

Planning Application 2020/1089

Land south of Barugh Green Road and east of Higham Common Road, Barnsley (Application 2).

Hybrid application for employment development comprising:-

- a) Full planning permission for: earthworks to create development platforms; strategic drainage ponds and associated drainage infrastructure; and location of strategic landscaping and ecological areas.**
- b) Outline planning permission seeking approval over means of access and landscaping for employment use development (use classes E/B2/B8) and associated infrastructure works.**

Planning Application 2021/1090

Land south of Barugh Green Road and east of Higham Common Road, Barnsley (Application 1).

Hybrid application for residential development for 1,760 dwellings comprising:

- a) Full planning permission for: earthworks to create development platforms; strategic drainage ponds and associated drainage infrastructure; construction of a new link road; location of strategic landscaping and ecological areas; demolition of existing buildings; works to Hermit Lane; and erection of Phase 1 residential development comprising 229 dwellings**
- b) Outline planning permission for: Residential development comprising 1,531 dwellings; new primary school; small shops and community facilities; and associated infrastructure works.**

Comments

My comments apply equally to Planning Application 2021/1089 and 2021/1090.

I am fully familiar with the sequence of events leading up to the submission of these two planning applications.

It has been known that the applicant has been in extensive discussions with the Council over many years, long before the Local Plan consultation procedures.

In these two planning applications we can now see the appalling effect that the Council's policy decision to remove 122 hectares of land from the Green Belt for Site MU1 will have on the existing community and the disastrous long term effect and implications for the area over the immediate next 8 years and the next full 15 years during the development period.

The two planning applications are accompanied by a long and detailed list of documents produced by consultants.

The excessive length and detail of the supporting documentation accompanying the two planning applications is complex and time consuming to consider.

The majority of the supporting documentation is far too technical for any layperson to understand.

The Council's online Planning Explorer has not been helpful in this regard.

It has not been possible to fully read all of the supporting documentation because of their reduced size on Planning Explorer.

As a consequence, local residents including myself, have great difficulty in making any direct comment on the technical aspect of these two planning applications.

All of the documents are written in a style which claims to show evidence supporting the proposal and compliance with the adopted Local Plan and Masterplan framework.

The content and conclusions section of each report is debatable and should be challenged.

The phrases "*mitigation*" or "*mitigation measures*", runs throughout the documentation.

The use of such phrases clearly demonstrates the problems with the site.

In reading the documentation, the number of times that the two phrases are mentioned becomes overbearing.

As such, the number of times that the phrases are used cannot be considered acceptable if the development is so dependent on such "*mitigation measures*".

The full and disastrous implications for the local community are only now beginning to be understood.

The submission of hybrid applications is confusing with full planning permission being sought for certain elements of the site and outline planning permission for the remainder to be dealt with as "*reserved matters*" at some future date.

The supporting documentation is complex enough in itself without this added complication which only adds to the confusion and concerns.

This is considered to be unacceptable having regard to the size and implications of the proposed development, particularly the later residential phases which will directly affect my residential amenity and outlook.

All detailed matters for all the phases relating to the development should be identified and addressed at the outset and not left to be dealt with as “*reserved matters*” at the outline planning application stage.

Such tactics again adds to the confusion where outline planning approval is obtained which effectively seals the fate of the whole site in favour of the developer, but without the detail.

The earlier submission and approval of two planning applications for the link road roundabouts is part of this continuing concern.

The Local Plan consultations, together with the consultation on the Site MU1 Masterplan Framework and subsequent BWC consultation in May 2021, were deemed a waste of time by the community in what was seen as a predetermined situation.

Will the consultation on these two planning applications be any different?

The deadline for comments of 30/10/21 was too short a timescale for the local community to understand and comment on the full implications of these two planning applications.

The consultation timescale should have been extended accordingly for this, and the reasons mentioned in my submission.

A further point of concern is that The Barnsley West Consortium consultation in May 2021 was not considered representative.

The consultation, like the Council’s consultation procedures, did not acknowledge that some members of the local community may not have the IT skills or knowledge to look at the BWC website and therefore saw it as a difficult task even though they may have had strong feelings about what is proposed by the development.

It is likely that this will now apply to this consultation having regard to all of the complex technical papers submitted with the two applications.

This does not mean that the local community does not have concerns however.

There should have been a better vehicle for the local community to be made aware of the two planning applications and their content.

The Statement of Community Involvement accompanying the two applications appears to have taken no direct notice of the May 2021 consultation comments submitted by the community, despite the report suggesting that it has.

It has already been well documented by objectors that the benefits of retaining Site MU1 in the Green Belt and the health and well being for the local community, together with the protection of the existing mature hedgerows, grassland, managed agricultural land and the

protection of wildlife habitat etc, cannot be replicated by the Site MU1 development proposals, despite what the applicant's supporting documents say.

The proposal is to build a new link road carrying many additional thousands of vehicle movements per day, the building of 1,760 houses with new estate roads and large scale industrial sheds all of which will destroy the existing mature hedgerows, grassland, managed agricultural land, wildlife habitat etc,

The proposed development will result in additional air, noise and light pollution, despite what the supporting documentation claims.

How can all of this replicate the current environmental, health and well being benefits which the 122 hectares of Green Belt provided?

The wildlife corridors proposed as a replacement for the existing 122 hectares of habitat are seen as little value since they will be in the middle of a resultant URBAN AREA.

In the meantime all of the existing wildlife will have dispersed or been destroyed.

The site plan shows the destruction and removal of the existing mature hedgerows and trees, with the exception of *"most of the 2 areas of gulley woodland"*.

It is clear that a scorched earth policy is being adopted in preparing the site for development.

The inevitable disruption and disturbance which all this will cause for the area and the local community, bearing in mind the 15 year timescale involved, is truly horrendous.

I am saddened by the proposed closure and loss of the PROW's and Hermit Lane because of the countryside feel, inward and outward views and walks which they currently provide.

This cannot be replicated by the development which will become an URBAN AREA and result in the coalescence of the historic villages of Pogmoor, Gawber, Redbrook, Barugh Green and Higham.

Any existing traffic which currently uses Hermit Lane will have to find alternative routes via an already congested local road network.

There is no net additional benefit of green spaces as implied in the documentation.

The proposals include the provision of a new school, apparently sited near or next to the proposed link road.

This will be a link road with all of its additional residential traffic, HGVs and induced traffic flows, including all of the problems and pollution that this will bring.

It is noted that the site layout plan only shows a southern and northern entrance to the main area of Site MU1 using the proposed link road.

In addition to the additional traffic generated by the development, there will be additional traffic using the link road to other areas in the north and south of Barnsley, including HGVs from Claycliffe Business Park and beyond.

It is noted from the size of the "sheds" which are shown on the site plan layout that they will be marketed as suitable for logistic, warehouse and distribution uses.

This inevitably will result in HGV's and other additional vehicle movements, all seeking to access the M1 at J37, or J38 of the M1.

This will result in additional traffic, noise and light pollution experienced by the existing residents in the houses adjacent to the Higham roundabout and beyond.

Of concern is that surprisingly the submitted Transport Statements for the roundabout said *"The proposed roundabout will not generate any new trips itself"*, and that a sensitivity test had indicated that *".....traffic associated with the wider MU1 development would be satisfactorily accommodated by the proposed layout"*.

It is difficult to believe and accept the validity of such statements when the proposals are seen by the Council as a key part of a large development of 1760 houses and 43 hectares of employment land with all of the additional traffic movements which this will bring, together with the additional traffic generated from the 140 houses which are the subject of planning application 2020/0977.

The layout plan for the Phase 1 housing lacks clarity.

It is very difficult to identify the house type and designated plots. There is a need for more clarity in order for comments to be made.

In addition, further detail showing the distances between the proposed and existing houses is required.

The short drives and lack of parking spaces, which seems to be the norm with all new housing developments inevitably leads to excessive parking on roads and pavements.

There are many examples of this throughout the borough, including a recent development not a million miles from Site MU1

There is no indication of the screen planting on the boundary slope referred to in the Design and Access statement. This should be rectified and included in the application.

The Design of Housing Development SPD is quite clear.

It sets down the requirements and provisions for the design for new housing developments at GD 1, including that there should be no significant adverse effect on the living conditions and residential amenity of existing and future residents.

There clearly will be a significant adverse effect on the living conditions and residential amenity of existing residents arising from Phase 1 (and the future phases of both residential and employment) from the proximity and type of housing proposed.

It is also clear that there will be many years of heavy plant involved in site contour levelling, and construction activity bringing dust, noise and disturbance for existing residents.

The site plan proposals include green spaces within the residential development for new properties.

It does not respect or provide the provision of green spaces on the full perimeter of the overall site (including future residential developments) which abut existing residential developments.

Green buffer zones should be provided to safeguard and protect the living conditions and amenities of the occupiers of the existing dwellings on the edges of the site of the Phase 1 development, and all future residential developments in later phases. None are shown on the site plan for Phase 1 or future residential developments.

The Planning Statement report refers to high walls which are *“undevelopable land and as such provide an opportunity to become a network of strategic greenspace surrounding the development platforms”*.

One of these high walls is at the Pogmoor eastern boundary of the site and should provide sufficient scope to provide a buffer of green space between new housing on the site and the existing dwellings in Wharfedale Road.

In addition, the existing natural “green” wildlife corridor that already exists on the eastern part of the site running alongside and parallel to the rear gardens of the properties on the south side of Colster Close and the boundaries of the existing properties in the upper part of Wharfedale Road to Farmhouse Lane is not shown on the layout plan.

This should be addressed, enhanced and protected as a buffer zone between the existing properties and future proposed properties, in the same way that Harden Close and Drury Farm Court is shown on the site plan.

The proposals appear to conveniently omit such information.

Of concern is that the site plan appears to show no concessions being made to protect the existing privacy and residential visual amenity and outlook as a result of the loss of Green Belt land.

The documentation shows that it is proposed to re-contour the whole site by cut and fill to provide lowered development platforms to counter this.

It is not clear from the plans however, how this will be achieved.

The site cut and fill analysis drawing is very difficult to understand.

I would be concerned if the proposed lower platform levels (or coal extraction) resulted in damage, land slip or stability of adjacent land boundaries and existing properties, including my own in Wharfedale Road which abuts the development site.

This point is recognised at Section 5 of the *“Coal Mining Risk Assessment And Coal Recovery Report”* (Pogmoor).

In view of the importance of this first part of the development proposal lasting 8 years, the drawings should identify the locations of the development platforms and the areas of excavated and created embankments associated with each of them.

There should be clear sectional drawings for each of these areas.

There is reference in the documentation to a proposed vehicular access to the south eastern part of the site (adjacent to Pogmoor) being taken from Farmhouse Lane.

This is shown as a reserved matter application for this phase of the development.

Strong concerns have previously been expressed about this access proposal and the wider proposed housing development on this part of Site MU1.

Farmhouse Lane is narrow throughout its length and links into the southern end of Wharfedale Road.

This is considered to be a dangerous corner where motorists have a bad habit of ignoring the white line markings.

In addition, there are no pavements on either side of the stretch of Farmhouse Lane to the west of its junction with Wharfedale Road and none on about half of its south side going towards the Pogmoor Road junction. There is a going to be serious safety risk to pedestrians here.

The housing proposal is also likely to increase the number of vehicles already travelling along Pogmoor Lane to Westmoor Crescent in order to short cut to Pogmoor Road.

Pogmoor Lane’s almost complete absence of a separate footpath, coupled with its narrowness, already gives rise to safety problems for pedestrians.

The proposal as indicated, will also involve the removal of another section of mature hedgerow.

Wharfedale Road already acts as a ‘rat run’ for through traffic in both directions which has to pass along the narrow Church Street or Beever Lane where the amount of parking already

does constitute a safety hazard. The extra traffic generated by the housing envisaged will only serve to exacerbate these problems.

There will be a detrimental effect on the local character of the whole of this area together with a significant adverse effect on the living conditions and residential amenity of existing residents.

The Farmhouse Lane access proposal is unacceptable.

Having made my limited comments above, my overall objections to the development and the destruction of 122 hectares of Green Belt to facilitate Site MU1 remain.

The planning applications should be refused

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]