



PLANNING SUPPORT STATEMENT

DETAILED APPLICATION FOR 1NO DWELLING  
FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING STABLES  
AND ASSOCIATED STRUCTURES  
(VARIATION TO PREVIOUS APPROVAL 2025/0169)

LAND OFF ROYD MOOR ROAD,  
THURLSTONE,  
SHEFFIELD

MR AND MRS L BARDEN

SEPTEMBER 2025

## **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 INTRODUCTION
  
- 2.0 THE SITE, THE PROPOSAL AND BACKGROUND
  
- 3.0 PLANNING POLICY
  - 3.1 Central Government Policy Advice
    - 3.1.1 National Planning Policy Framework December 2024
    - 3.1.2 Planning Policy Guidance – Green Belts
  - 3.2 Local Planning Policy
    - 3.2.1 Barnsley Local Plan
    - 3.2.2 Penistone Neighbourhood Plan
  
- 4.0 THE ISSUES - THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
  - 4.1 The Development Plan
  - 4.2 Other Material Considerations
    - 4.2.1 The NPPF Green Belt/Openness
    - 4.2.2 Brownfield Development
    - 4.2.3 Planning History
    - 4.2.4 Sustainability
    - 4.2.5 Design
    - 4.2.6 Biodiversity Net Gain – De Minimis Exemption
  
- 5.0 CONCLUSION

## APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Sevenoaks Appeal Decision

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

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.

This application is a variation to the recently approved scheme for 1no dwelling approved in June 2025 (2025/0169). The current scheme seeks consent for a dwelling of the same volume and footprint as the stables the dwelling will replace. Prior to the submission the principal of the matter was discussed with the Council's Planning Officer.

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;
- (iv) Highways Report – Paragon Highways; and
- (v) Appendices.

It is considered that this statement, together with the accompanying plans and documents, clearly demonstrate to the Council that the proposal as submitted 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.

It will be noted that in the context of the recently adopted NPPF, as the site forms a brownfield site within the Green Belt, the proposal does not constitute inappropriate development when considered against the test of openness, it will not result in "substantial harm to openness". As such, no "very special circumstances" are necessary to justify the grant of planning permission in the green belt.

This statement now proceeds to give details of the background to the site, its current uses and specifically the comments of the previous Inspector are outlined. The details of the proposal as now amended are then set out. Relevant planning policy and central

government advice with specific reference to the recently adopted 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

The subject site has a longstanding use for equestrian purposes with equestrian use of the land for circa 23 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 also granted permission for an equestrian exercise arena (ref 2016/0863).

The applicants live away from the site and make a minimum of 5 visits per day to the site for tending the horses, riding and training. There are 4 horses on site and other visits to the site include veterinary visits; food and hay deliveries; and taking horses off site for shows and eventing. The use of the site for its lawful equestrian use generates significant amounts of vehicular movement.

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, ménage and areas of hardstanding within the curtilage of the building. The site is located wholly within the Green Belt.

The Council granted planning permission on the 27<sup>th</sup> June 2025 for the “demolition of existing stable building and removal of menage. Erection of new dwelling with associated works” (ref 2025/0169). The proposal was a 33% volume reduction on the existing stable block. The officer within their report considered that the proposals:-

*“The development would see the removal of a poor-quality stable building, associated paraphernalia, and the removal of the existing menage with a replacement dwelling of a similar design and smaller scale, and therefore it is considered that on balance the re-development of the site would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, and is considered in compliance Local Plan Policies GB1 and D1.”*

Prior to the resubmission of the subject proposals the principle of a larger dwelling (but no larger than the existing building) was discussed with the Council’s planning officer. It was agreed in principle that in light of the revised NPPF (December 2024) and the change in the test of brownfield development within the Green Belt to “substantial harm”.

The principle of replacing the stables with a dwelling no larger than the existing stables should be considered acceptable.

It will be noted that the proposed scheme follows the same general design criteria adopted in the approved scheme. The curtilage and boundary treatments remain as previously proposed. The only difference is that the proposed dwelling now replicates the size of the existing stables (rather than being smaller as previously proposed).

The proposals are supported by the previously submitted highways statement by Paragon Highways setting out the suitability of the proposals, including its sustainability which was accepted by the Council. As part of the proposals a passing place is proposed to the east of the site access to assist in traffic flow 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 modes including public transport, cycling and walking on this Council defined Green Way.

Whilst the subject site is outside the settlement, it is situated in a sustainable location and the following issues are considered relevant:

- a. Bus stop – Windsor Avenue (hourly service) - 0.5 miles.
- b. Walking distance to schools/village primary school - 0.4 miles.
- c. Walking distance to public house – 0.6 miles.
- d. Walking distance to bakery – 0.7 miles.
- e. Walking distance to takeaways – 0.7 miles.

Given its rural context, it is considered there are some reasonable options for public transport for future occupiers. The walking distances to services and facilities in the settlement are only around 10 minute walk. There would be opportunities for walking and cycling to access local services and facilities within reasonably accessible distances. Future occupiers may well use private vehicles but the number of trips would not be great and this rural site would be accessible by a range of modes of transport.

Therefore, the site is within walking distance of essential facilities and as such the need for travel is reduced and essential travel needs can be met by use of modes of transport other than the private car.

It is considered that the in the context of the requirements of the Framework (NPPF) to have regard to the need to recognise rural areas will have less opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions than urban areas, the degree of environmental harm will be negligible. The position was accepted by the Council in their recent grant of planning permission.

The revised proposals, therefore, comprises of the reuse of a brownfield site with a built form which replicates the existing building in size and will not give rise to “significant harm” to openness. There will be a reduction in the existing hardstanding working area around the stables. That existing working area located outside the proposed residential curtilage will be set to grass which will improve the greening of the site (as previously approved).

It is considered that the proposals falls to be judged in the light of the new NPPF and do not give rise to issues of “substantial harm” to openness.

### 3.0 PLANNING POLICY

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sets out that in considering planning applications the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework 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 to Government Guidance.

#### 3.1 Central Government Policy Advice

##### 3.1.1 National Planning Policy Framework December 2024

The latest version of the NPPF was published on the 12<sup>th</sup> December 2024. There are significant changes to the approach to development in the Green Belt which includes advice in respect of the development of brownfield sites.

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.”*

Section 2 sets out the aims of achieving sustainable development.

At Para 39 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.”*

It will be noted at para 154 that the previous advice related to **“new building”**. However, this has now changed to a more encompassing approach and refers to **“development”**. Para 154 states:

***“Development in Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the following exception***

**applies.....:**

- ...(g) **Limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land... which would not cause substantial harm to openness of the Green Belt**". (TPC underlining).

The site constitutes previously developed land, a position accepted by the Council in the previous grant of planning permission on the site.

This proposal seeks to replace the stables with a dwelling no larger than the building it replaces which will ensure there is no substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Therefore, no "very special circumstances" are required to justify the grant of planning permission as the proposal does not constitute inappropriate development.

### 3.1.2 Planning Practice Guidance - Green Belt

National Planning Policy Guidance 'Green Belt' published on the 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2019 and was most latterly revised on the 27<sup>th</sup> February 2025 is clearly an important material consideration.

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 remendability - 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.”**

In the context of the above, in this instance:

- (i) In spatial and visual terms, the scale of building proposed is no larger than the existing building on site. Any visual impact can be mitigated by timber cladding the building and reducing the existing working area. As such, the proposal is of benefit to openness when considered in the context of the spatial 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 a decrease in activity to the lawful use. A dwelling would generate less activity than the existing use, which will be of benefit to openness.

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

## 3.2 Local Planning Policy

### 3.2.1 Barnsley Local Plan

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. It will be noted that the document pre-dates the latest publication of the NPPF.

The following policies are considered relevant to the proposals:-

#### (i) Policy GD1 General Development

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”.***

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).

(ii) Policy T3 New Development and Sustainable Travel

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 single a two bedroom property.

(iii) Policy T4 New Development and Transport Safety

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.

(iv) Policy D1 High Quality Design and Place Making

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.

(v) Policy GB1 Protection of Green Belt

The policy sets out the Green Belt is set out on the proposals map.

(vi) Policy GS2 – Green Ways and Public Rights of Way

Policy GS2 states:

***“We will protect Green Ways and Public Rights of Way from development that may affect their character or function.***

***Where development affects an existing Green Way or Public Right of Way it must:***

***Protect the existing route within the development; or***

***Include an equally convenient and attractive alternative route.***

***Where new development is close to a Green Way or Public Right of Way it may be required to:***

***Provide a link to the existing route; and/or***

***Improve an existing route; and/or***

***Contribute to a new route.***

***In some cases, we will ask developers to make a financial contribution to meet those requirements in accordance with the Infrastructure and Planning Obligations Policy.”***

The supporting text at Para 17.20 states:

***“When considering new development, we will make sure that it helps create places that connect with each other, providing the right conditions to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport.”***

Furthermore, at Para 17.21 it states:

***“One of the benefits of Green Ways and Public Rights of Way is that they allow connections with and access to leisure and facilities. In some cases, small scale tourism and leisure development may improve the quality of routes. Any such proposals must meet the criteria of E8 (Rural Economy) and may include such things as cafes, campsites, bike hire centres, public art and sculpture walks. We must also ensure that there are no negative visual or environmental effects and that development is consistent with Green Belt policy.”***

It will be noted that the subject road, Royd Moor Road, is a designated Green Way and as such by reference to the Council’s adopted policy this is suitable for walking, cycling and the use of public transport.

### 3.2.2 Penistone Neighbourhood Development Plan

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.

(i) BE1: Design of the built environment

The policy forms the predominant policy for new housing in the neighbourhood plan area. The policy makes number of requirements 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

### 4.1 The Development Plan

The form of development proposed (i.e. the redevelopment of a brownfield site in the Green Belt) National policy (the NPPF) has recently been amended in respect of the test of openness. Local Planning Policy is silent on this issue.

As set out in the text of this statement, by reference to the NPPF such development is not considered to be “inappropriate” subject to a test of substantial harm to “openness”. It is clear that this proposal will not give rise to issues of “substantial” harm to the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal therefore does not constitute inappropriate development and as such, no very special circumstances need to be demonstrated to justify development.

It has been demonstrated that the proposal conforms with national policy and guidelines and, as such, it can be argued that there is no conflict with the Development Plan. The applicant is therefore entitled to the presumption inherent in Section 38(6) to be weighed in their favour.

### 4.2 Other Material Considerations

#### 4.2.1 Central Government Advice – the National Planning Policy Framework

This proposal, which seeks the redevelopment of a brownfield site, conforms with the advice contained in the NPPF which relates to brownfield sites in the Green Belt.

Since the government has updated the NPPF (December 2024). The test in respect of **“development”** of brownfield sites is now that it **“would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt”**. The proposal which involves the replacement of a building with one no larger than the existing will not cause substantial harm to openness and as such does not constitute inappropriate development.

In terms of how the issue of substantial harm is being considered elsewhere, the Council’s attention is drawn to appeals APP/G2245/W/24/3342128 and 3331236 (Oast House Nursery, Ash Road, Sevenoaks, Kent, TN15 7HJ – copy appeal decision

attached to the submission). The proposals sought the demolition of an existing nursery and replacement with 16 and 18 dwellings respectively. Both appeals were upheld. The development involved the increase in built form for the 18 dwelling scheme from:

Existing	2980 cu m
	924 sq m floorspace
Proposed	6466 cu m
	1513 sq m floorspace

Clearly, there was a significant increase in development. The Inspector stated at para 19:-

*“However, in my view neither scheme would cause a substantial degree of harm to the openness of the green belt.”*

At para 20 the Inspector goes on to state:-

*“Therefore my conclusions are that neither appeal scheme would cause substantial harm to openness and given my findings above, neither proposal would constitute inappropriate development...”*

If a development which doubles the built form does not constitute substantial harm the minor increase in built form with the subject proposal would clearly not.

The Council should also be drawn to the attention of two other recent appeal decisions (which are submitted with the application):-

- (i) Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/W/24/3357664 LPA21/01359/FUL - Metropolitan Demolition and Metropolitan Crushing, Green Lane, Horbury, Wakefield WF4 5DY

A retrospective appeal on the basis of the replacement on a prefabricated office block with a two storey office block on a historic and longstanding commercial

site in a commercial area. The Inspector considered that the did not have substantial harm to openness under Para 154 g.

- (ii) Appeal Ref: APP/R1038/C/24/3342342 - Land at Summerley Cottage Summerley, Apperknowle, Dronfield S18 4BA

This was a retrospective appeal on the basis of a part constructed two storey outbuilding where the only previous development was hardstanding. The Inspector considered that the proposals would not result in substantial harm to the Green Belt under Para 154 g.

#### 4.2.2 Brownfield Development

The subject site constitutes a longstanding equestrian site.

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.”***

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.

#### 4.2.3 Planning History

The Council granted planning permission on the 27th June 2025 for the “demolition of existing stable building and removal of menage. Erection of new dwelling with associated works” (ref 2025/0169). The proposal was a 33% volume reduction on the

existing stable block. The officer within their report considered that the proposals:-

*“The development would see the removal of a poor-quality stable building, associated paraphernalia, and the removal of the existing menage with a replacement dwelling of a similar design and smaller scale, and therefore it is considered that on balance the re-development of the site would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, and is considered in compliance Local Plan Policies GB1 and D1.”*

It is considered that the revised proposals do not result in substantial harm.

#### 4.2.4 Sustainability

As demonstrated in this submission, the site has access by foot to local services in the village including some schooling, shopping and recreational facilities. The site is within 10 minutes of a public bus stop. As stated in the NPPF Para 110:

***“However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan making and decision making.”***

The site is also on a Council defined Green Way where cycling and walking are encouraged.

#### 4.2.5 Design

Whilst it is contended that the proposal clearly passes the new test in respect of openness nevertheless the opportunity has been taken to revisit the design of the proposal to ensure the scheme is sustainable for the rural setting. The scheme proposals now more closely relates to the existing building in terms of form and layout including fenestration/door detailing and materials.

Notwithstanding the change in the openness. Nevertheless the building no larger than the existing building.

#### 4.2.6 Biodiversity Net Gain – De Minimis Exemption

The application proposals seek the redevelopment of the stables with a reduction in areas of existing hardstanding areas. The proposals would therefore fall within *“the de*

*minimis exemption”.*

The Planning Practice Guidance note on Biodiversity net gain sets out at Paragraph 4 (Ref ID: 74-004-2024-214) the de minimis exemption applies if:-

- *“the development must not impact on any onsite priority habitat; and*
- *if there is an impact on other onsite habitat, that impact must be on less than 25 square metres (e.g. less than a 5m by 5m square) of onsite habitat with a biodiversity value greater than zero and on less than 5 metres of onsite linear habitat (such as a hedgerow)”.*

Therefore, Biodiversity Net Gain does not apply in this instance.

The applicants are also looking to self build the dwelling and could also come under this exemption.

## 5.0 CONCLUSION

This application seeks the development of 1No residential dwelling following demolition of the existing stables. This is a variation to the approved scheme and now seeks permission for a dwelling which replicates the size of the existing building.

The test for the redevelopment of such sites is that the proposal should not lead to “substantial harm to openness”. As this proposal which is no larger than the built form on the site it will not, by any stretch of the imagination, cause substantial harm to openness. The principal of this approach has been discussed with the Council’s Planning Officer, prior to the submission of the application.

By reference to the NPPF, the proposal does not constitute inappropriate development. It has been demonstrated that the proposal wholly conforms with the NPPF and development plan policy and, as a consequence, the applicants are entitled to the presumption in favour inherent in Section 38(6) to be weighed in their favour. Nevertheless, the applicants remain willing to discuss all aspects of the proposal with the Council.

It is therefore considered in the context of the development plan and all material considerations that planning permission should be forthcoming. Should the Council require any further information or wish to discuss the matter in more detail, please do not hesitate to contact me.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1 – Sevenoaks Appeal Decision