



PLANNING SUPPORT STATEMENT

FULL APPLICATION FOR 1NO DWELLING
FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING STABLES
AND ASSOCIATED STRUCTURES

LAND OFF ROYD MOOR ROAD,
THURLSTONE,
SHEFFIELD

MR AND MRS L BARDEN

APRIL 2021

CONTENTS

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION
- 2.0 THE SITE, THE PROPOSAL AND BACKGROUND
- 3.0 PLANNING POLICY
- 4.0 THE ISSUES - THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN & OTHER MATERIAL
CONSIDERATIONS
- 5.0 CONCLUSION

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The proposal which forms the subject of this application for detailed planning permission for 1no dwelling relates to a site located off Royd Moor Road, Thurlstone which is currently used for equestrian purposes. This proposal seeks detailed permission for the construction of 1No dwelling following the demolition of the existing stables and associated structures.
- 1.2 The following supporting documents/information are submitted with the application:-
- (i) Full plans and details – Stephen A Welcer;
 - (ii) Planning Support Statement – Townsend Planning Consultants;
 - (iii) Bat Report - Middleton Bell Ecological Consultancy; and
 - (iv) Highways Report – Paragon Highways.
- 1.3 It is considered that this statement, together with the accompanying plans and documents, clearly demonstrate to the Council that the proposal accords with national and local planning policy and, when judged against this and all material considerations, it is clearly the case that notwithstanding the site's green belt status planning permission should be granted.
- 1.4 The subject site has a longstanding use for equestrian purposes with equestrian use of the land for circa 19 years. The Council granted planning permission for stables on the site in 2002 (ref B/02/0123/PU). Subsequently, permission was granted by the Council in 2005 for the extension to the stables (ref B/05/0612/PU) and in 2016 granted permission for an equestrian and exercise arena (ref 2016/0863).
- 1.5 It will be noted that in the context of the adopted NPPF, as the site forms a brownfield site within the Green Belt, the proposal does not constitute inappropriate development. As such, no “very special circumstances” are necessary to justify the grant of planning permission in the green belt.
- 1.6 This statement now proceeds to give details of the background to the site and its current uses. The details of the proposal are then set out. Relevant planning policy and central government advice in the form of the National Planning Policy Framework is then discussed. The issues that the proposal raises are also examined and finally the

conclusion is reached that planning permission should be granted for the proposal to proceed. Nevertheless, the applicants remain willing to discuss all aspects of this proposal with the Council.

2.0 THE SITE, THE PROPOSAL AND BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The subject site forms a longstanding equestrian site. The site is located off Royd Moor Road, to the north west of the village of Thurlstone. The site is accessed via a gated access and contains an L shaped stable building, menage and areas of hardstanding set amongst wider fields (in the applicant's ownership) for horse grazing. The site is located wholly within the Green Belt.
- 2.2 It is understood that the equestrian use of the site dates back circa 19 years. The Council granted planning permission for stables on the site in 2002 (ref B/02/0123/PU) and the applicants subsequently built the stable block. Consent was given by the Council in 2005 for the extension to the stables (ref B/05/0612/PU) which was constructed and in 2016 granted permission for an equestrian and exercise arena (ref 2016/0863) which again was implemented. The site has clearly a longstanding history as an equestrian site.
- 2.3 The subject proposal seeks to develop 1No dwelling following demolition of the stables and associated structures as shown on the submitted plans. The proposal has been sensitively designed and is appropriate in scale form and layout for this Green Belt location. It would be noted that the size of the dwelling proposed is less than the size of the buildings to be removed (around 80%). The dwelling will be located on broadly the same footprint as the existing stables and the formed curtilage will be less than the defined working areas of the existing equestrian use (including hardstanding). Care has been taken to ensure the residential curtilage is small scale and that the boundary treatment is appropriate for a rural area.
- 2.4 The proposals have also been drawn up in association with Paragon Highways who have produced a Highways Statement setting out the suitability of the proposals including its sustainability. As part of the proposals a passing place is proposed to the east of the site access to assist in traffic along Royd Moor Road if required. In terms of traffic movements, it is considered that should be no additional traffic when compared to the existing use and that the site has suitable access to sustainable transport means including sustainable transport measures including public transport, cycling and walking.

2.5 It is considered that in the context of the Development Plan and all material considerations, the proposal is acceptable. Nevertheless, the applicants remain willing to discuss all aspects of the proposal with the Council.

3.0 PLANNING POLICY

- 3.1 By virtue of Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the planning authority must determine the planning application in accordance with the statutory development plan (insofar as it is material to the application), unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The NPPF also advises of a presumption in favour of development which accords with the development plan. The importance of the statutory development plan in the decision making process necessitates an examination of the relationship between the policies and proposals of the plan and government guidance.

Central Government Policy Advice

The National Planning Policy Framework

- 3.2 The following are comments on the advice in the Framework which is considered to be relevant to the consideration of the proposal:

- 3.3 Para 2 of the 'Introduction' sets out that:

"Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

- 3.4 Section 2 sets out the aims of achieving sustainable development.

- 3.5 At Para 38 with regard to decision making, it states:

"Local Planning Authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way... and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve economic, social and environmental conditions in the area. Decision makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible."

- 3.6 Section 13 deals with Protecting Green Belt Land. At Para 143 it states:

“Inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.”

3.7 Para 145 goes on to state:

“A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

...(g) Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (except temporary buildings), which would:

- not have a greater impact on the openness than the existing development; or*
- not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt where the development would reuse previously developed land and contribute to the meeting and identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority.”*

3.8 It is clear that this proposal will not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development it seeks to replace.

National Planning Practice Guidance – Green Belt

3.9 National Planning Policy Guidance ‘Green Belt’ published on the 22nd July 2019 has been taken into account in the drafting up of this scheme and is clearly an important material consideration.

3.10 The advice sets out *“what factors can be taken into account when considering the potential impacts of development on the openness of the green belt.”* The advice identifies that this *“requires a judgement based on the circumstances of the case”*. It also goes on to set out that the Courts have identified a number of matters which may be taken into account, which include:

- *“Openness is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects – in other words the visual impact of the proposal may be relevant as could its volume;*

- *the duration of the development and its remedially taking into account the provisions to return the land to its original state or to an equivalent or improved state of openness; and*
- *A degree of activity likely to be generated such as traffic generation.”*

3.11 In the context of the above, in this instance:

- (i) In spatial and visual terms, the level of building proposed on site is less in terms of volume than the existing buildings on site and will be an improvement visually. As such, the proposal is of benefit to openness when considered in the context of the volume and visual impact.
- (ii) In terms of duration, the impact is neutral.
- (iii) In terms of the generation of activity, the proposal will result in decreased activity than the lawful use which generates more activity than the proposed use, which will be of benefit to openness.

3.12 It is clear that the proposals as submitted conform with this up to date advice on considering the issue of openness.

Local Planning Policy

Barnsley Local Plan

3.13 The Development Plan for Barnsley MBC consists of the Barnsley Local adopted in January 2019. It should be noted that on the supporting proposals map the site falls wholly within the Green Belt.

3.14 The following policies are considered relevant to the proposals:-

Policy GD1 General Development

3.15 The policy sets out a range of requirements for proposals to comply with before planning permission would be granted these include:-

- *“There will be no significant adverse effect on the living conditions and residential amenity of existing and future residents;*

- *They are compatible with neighbouring land and will not significantly prejudice the current or future use of the neighbouring land;*
- *They will not adversely affect the potential development of a wider area of land which could otherwise be available for development and safeguards access to adjacent land;*
- *They include landscaping to provide a high quality setting for buildings, incorporating existing landscape features and ensuring that plant species and the way they are planted, hard surfaces, boundary treatments and other features appropriately reflect, protect and improve the character of the local landscape;*
- *Any adverse impact on the environment, natural resources, waste and pollution is minimised and mitigated;*
- *Adequate access and internal road layouts are provided to allow the complete development of the entire site for residential purposes, and to provide appropriate vehicular and pedestrian links throughout the site and into adjacent areas;*
- *Any drains, culverts and other surface water bodies that may cross the site are considered;*
- *Appropriate landscaped boundaries are provided where sites are adjacent to open countryside;*
- *Any pylons are considered in the layout; and*
- *Existing trees that are to remain on site are considered in the layout in order to avoid overshadowing”.*

3.16 The proposals have been drafted in the context of these requirements and it should be noted that there is no conflict with the requirements of the above (some of which are not relevant to the proposals).

Policy T3 New Development and Sustainable Travel

- 3.17 This policy is relevant to all development proposals. The application is supported by a Highways Statement to ensure the Council's accessibility standards can be met. The proposals will also provide required level of vehicle parking for a 1no bed property.

Policy T4 New Development and Transport Safety

- 3.18 The policy requires new development to be designed and built to provide all transport uses within and surrounding the development with safe, secure and convenient access and movement. A highways statement supports the proposal and demonstrates this can be achieved.

Policy D1 High Quality Design and Place Making

- 3.19 The policy requires development to be of high quality design. The policy provides a checklist of requirements (some of which are not relevant to the proposal). It is considered that the proposals do not conflict with the requirements of the policy.

Policy GB1 Protection of Green Belt

- 3.20 The policy sets out the green belt is set out on the proposals map.

Penistone Neighbourhood Development Plan

- 3.21 The Penistone Neighbourhood Development Plan became part of the statutory development plan for Barnsley Council in August 2019. The application site falls within the Neighbourhood Plan Area however the Plan does not add any additional policy designation on the site.

BE1: Design of the built environment

- 3.22 The policy forms the predominant policy for new housing in the neighbourhood plan area. The policy makes number of requirements where including:
- Where new housing developments are proposed, homes should be reflective of local architecture and in keeping with the surrounding area including using

external building materials that reflect the characteristic of development in the locality; and

- Use of appropriate landscaping.

4.0 THE ISSUES

The Development Plan

- 4.1 The form of development proposed (i.e. the redevelopment of a brownfield site in the green belt) and national policy (the NPPF) towards such development is silent in the Development Plan.
- 4.2 As set out in the text of this statement, by reference to the NPPF and policy to the redevelopment of brownfield sites in the Green Belt, the development does not constitute inappropriate development subject to a test “openness” and the impact on the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. It is clear that this proposal will not give rise to issues of harm in terms of the openness of the Green Belt and not harm the purposes of Green Belt.
- 4.3 It has been demonstrated that the proposal conforms with national guidelines and, as such, it can be argued that there is no conflict with the Development Plan.

Other Material Considerations

Brownfield Development

- 4.4 The subject site constitutes a longstanding equestrian site.
- 4.5 The NPPF defines previously developed land as:

“Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) and any associated fixed surface infrastructure. This excludes: land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration has been made through development control procedures; land in built-up areas such as private residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structures or fixed surface infrastructure have blended into the landscape.”

- 4.6 The whole of the application site, therefore, falls within the definition of previously developed land as it has been and continues to be used as stables, storage and curtilage land for equestrian use.
- 4.7 It is acknowledged that this is subject to a test of 'openness'. It will be noted that the proposed building is significantly smaller than the built form on site. The proposal residential curtilage is also smaller than the overall curtilage of the existing use.

The Green Belt

- 4.8 It is clear that this site constitutes brownfield development and in policy terms it falls to be judged in the context of para 145(g) of the NPPF.
- 4.9 It is clear that this proposal wholly conforms with the tests set out in the NPPF. The proposal constitutes the redevelopment of a previously developed site (brownfield) and this is in a manner which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it than the existing development. By reference to the NPPF, clearly planning permission should be granted.

Visual Impact

- 4.10 In Green Belt terms, the proposal does not constitute inappropriate development. Following demolition of the buildings, this proposal for a small scale dwelling will not harmfully impact on the openness, visual character and amenity of the Green Belt in this location. The proposed dwelling has been sensitively designed and will be smaller than the existing built form of development on the site.

Bats

- 4.11 A Bat Survey Report is submitted with this application, no doubt its recommendations can be dealt with via condition.

Highways

- 4.12 A Highways Statement is submitted with this application and has been produced by Paragon Highways. The report covers the proposals and arrangement including the

provision of a passing place along Royd Moor Road, close to the site entrance which the Council should give weight to. The report covers transport sustainability in terms of walking provision and distances to the site, cycling accessibility and public transport linkages. In relation to vehicle movements, it considers that due to the nature of stables on the site, a dwelling on site will not create any additional highways movements in comparison with the current use. The report concludes the suitability of the proposals from a highway's perspective.

Planning Context

4.13 It should be noted that the Council has recently approved for similar developments in the district and these should be taken into account when considering the current application:-

- 2020/1132 – Barnsley Road, Brierley, S72 9LQ – Approved 23/12/2020; and
- 2020/0334 – Land off Moor Lane, Lindwood, Barnsley, S71 5LF – Approved 26/5/2020.

5.0 CONCLUSION

- 5.1 This application seeks the development of 1No residential dwelling on this site following demolition of stables. The use of the site constitutes brownfield development. By reference to the NPPF the proposal, therefore, does not constitute inappropriate development and as such no 'very special circumstances' need to be demonstrated to justify the development. The proposal passes the test of openness in that the scale of the buildings and curtilage to be removed is greater than the scale of the buildings and curtilage to be built in replacement.
- 5.2 In relation to highways matters the proposals in terms of traffic movements it is considered that should be no additional traffic when compared to the existing use and that the site has suitable access to sustainable transport means including sustainable transport measures including public transport, cycling and walking. Indeed, as part of the proposals a passing place is proposed to the east of the site access to assist in traffic along Royd Moor Road adding further benefits to the proposals.
- 5.3 It is clear that the basis on which this application must be judged is the NPPF and this proposal wholly conforms to that.
- 5.4 Should the Council require any further information or wish to discuss the matter in more detail, please do not hesitate to contact me.