Hearings, dated 24 May 2018, Sarah Housden Inspector.