

---

**2017/1300**

**Applicant:** Mr Robert Wicks, C/o Alan Robinson

**Description:** Erection of 1 no. dwelling and associated access (Resubmission)

**Site Address:** Crowick House, Belle Green Lane, Cudworth, Barnsley, S72 8LU

---

This application is presented to Planning Regulatory Board at the request of Councillor Sir Steve Houghton. 7 representations in support have been received from members of the public.

### **Description**

Crowick House is a detached dwelling located at the end of Belle Green Lane in Cudworth. The dwelling is of unique/bespoke design, has an interesting building shape and a mixed material palette of stone and timber. The existing house is located at the edge of the settlement with the land beyond the southern boundary of the property, where the house is proposed to be relocated, lying in the Green Belt.

The proposed site where the house is to be relocated is a spacious plot, approximately rectangular in shape and amounts to around 0.19ha of land in total. The site is currently agricultural land with a large agricultural barn present on the land measuring 30m x 15m by 5.5m in height. The land slopes gently down from north to south and east to west, but otherwise there are no significant levels differences across the site. The barn is located up against an existing high hedgerow beyond which is a public footpath (Footpath No.7) and more agricultural fields.

To the north is the established residential area of Cudworth. The dwellings located immediately to the north of Crowick House (as existing) are new properties built by the applicants company, Oakstone Developments. A new development of 8 houses is in the process of being constructed on the site of the existing Crowick House (ref: 2016/1062) by the same company. At the time it was approved, this application included the demolition of Crowick House.

### **Proposed Development**

The proposed development is to demolish Crowick House and rebuild it on the Green Belt land to the south. The existing agricultural Barn would also be demolished.

The design of the new dwelling is a contemporary replica of the property to be demolished and it is proposed to re-use at least 85% of the materials incorporated in the original house. The new building will have significantly improved carbon credentials than the existing Crowick House. The applicants have provided SAP calculations which confirm that the house would meet very high standards of thermal insulation. A projected EPC has also been submitted and the applicants state that property would be Carbon Positive, exporting more power to the grid than it would consume.

### **History**

Previous applications on the land are as follows:-

B/02/0612/CU - Erection of dwelling houses and creation of a new access (Outline). The application was recommended for refusal by Officers 17/06/2002 due to the proposals being an inappropriate form of development in the Green Belt which would have been prejudicial to the character and openness of the Green Belt. However no decision was issued because of a dispute about the application fee amount.

2005/1466 - Residential Development (Outline). Outline planning permission granted with conditions 22/09/2005. The application site boundary differed from the 2002 application and did not include land within the Green Belt.

2011/0313 - Residential development (Outline). Outline planning permission granted with conditions 25/05/2011. Once again this did not include Green Belt land.

2011/1446 - Erection of 2no dwellings. The application was withdrawn 05/01/2012 prior to a decision being made on the application.

2012/0005 - Erection of 5 no. dwellings. Granted planning permission with conditions 20/03/2012.

2016/1062 Erection of 8 no. residential dwelling. Granted planning permission with conditions 27/10/2016

2017/0287 – Erection of 1 No.Dwelling House and Associated Access – The previous version of the application now under consideration was refused permission by the Council 17/05/2017 for the following two reasons:-

*1. The site lies within the Green Belt on the Saved Barnsley Unitary Development Plan, wherein it is the Policy of the Local Planning Authority not to permit new development except in very special circumstances, for purposes other than those set out in paragraphs 89 and 90 of the NPPF. Core Strategy Policy CSP34 reflects national policy guidance, protecting and safeguarding the countryside and open land around built up areas. In the opinion of the LPA the proposed dwelling constitutes inappropriate development contrary to policy and prejudicial to the character and openness of the Green Belt. Furthermore, there are considered to be no very special circumstances to justify the granting of planning permission in this instance.*

*2. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed would result in overlooking and overshadowing of adjacent properties, contrary to Saved UDP Policy H8A, Core Strategy Policy CSP29 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Designing New Housing Development.*

In addition the following application was made on the adjoining land to the south of the application site:-

2015/1255 - Erection of a steel frame general purpose building (Prior Notification Agricultural) – Deemed consent.

## **Policy Context**

Planning decision should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise and the NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. The development plan consists of the Core Strategy and the saved Unitary Development Plan policies. The Council has also adopted a series of Supplementary Planning Documents and Supplementary Planning Guidance Notes, which are other material considerations.

The Council has submitted our emerging Local Plan to the Secretary of State but we are at an early stage in the examination process. It establishes policies and proposals for the development and use of land up to the year 2033. The document is a material consideration and represents a further stage forward in the progression towards adoption of the Local Plan. As such increasing weight can be given to the policies contained within the document although, in accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF, the extent of this will depend on:

- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given) and;
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

### Saved UDP Policies

UDP notation: Green Belt

### Core Strategy

CSP2 'Sustainable Construction' Development will be expected to minimise resource and energy consumption.

CSP3 'Suds' All development will be expected to use Suds except in exceptional circumstances.

CSP4 'Flood Risk' sets out how the extent and impact of flooding will be reduced.

CSP8 'The Location of Growth' priority is given to development in Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns as set out in the settlement hierarchy.

CSP9 'Number of New Homes to be Built' is set at 21,500 between 2008 to 2026.

CSP10 'The Distribution of New Homes' provides an indication of the distribution of new homes across areas of the Borough.

CSP25 'New Development and Sustainable Travel' seeks to locate and design development to reduce the need to travel and be accessible to public transport, cyclists and pedestrians.

CSP26 'New Development and Highway Improvement' new development shall be expected to be designed and built to provide safe, secure and convenient access for all road users.

CSP29 'Design' sets out that high quality design shall be expected.

CSP 34 'Protection of Green Belt' the extent of the green belt will be safeguarded and remain unchanged.

CSP 36 'Biodiversity and Geodiversity' development is expected to conserve and enhance the biodiversity and geological features of the borough.

CSP 37 'Landscape Character' Development will be expected to retain and enhance the character and distinctiveness of the individual Landscape Character Area.

## Publication Draft Local Plan

The site remains located within the Green Belt as shown on the emerging Local Plan Proposals Map. As such policies GB1 'Protection of the Green Belt', GB2 'Replacement, extension and alteration of existing buildings in the Green Belt' and GB3 'changes of use in the Green Belt' would apply.

GB1 protects the green belt from inappropriate development in accordance with national planning policy.

## SPDs/SPGs

The following LDF Supplementary Planning Documents have now been adopted which are relevant to the proposal:-

'Designing New Residential Development' sets out the standards that will apply to the consideration of planning applications for new housing development.

'Parking' states that the parking standards for new housing development shall be 1 space for dwellings under 3 bedrooms in size and 2 spaces for 3 bed dwellings and above.

The South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide has been adopted as a best practice guide by the Council and covers issues relating to sustainability, local distinctiveness and quality in design and is underpinned by the principles in the CABI 'Building for Life' scheme.

## NPPF

The NPPF sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. At the heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole; or where specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted or unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Paragraphs of particular relevance to this application include:

- Para 7 – 3 dimensions to sustainable development
- Para 14 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- Para 55 – Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- Para's 58 & 60 – Design considerations
- Para 79-92 – Green Belt

## **Material Consideration**

*Barnsley Green Belt Review (ARUP) 2014, Cudworth (including the village of Brierley)*

Part of a suite of documents detailing the assessment of Barnsley's Green Belt to support the emerging Local Plan. The site is located on an area identified as CUD4 (one of 11 General Areas assessed in this document). The assessment is a 3 Stage Process, the first of which is a site assessment proforma appraising the 'General Area' against each of the five equally weighted purposes of the Green Belt with a score out of 25 determined. Stage 2 is an assessment of the constraints and suitability of land considered for removal of the Green

Belt and Stage 3 re-assesses if specific sites meet the Green Belt Purposes as defined in the NPPF.

CUD 4 achieves 16/25 at Stage 1 which signifies that the General Area as a whole is considered to be strongly fulfilling the purposes of the Green Belt. The detailed assessment acknowledges that there are irregularities / weaknesses in the boundary around the Dorothy Hyman (to the south) but that the boundary of the housing allocation on Belle Green Lane (which includes Crowick House) is more regular.

It is concluded that General Area CUD4 has a relatively strong functional relationship with the built form of Cudworth and does play a strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and protecting a largely essential gap between Cudworth and Grimethorpe. No Resultant Parcels are identified within the General Area which could be suitable for release from the Green Belt; therefore Stage 2 of the assessment is not required.

## **Consultations**

Highways DC – No objections in principle but have commented that the plans are insufficiently detailed with regards to demonstrating that the dwelling could be accessed by a fire appliance vehicle, or with regards to the provision of an alternative means of fire control in the event of an emergency.

Ward Councillors – Cllr Houghton has referred the application to the Board for determination.

Drainage – No objections

Yorkshire Water – They would wish to object to the application should it be proposed to plant trees over the public sewerage system located within the site. The plans should also detail the line of the sewer and any requirement to divert it is subject to agreement from YW.

Trees – The plans show that the proposed dwelling would be close to the trees on the southern boundary which border the footpath (much closer than the previous application) and as such a tree survey should have been provided so that the impacts can be properly assessed. If the development is close to, or encroaches in to, the rooting areas or canopy spreads of any of the trees an arboricultural impact assessment should also be provided.

PROW – No representations have been received.

Pollution – The Biomass Boiler is an exempted appliance. It must be operated to manufacturer's specifications. The stack shall be designed to ensure adequate dispersion of pollutants, such as ensuring a free flow from the chimney, which itself shall be at least 1 metre higher than roof ridge. In addition, a form must be completed in order to ascertain impact on local air quality.

Biodiversity – No representations have been received.

Design – It is clear that a lot of architectural thought has gone into the design of the elevations in terms of their solid/ void relationships, proportions, depth, planes and angles. Whilst the use of natural materials, (timber, reclaimed natural stone and zinc), is welcome I find it hard to make a case that this is an 'exceptional design'. The design of the dwelling in itself needs to be specific to the site and its context, otherwise it would be hard to argue it as having an 'exceptional quality' re: para 55 of the NPPF.

## Representations

The application was advertised through neighbour letters, a site notice and press advert. No objections have been made and 7 letters of support have been received. The letters give the following reasons to support the proposal:

- The high quality design of the building.
- Other recent development by the applicant has improved the area and increased security.
- Links to childhood and the film KES.
- Support for an Eco-House.
- Preservation of the contribution that the existing dwelling makes to the local character of the area.

## Assessment

### Principle of Development / Impact on the Green Belt

The NPPF (at Paragraph 14) is clear in that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay. The proposed development is, however, not in accordance with the development plan being located on a site that is allocated as Green Belt. Core Strategy Policy CSP 34 protects and safeguards the Green Belt which should remain unchanged. The NPPF is clear at paragraph 87 that *“inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”*. And at paragraph 88 *“when considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very Special Circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations”*.

### *Applicants Case*

The applicant has stated that the building needs to be rebuilt because of structural defects which make it unmortgageable. The applicant has also confirmed that the house cannot be rebuilt on its current site because, following the death of the applicants father, the land was left to the applicant and his two sisters on the condition that any financial benefit derived from the house or land be split between them. The applicant has confirmed that he owns the land to the south (the redline for the application) outright and that the field to the east belongs to his sister.

The applicant has sought to demonstrate that very special circumstances exist by virtue of:

- the high quality and unique design of the dwelling, being an example of an American Prairie House style designed by Architect William McCrow and the only known example of his work in the UK.
- Links to the film ‘Kes’, via the fact that the Architect William McCrow was the set designer for the film and the builder of the house (Eric Wicks) was a set builder.
- Links to the history of the wider borough of Barnsley, through the extensive use of reclaimed material on the existing building (85%); and

- The buildings eco-credentials in relation to utilising renewable energy, reduced energy consumption and through recycling materials (it is claimed that Crowick House was built from 85% reclaimed materials and when re-built would use 85% of the materials of the original house).

It is their case that the benefits arising from these amount to very special circumstances.

In terms of the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, it is the applicants view that the harm to the green belt is limited / off set by:

- the removal of the existing agricultural building on the site; and
- ceasing the use of the site of the barn for the storage of building materials.

In this regard the applicant is of the view that the proposed '*assists in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land*' one of the 5 purposes of the green belt. The applicant is also of the view that Crowick House once rebuilt will continue the building line along the eastern edge of Cudworth, which they state is terminated by the public bridleway and therefore no unrestricted sprawl will result.

#### *Assessment of the Development*

##### *- Harm to the Green Belt*

Crowick House is currently located at the very edge of the settlement of Cudworth with the land to the east, south and south west all open agricultural fields. Belle Green Lane ends at the access to the existing house after which it becomes a farm track / public footpath. It is proposed to re-locate Crowick House into the field adjacent (to the south). Some screening of the site is provided by existing hedgerows and trees along the field boundary, consistent with field boundaries in the wider area. The land is open to the east with no screening.

The fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristic of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Green Belt boundaries have been reviewed as part of the Local Plan process with no change proposed in this location. The wider area of Green Belt (of which this site forms part) was assessed to have "*a relatively strong functional relationship with the built form of Cudworth which does play a strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and protecting a largely essential gap between Cudworth and Grimethorpe*". The assessment undertaken acknowledges some blurring of the boundary at the Dorothy Hyman to the south but specifically states that the housing development sites to the north (along Belle Green Lane) have a clear defined edge. This directly conflicts with the applicant's view that the relocated Crowick House would continue the existing building line along Belle Green Lane to the edge of Cudworth. In fact, the relocated Crowick House would erode the existing clearly defined boundary and is inappropriate development which conflicts with two of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt i.e. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Substantial weight is attached to this harm in accordance with paragraph 88 of the NPPF.

Turning to the harm to the Green Belt, the applicant has stated that this is offset by the removal of the existing agricultural barn and through ceasing the use of the site as a builders yard. This is directly in conflict with the application form which states that the site is a garden. The barn was approved under the Prior Approval process in 2015 and no planning permission has been granted for the use of the site as a builders yard. Whilst the applicant refers to the builders yard as being established use, no evidence is provided to support this

claim and at the time that the agricultural barn was given Prior Approval the application was accompanied by a statement from Mr R Wick asserting that the site was part of a single agricultural holding known as Belle Green Farm and that:

*“We urgently require a general purpose agricultural building at this location for the following:-*

- We live at this location this also enhances security with the proposed building*
- To keep feeds/grain hay straw dry*
- Keep tractors trailers and implements and tools dry out of the winter weather when not in use*
- Keep all the mentioned above safe secure from vandalism and theft which is indeed a problem in this area”*

This is at odds with any use of the site as a builders yard.

Turning to the removal of the barn, NPPF paragraph 89 states that: ‘*A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt*’ and then lists specific exceptions to this, including the complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land). Development which would fall under this exception (i.e. the redevelopment of brownfield land) is not inappropriate and as such no very special circumstances would be required. However, the NPPF provides a clear definition of Previously Developed Land at Annex 2 and excludes “*land that is or has been occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings*”. It is therefore clear that the demolition of the barn and proposed redevelopment would not qualify as an exception to Green Belt policy as set out under NPPF paragraph 89. It should also be noted that under the conditions attached to the Permitted Development Rights utilised for the barn, if the agricultural use of the building ceases within 10 years the building must be removed and the land restored to its condition before the development took place. Therefore as the applicant has confirmed, through correspondence associated with this application, that the building is no longer required for agricultural purposes and stated that the agricultural land holding (Bell View Farm) has been divided up (following his father’s death), the barn should be removed and the site returned to its previous condition. In this regard its impact on the openness would also be removed. On this basis, only very limited weight can be afforded to this argument.

- *Very Special Circumstances*

In terms of Very Special Circumstances, the applicants have referred to the unique design of Crowick House. The applicant states that the house was built in 1969 and designed by Canadian architect William McCrow AIA who was the art director for the film Kes (filmed in the same year). The house incorporates materials reclaimed from various demolition sites around Barnsley but is stated (by the applicant) to be unsaleable in its current condition because of issues with its structural integrity. Whilst the proposed is clearly not an isolated dwelling (paragraph 55 in the NPPF), exceptional quality or innovative design can carry weight when considering the Very Special Circumstances for development in the Green Belt. To support this aspect of the case, the applicant has presented the design of Crowick House to the Design Review Service for Yorkshire and the Humber. A copy of the presentation has been provided with the application along with the Design Review Report issued by the Panel. The Council’s Design Officer has also assessed the proposed.

The Design Panel comments attribute merit to the historical and cultural narrative of the building through its links to the film Kes via William McCrow and the builder and on the influences on the design, which draws on the prairie house style of renowned architect(s) Frank Lloyd Wright and Bruce Goff. The Design Review Panel have suggested the site could become an educational resource and attribute a clear benefit of the scheme to the removal of the existing barn and possible improvements to the wider site through landscaping. The

applicant has been asked for further information in relation to architect William McCrow and his portfolio of work, however, whilst some evidence has been uncovered of other buildings he has designed - most notably the Windrush community in the City of Vaughan, Canada which is referenced in the Klienburg-Nashville Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan - the information provided is limited and does not support the narrative that the building or its architect has significant Architectural Credentials or that there would be a clear interest in the building as an education resource (from a design perspective). Further, the connection to the film 'Kes' is limited to the fact that the architect and builder worked together on the set, neither the building nor site feature in the film.

The Council's Design Officer acknowledges that a lot of architectural thought has gone into the design of the elevations in terms of their solid / void relationships, proportions, depth, planes and angles. However, it is hard to make a case that this is an 'exceptional design' or truly innovative. This view is supported by the recent planning permission for its demolition (2016/1062) which was submitted by the same applicant and the fact that the house is not subject to any specific protection. The relationship of the building with the area within which it is located is also an important factor. This is unclear and no evidence has been provided as to how the design evolved or responded to its specific environment. Regardless, any relationship to the surrounding landscape has been lost through the comprehensive development of land within its setting. The applicant has stated that subject to agreement on the principle of the development being acceptable, a detailed landscape study would be undertaken and a landscaping scheme provided, however, this would result in the landscape being altered to support / compliment the design of the building and not the other way round and these landscaping works themselves could constitute a change to the character of the Green Belt in this location. This latter point is exacerbated by the size of the development plot which provides a large garden and area of hardstanding for parking and maneuvering, itself inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

In conclusion, it is acknowledged that the building is unusual in the context of Cudworth and the wider borough of Barnsley and some weight can be attached to the quality of the overall design. However, this weight is reduced by the lack of evidence provided in relation to the architectural credentials of the building or any specific evidence about how the building was/is designed to respond to its location or its relationship with the surrounding area. The link to the film Kes is also only afforded limited weight as it is somewhat tenuous.

Turning to the eco credentials of the house once rebuilt, it is proposed to re-use 85% of the materials already incorporated in the original dwelling, of which it is claimed 85% are already recycled from elsewhere in the borough. The environmental sustainability of this approach is afforded some weight as a benefit of the proposal, however, the structural report provided is not conclusive as whether this level of recycling is achievable, particularly when the proposed alterations to increase the air tightness of the building are taken into account (which includes a new roof and glazing), the benefit and therefore weight afforded is reduced.

The applicants have stated that the house once rebuilt would surpass Passivehaus standards and Level 5 of the now scrapped code of sustainable development. This will be achieved through the use of high levels of thermal board insulation, with minimal thermal bridging, heat recovery ventilation, triple glazing and the buildings air tightness along with a 12Kw of Solar PV system with a high tech battery storage facility, Biomass Boiler and rainwater harvesting. A projected EPC and SAP calculations have been provided for the house as re-built confirming the potential for it to reach a SAP rating of 102 (a rating of 100 means zero energy cost with anything over being an exporter of energy). Regulatory Services have confirmed that the use of a biomass boiler would require a chimney stack or flue at least 1m above the roof which is not shown on the elevations. Neither is it clear where the Solar Panels would be located (the previously refused planning application (2017/0287)

showed the solar panels in the garden). Whilst the installation of a flue and solar panels on the roof of a dwelling can be permitted development, the fact that these elements have not been included in the design means that it is not possible to assess what the impact would be on the design of the building or on the Green Belt (it is not clear if the roof could accommodate the scale of solar panels required for a 12Kw system).

Therefore, whilst the use of sustainable technology and building techniques to minimise energy usage is of benefit and can hold weight in terms of demonstrating Very Special Circumstances, the lack of detail provided limits the ability to assess this aspect of the development.

Overall it is felt that the benefits of the scheme, through energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy (assuming a SAP rating of 102 is achieved) and the recycling of material, alongside the design and cultural and historical links of the building with the area are of some benefit; albeit not always clearly expressed by the applicant. However, these benefits (taken as a whole) do not amount to sufficient Very Special Circumstances which would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriate development.

### Residential Amenity

Crowick House, as relocated, would be 10m (measured at its closest point) from the boundary with properties approved under 2016/1062 which are currently being constructed. This is further back within the site than the previously refused application and the orientation of the building has been changed. Large areas of glazing form a characteristic of the building design with floor to ceiling windows in the elevation of Crowick House closest to the boundary (bedroom and study). Whilst distances have increased and the orientation of the building does remove instances where there is a direct line of sight (back to back) between windows, there remains a concern regarding privacy. The minimum standards as set out in the Designing New Housing Development SPD are not fully met and the situation is exacerbated by the small rear gardens of the properties approved under 2016/1062. These are only 6m in depth with the reduced distance approved only because the land to the south is Green Belt and therefore unlikely to be developed. The proposed still raises concerns regarding overlooking of the rear of properties to the north and, because of the change in level across the site and extent of glazing, a loss of privacy to Crowick House itself.

As such the proposed will result in loss of privacy which conflicts with CSP 29 Design and the SPD Designing New Housing Development.

### Highway Safety

Highways have no objection in principle but requested a plan showing all on-site parking/maneuvering, parking provision, bin collection point and tracking for a fire appliance. The revised plan submitted (S1 Rev A) does not show the tracking for a fire appliance, which is necessary as the length of the proposed drive exceeds the carry distance for a fire appliance. In addition, the drawing shows the location of the proposed fire hydrant within the rear garden of no: 71 Belle Green Lane and it is difficult to envisage how access to this hydrant would work. Therefore, further information would have been necessary to have demonstrated how these issues would have been overcome. It is likely that this could be resolved, however, it should be noted that any additional maneuvering space would have further impact on the Green Belt.

### **Conclusion**

The site lies within the Green Belt in the Saved Barnsley Unitary Development Plan and the emerging Local Plan, wherein it is the Policy of the Local Planning Authority and the

Government not to permit new development except in very special circumstances, for purposes other than those set out in paragraphs 89 and 90 of the NPPF. Core Strategy Policy CSP34 reflects national policy guidance, protecting and safeguarding the countryside and open land around built up areas. In the opinion of Officers the proposed dwelling constitutes inappropriate development contrary to policy and prejudicial to the character and openness of the Green Belt. In addition the development would conflict with two of the purposes of two of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt i.e. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Substantial weight is attached to the identified harm in accordance with paragraphs 79, 80, 87 and 88 of the NPPF. Accordingly there are insufficient very special circumstances to justify the granting of planning permission in this instance.

Furthermore the proposed would result in overlooking of adjacent properties, which is contrary to Saved UDP Policy H8A, Core Strategy Policy CSP29 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Designing New Housing Development.

In addition despite requests for additional information the applicant has not submitted sufficient details to enable an adequate assessment to be made of the effect of the proposal on trees or the wider landscape.

### **Recommendation**

Refuse permission

- 1 The site lies within the Green Belt in the Saved Barnsley Unitary Development Plan and the emerging Local Plan, wherein it is the Policy of the Local Planning Authority and the Government not to permit new development except in very special circumstances, for purposes other than those set out in paragraphs 89 and 90 of the NPPF. Core Strategy Policy CSP34 reflects national policy guidance, protecting and safeguarding the countryside and open land around built up areas. In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed dwelling constitutes inappropriate development contrary to policy and prejudicial to the character and openness of the Green Belt. In addition the development would conflict with two of the purposes of two of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt i.e. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Substantial weight is attached to the identified harm in accordance with paragraphs 79, 80, 87 and 88 of the NPPF. Accordingly there are insufficient very special circumstances to justify the granting of planning permission in this instance.
- 2 In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the proposed would result in overlooking of adjacent properties, contrary to Saved UDP Policy H8A, Core Strategy Policy CSP29 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Designing New Housing Development.
- 3 Despite requests for additional information the applicant has not submitted sufficient details to enable an adequate assessment to be made of the effect of the proposal on trees or the wider landscape.

PA Reference:-

2017/1300

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. 100022264. (2015)



**BARNESLEY MBC - Economic Regeneration**



Scale 1: -----