

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 16 November 2022 10:59  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** Reponses to the Neighbourhood Planning Submission.  
**Attachments:** [REDACTED].docx; Response form sht2.jpeg; Resonse form sht 1.jpeg

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

---

Please see attached.

Kind Regards.

[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows



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

13/11/2022

Subject: Neighbourhood Planning.

Section 5 Woods.

There is no mention of Noblethorpe Woods, situated behind Towngate, I am given to understand it is privately owned. I have enquired numerous times about ownership, and have been told that the near side of the beck is owned by the Council, with the remainder of the woods coming under Noblethorpe Estate.

Section 5 Issues & Options.

Wildlife is important and should be protected, however I would raise concerns of feeding the birds every day, due to rodent entry into houses. Which has happened recently.

Section 5.1.15 Housing Development.

This should be limited, the current Infrastructure in Silkstone and Silkstone Common cannot handle new developments. The drainage system is outdated it needs maintenance on a regular basis. The Schooling is full, parking for parents to drop the Children off is a nightmare, making it difficult for Cars Buses etc.

The Villages of Silkstone and Silkstone Common, are lovely places, with history in abundance. The current infrastructure cannot handle further developments



on any large scale. One shop at the Garage is the only means of access for many residents.



To help the examiner consider your representation, please specify which part of the plan you are commenting on, using the page number, section, paragraph, policy or map. Please put your comments here:

Please see attached sheet.

(and continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Please tick (or cross, or type yes in) the box if you would like to be notified whether the plan proposal is made (adopted) by the Council and to confirm that you have read the Council's privacy notice <https://www.barnsley.gov.uk/services/information-and-privacy/your-privacy/>

Please confirm whether you are under or over 18. If you are under 18 we may need to request permission from a parent or guardian to retain your data.

Under  
18

Over  
18



Please sign and date the form:

Signature

Date

16/11/2022

Please return your completed form by 5pm on Friday 18 November 2022 to:

Planning Policy, Regeneration and Culture, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council, PO Box 634, Barnsley S70 6GG or by email to [neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk](mailto:neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk)

Please note that any comments that you make will be made publically available, published on the Council's website and may be attributed to your name. Your comments will also be forwarded to the independent examiner and we may need to share your details with the examiner. The examiner will consider whether the Plan meets the statutory requirements and will recommend whether it should be submitted to referendum. It is your right to request that the Council notifies you of its decision under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, and your contact details will be used for this purpose should you request to be notified. You can however ask not to receive further contact in this regard by contacting [neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk](mailto:neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk)

The Council's corporate privacy notice, which includes details of the authority's Data Protection Officer and your Information Right, is available at:

<https://www.barnsley.gov.uk/services/information-and-privacy/your-privacy/>



## Response Form

**The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012: Regulation 16 –  
Publicising a plan proposal.**

**PUBLICATION OF THE SILKSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN PROPOSAL SUBMITTED  
TO BARNSELEY METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL FOR EXAMINATION**

**10am on Friday 7 October to 5pm Friday 18 November 2022**

The Silkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan prepared by Silkstone Parish Council has been submitted to Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council for examination. The Council must now publicise the Plan proposal and accompanying documents and seek comments. We would like to hear your views on the Plan proposal. It is available to view at:

- Library @ the Lightbox
- Penistone Library
- Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council's website at: [www.barnsley.gov.uk/silkstone-ndp](http://www.barnsley.gov.uk/silkstone-ndp)
- Silkstone Neighbourhood Plan website:  
[http://www.silkstoneplan.co.uk/The\\_Neighbourhood\\_Plan\\_34923.aspx](http://www.silkstoneplan.co.uk/The_Neighbourhood_Plan_34923.aspx)

Alternatively email [neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk](mailto:neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk) for more information.

Response forms must include a name and address otherwise your comments will not be taken into account

Title.....

Name .....

Organisation.....

Address.....  
.....  
.....

Postcode.....

Email.....

Clients details if relevant

Title.....

Name.....

Organisation.....

Address.....  
.....  
.....

Postcode.....

Email.....

If the details above/over are for an agent, please enter the client's details alongside



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 November 2022 23:18  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** Comments on Silkstone Common Neighbourhood plan

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

---

In response to the Silkstone common Neighbourhood plan my comments are as follows.

This plan makes no reference to a Planning Inspectors report by [REDACTED] (24th May 2018) regarding Site EC11 - Land at Silkstone Common, in response to a proposed development on the site, to which 100 local people sent objections to the council.

Her report talks about losing an area which acts as a transition between the main part of the village and the countryside and that infill of this area would be harmful to the existing compact form and character of the village. It also talks about the trees along the Trans Pennine trail banks and the likely pressure for removal or tree works on these in time, should any development go ahead. Her conclusion is that development on site EC11 would not be soundly based and that exceptional circumstances to remove this site from the Green Belt for housing development have not been demonstrated.

The Neighbourhood plan is very detailed in other ways and yet there is no mention of this, which was discussed by a number of local people with the planning group members at the last consultations earlier this year. I would like the plan to be amended to mention this.

In addition to the reasons given above, this land has become in recent times even more of a wildlife haven, hosting up to six hares at the same time and a number of hedgehogs.

With hares being a rapidly declining species and a priority species under the UK post 2010 biodiversity framework, and with them favouring a mosaic of habitats, fields, grassland habitats, hedgerows and woodland edges, this site is perfect for them. They do not use burrows, but simply shallow areas in the grassland, so obviously they are here because the habitat is just right for them and is rather more protected than farmland. Removing this green space would effectively mean the most important part of their habitat being removed.

Hedgehogs are also a priority species and now on the IUCN red list for British mammals and classed as vulnerable to extinction. This area seems to be a common branching out area from the allotments at South Yorkshire buildings for them.

I applaud the attention and detail given to wildlife in the plan but mitigation and hedgehog holes etc do not replace the existing habitat for hares, which we are fortunate to have.

The plan talks about protecting, enhancing and developing the parish's wildlife and biodiversity. Part 5.2.4 of the document talks about protecting and managing existing wildlife habitats as part of the landscape strategy objectives.

For these reasons I feel it is even more imperative that the plan is amended to mention [REDACTED] report.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]







## Response Form

### The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012: Regulation 16 – Publicising a plan proposal.

PUBLICATION OF THE SILKSTONE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN PROPOSAL SUBMITTED  
TO BARNSLEY METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL FOR EXAMINATION

10am on Friday 7 October to 5pm Friday 18 November 2022

The Silkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan prepared by Silkstone Parish Council has been submitted to Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council for examination. The Council must now publicise the Plan proposal and accompanying documents and seek comments. We would like to hear your views on the Plan proposal. It is available to view at:

- Library @ the Lightbox
- Penistone Library
- Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council's website at: [www.barnsley.gov.uk/silkstone-ndp](http://www.barnsley.gov.uk/silkstone-ndp)
- Silkstone Neighbourhood Plan website:  
[http://www.silkstoneplan.co.uk/The\\_Neighbourhood\\_Plan\\_34923.aspx](http://www.silkstoneplan.co.uk/The_Neighbourhood_Plan_34923.aspx)

Alternatively email [neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk](mailto:neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk) for more information.

Response forms must include a name and address otherwise your comments will not be taken into account.

Title.....

Name.....

Organisation.....

Address.....

.....

.....

Postcode.....

Email.....

Clients details if relevant

Title.....

Name.....

Organisation.....

Address.....

.....

Postcode.....

Email.....

If the details above/over are for an agent, please enter the client's details alongside



To help the examiner consider your representation, please specify which part of the plan you are commenting on, using the page number, section, paragraph, policy or map. Please put your comments here:

(and continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

Please tick (or cross, or type yes in) the box if you would like to be notified whether the plan proposal is made (adopted) by the Council and to confirm that you have read the Council's privacy notice <https://www.barnsley.gov.uk/services/information-and-privacy/your-privacy/>

Please confirm whether you are under or over 18. If you are under 18 we may need to request permission from a parent or guardian to retain your data.

Under  
18

Over  
18

Please sign and date the form:

Signature

[Redacted Signature]

Date

Please return your completed form by 5pm on Friday 18 November 2022 to:

Planning Policy, Regeneration and Culture, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council, PO Box 634, Barnsley S70 6GG or by email to [neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk](mailto:neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk)

*Please note that any comments that you make will be made publically available, published on the Council's website and may be attributed to your name. Your comments will also be forwarded to the independent examiner and we may need to share your details with the examiner. The examiner will consider whether the Plan meets the statutory requirements and will recommend whether it should be submitted to referendum. It is your right to request that the Council notifies you of its decision under Regulation 19 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations, and your contact details will be used for this purpose should you request to be notified. You can however ask not to receive further contact in this regard by contacting [neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk](mailto:neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk)*

*The Council's corporate privacy notice, which includes details of the authority's Data Protection Officer and your Information Right, is available at:*

*<https://www.barnsley.gov.uk/services/information-and-privacy/your-privacy/>*



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 November 2022 20:35  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** Neighbourhood Plan

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

---

To whom it may concern:

I am writing this email in objection to the Neighbourhood Plan in its current form. The omission of any mention of the decision of the planning inspector, [REDACTED], around site EC11 concerns me greatly. My partner and I bought our house on [REDACTED] on the strength of this decision, so naturally any means to get around this is a cause of great worry to us both. I respect the need to build affordable housing, but this was considered at great length and the justification not considered to be appropriate to remove the area from the Green Belt for housing development. Well over a hundred people were in attendance at the public meeting, with not a single person present in favour of such a move.

I hope that you will reconsider the failure to mention such a significant recent and relevant matter from the Neighbourhood Plan, as was promised to us on 7th June this year by the Neighbourhood Planning Group.

Thank you

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 November 2022 14:51  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** Comments on the NP

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

---

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

---

- Still no mention of decision made by planning inspector [REDACTED] ie. that there should be no housing built on the field known as EC11.
  - We were promised that there would be a clear mention of her decision by the neighbourhood planning group on 7 June 2022.
  - I would therefore like the NP to be amended to include a clear and complete reference to [REDACTED] decision, set out in her letter to the Council dated 24 May 2018. (In my previous comments on the Draft Plan I did send you a copy of [REDACTED] letter).
  - To briefly paraphrase what she decided....
1. Housing on EC11 would be harmful to the existing compact form and character of Silkstone Common village;
  2. More housing along the TPT could possibly encourage households to further cut down trees ( or parts thereof) in order for more light in their gardens. A short walk along the TPT will show the observer several places where this has happened in the past.
  3. That the exceptional circumstances necessary to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt for housing development "had not been demonstrated."

Furthermore, when we (Keep Silkstone Common Green) arranged a public meeting in the local village primary school, we had well over a hundred people attend. No one there said they were in favour of housing on EC11. Indeed 100 objections were lodged with the Council on this subject.

[REDACTED]

- .

Sent from my iPhone



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18 November 2022 12:43  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** Fw: Representations regarding the Silkstone and Silkstone Common Neighbourhood Plan  
**Attachments:** [REDACTED] letter.pdf; IMG\_2739.JPG; IMG\_2740.JPG; IMG\_2741.JPG; IMG\_2742.JPG; IMG\_2745.JPG; thumbnail-5.jpg; thumbnail-6.jpg; IMG\_2739.JPG

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

---

With all attachments.

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk <neighbourhoodplanning@barnsley.gov.uk>  
**Sent:** Friday, 18 November 2022 at 11:40:06 GMT  
**Subject:** Representations regarding the Silkstone and Silkstone Common Neighbourhood Plan

[REDACTED]

18th November 2022

Barnsley MBC  
Neighbourhood Planning.

Dear BMBC,

I wish to make the following representations concerning the Silkstone Neighbourhood Plan.

1. The failure to reference the decision of [REDACTED], planning inspector, regarding Green Belt land at Throstlenest Equestrian Centre, Silkstone Common, designated EC11 in the Draft Local Plan, and the Local Authority's acceptance of it.

Barnsley MBC's Draft Local Plan included the above site for housing development. Silkstone Parish Council did not respond to the draft plan and local residents formed a community group and adopted the name 'Keep Silkstone Common Green' to oppose this element of the plan.

A public meeting was held in March 2018 which was attended by well over 100 residents of Silkstone Common and 100 formal objections to the plan to build houses on this meadow were lodged with Barnsley MBC.

Stage 4 Hearings took place in April 2018, presided over by [REDACTED], the appointed Inspector, and having read these objections and heard oral evidence for over two hours, [REDACTED] wrote to Barnsley MBC on the 24th of May 2018 and stated that the exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated. Barnsley MBC accepted that decision and dropped this element of the plan from the final version of what became the Local Plan.

Silkstone Parish Council subsequently established a Neighbourhood Planning Group as a sub committee of the council. A Draft Neighbourhood Plan was prepared which did not contain reference to the decision of [REDACTED] regarding this site and I, and others, responded asking for this to be rectified.

The relevant parts of [REDACTED] letter and my e mail to the planning group dated 11th April 2022 are attached below and I would be grateful if you would read these now.



As a result of this e mail and a subsequent telephone conversation I had with [REDACTED], the chair of the planning group, i and two other members of Keep Silkstone Common Green attended a meeting of the planning group on the 27th of April 2022. After some discussion we were assured by [REDACTED], in the presence of the whole group and their planning consultant, that the submitted plan would contain reference to [REDACTED] decision and acceptance that the field in question was not suitable for housing development.

I made a contemporaneous note of this meeting which i sent in the form of an e mail to other members of Keep Silkstone Common Green on the 29th of April 2002 and I have attached that note below and would be grateful if you would read that now.

On the 6th of June 2022 the full Parish Council considered the Draft Neighbourhood Plan and, despite the assurances given by [REDACTED] and the Neighbourhood Planning Group, I received an e mail from [REDACTED] dated 7th of June 2022 indicating that no reference to Ms Housden's decision and the Council's acceptance of it would be included in the submitted version. Reasons for this decision were set out by Mr Turner in his e mail which I attach below. Please read that now.

You will see that [REDACTED] states that 'the narrative flow of the document' makes it difficult to incorporate such a reference. I am unable to accept this. It seems to me a simple matter to incorporate such a reference at paragraphs 5.2.60 or 5.1.27. of the submitted plan.

Neither do I accept that such a statement should not be included because the submitted plan does not reference 'other controversial planning proposals affecting the village. The matter could fairly be described as 'controversial' while there was a difference of view between Barnsley MBC and those objecting to housing development on the site, but it ceased to be controversial when Barnsley MBC accepted Ms Housden's decision and removed the site from the Local Plan. It simply became agreed by the inspector, Barnsley MBC and the objectors view that development of this site should not take place; controversy evaporated at this point. Further evidence of its uncontroversial nature seems to me to be demonstrated by the fact that 81% of those responding to the parish council's own 'issues and options' consultation want the Green Belt land in the village to be protected, which makes the refusal of the parish council to include reference to this extraordinary in my view.

Also, I'm unable to accept that this matter can be regarded as similar to 'other controversial planning proposals affecting the village'. I have lived in Silkstone Common for fifteen years and am unaware of any other planning issue concerning such a large site, that has generated the degree of opposition and resulted in a planning inquiry or hearing following which an inspector has reached the conclusion that development of a site for housing would be positively harmful to the form and character of the village.

For these reasons I, and others in the village, are alarmed by [REDACTED] comment, recorded in the note of our meeting, that 'if any ( housing) was built on the field that was designated EC11 in the Local Plan it certainly wouldn't on the whole field.'

In my view this raises the distinct possibility that [REDACTED], at least, has given some thought as to where the affordable housing that the submitted plan makes clear they believe is needed might be built.

2. The evidence base for the assertion throughout the submitted Neighbourhood Plan that smaller 'affordable' housing is needed.

You will have read my thoughts on the evidence for this in my response to the draft Neighbourhood Plan dated 11th April and my note of the meeting between the planning group and myself and others from Keep Silkstone Common Green records the discussion that took place on this issue then.

At this stage the draft Neighbourhood plan included a policy H3 concerning rural exception housing which has subsequently been deleted from the submitted plan. However, a major theme of the narrative of the plan remains the need for more such housing. This aspiration seems to be based on the planning group's consultation with six or seven young people from the parish. I accept that the views of these young people may be correctly reported but I do not accept that these views are the same as objective evidence of a need for more modestly priced housing in Silkstone Common.

In support of my view I would refer to the NPPG which states that "A policy in a Neighbourhood Plan should be 'concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence, reflecting and responding to both the context and the characteristics of the area ( para 41).

[REDACTED], professor of planning at Reading University states, 'Policies must be supported by robust evidence and not just based on local opinion' ( pd 87 of Neighbourhood Planning in Practice, Lund Humphries, 2019).



If this is true of policies it must also be relevant to the major aspirations set out in the narratives of a Neighbourhood Plan in my view.

For all the reasons set out above I would ask the examiner to recommend

a) amendment of the plan by insertion of a paragraph saying;-

The field at Throstlenest Equestrian Centre that was designated EC 11 in the Draft Local Plan was considered by a planning inspector who concluded that;  
Development of this site would result in the loss of an undeveloped gap which forms a transition between the main built-up area of the village and the more dispersed development within the open countryside to the south of the Transpennine Trail. The consolidation of development at this point would be harmful to the existing compact form and character of the village. Furthermore the mature trees along the Transpennine Trail banks make a significant contribution to the landscape setting and visual amenity of this part of the village. Whilst they would be outside of the site boundary and individual garden curtilages, the location of the development to the north of the trees would be likely to cause pressure for removal or tree works from individual householders. For the reasons outlined above I consider that site EC 11 would not be soundly based and the exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt for housing development have not been demonstrated'.

b) relevant amendments to the submitted plan to remove references to the evidence base for more affordable or lower cost housing  
and paragraphs indicating that aspiration.

c) I would ask the inspector to make clear that without these amendments the plan would not reflect a shared vision for the neighbourhood area and would therefore not meet the Basic Conditions as it would not have regard to national policy within the NPPF.

If I can provide any further information I would be very happy to do so.

Yours Sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

Telephone [Redacted]

[Redacted]



## **Barnsley Local Plan Examination**

Inspector - [REDACTED]  
Programme Officer - [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

[REDACTED]  
Planning Policy Group Leader  
Place Directorate  
Economic Regeneration Service  
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council  
PO Box 634  
Barnsley  
South Yorkshire  
S70 9GG

24 May 2018

Dear [REDACTED]

### **Barnsley Local Plan Examination – Post Hearings**

1. I am writing following the closing of the Stage 4 Hearings and the accompanied site visit to Site H73 on 8 May 2018 to set out my observations on the plan at this stage and on the way forward with the Examination. This letter refers to the employment land requirement, five year land supply, Examination Consultation sites EC9, CA2a, EC11, EC6, EC7, EC1 and EC2 in the submission plan and the implications of a recent Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) judgement for the Habitats Regulations Assessment.
2. My comments are based on all the representations and evidence that I have read and heard at the Stage 1, 2, 3 and 4 hearing sessions including the Council's response to my interim findings. However, I emphasise that the Examination is not yet concluded and consultation on further Main Modifications (MMs) is still to take place. Consequently the comments in this letter are made without prejudice to my conclusions in my final report on the Examination.
3. The Council has published a table of Proposed Modifications on the Examination web site (SD30 Version 1.5). This was the subject of further discussion at the final hearing session on 27 April 2018 to establish which of those should be treated as main modifications and which should be additional. This letter focuses on those areas where further changes to the Proposed MMs will be necessary and where further MMs will be needed to address matters of soundness. My final report will also cover other matters that have arisen during the Examination but which are not referred to in this letter.



4. Subject to the necessary MMs to deal with the matters below, my current view is that the plan is likely to be capable of being found legally compliant and sound. I will set out my reasoning for this conclusion in my final report. In the meantime, I intend to liaise with the Council on any further changes necessary to the wording of the current Proposed MMs and the wording of any further MMs which are produced in response to this letter. In so far as is necessary, the final Schedule would then be subject to further Sustainability Appraisal and assessment under the Habitats Regulations Assessment and full public consultation.

#### Revised Jobs Target and Employment Land Requirement

5. Main Matter 16 covered the Council's revised jobs target (reduction from 33,000 to 28,840 or 23,560 FTE) and the employment land requirement. Notwithstanding the reduced jobs target, the Council is not proposing to reduce the employment land requirement of 307 hectares set out in Policies E1 and E2<sup>1</sup> of the submission plan. The Council's position is based on a number of factors including revised assumptions about the proportion of B1(a)(b)(c), B2 and B8 uses that are likely to come forward on the proposed allocated sites and the corresponding numbers of jobs created and the need to maintain a 'forward' supply of sites towards the end of the plan period in order to support continued improvements to job density within the Borough.
6. The 307 hectare figure itself represented an 'over' supply compared with the objectively assessed need for 291 hectares of employment land set out in the Employment Land Review (EB33) and the Employment Background Paper. The mix of employment uses and associated number of jobs that may come forward on the allocated sites over the plan period remains uncertain. However, I consider that in the context of the reduced jobs target, the employment land requirement set out in Policies E1 and E2 should be 291 hectares. It will be necessary to amend MM11 and MM290 accordingly and other consequential text changes may be required.
7. MM18 already proposes to reduce the employment allocation at site HOY1 from 52.3 hectares to 49.3 hectares with a corresponding Policies Map change. In addition, I consider that Site UB16 (9.3 hectares) should be deleted as an employment land allocation. Its deletion should form a further MM with corresponding Policies Map change. The site is the subject of a current outline planning application for housing and I consider that it should be identified as an additional housing site through a further MM and Policies Map change.

#### Five Year Land Supply and the Appropriate Buffer

8. Having regard to the housing requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy, I consider there has been a persistent under delivery of housing.
9. At this point in time, a 20% buffer added to the five year supply of deliverable sites (brought forward from later in the plan period) is

---

<sup>1</sup> Proposed MM11 and MM290



appropriate and justified. However, for reasons which will be set out more fully in my final report, I consider that the backlog should be dealt with over the lifetime of the plan – the 'Liverpool' method. This permutation accords with the final table set out in the Council's document BMBC044 and indicates a five year requirement of 7345 dwellings in the 2018/19 to 2022/23 period or 1469 per year. This should be included in the proposed MMs.

10. A MM is also necessary to update to the housing trajectory to take account of the site deletions and additional site which have been referred to in this letter and to ensure inclusion of the most recent trajectory within the plan. It would also be helpful to include the most recent position on the planning status of the proposed housing allocation sites as discussed at the hearing sessions, in particular where any planning permissions have been granted.

#### Examination Consultation Sites

##### Site EC9 - Land north of Darton Road, Cawthorne

11. The existing development to the north of Darton Road extends along a prominent ridge line creating a distinctive form and character to the village. More recent residential development has occurred between Darton Road/Taylor Hill/Tivy Dale and the A635 to the south. The proposed site allocation of 86 houses extending into the open countryside to the north of the village would be harmful to its existing form and character. The site also includes allotments proposed to be designated as greenspace under Policy GS2 of the submission plan. The northern boundary of the site is not delineated by any features on the ground which would create stark and harsh edge to the northern boundary of the development for a considerable period of time.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that Site EC9 would not be soundly based and should not be included as a housing allocation within the proposed MMs to the plan. The site should remain as safeguarded land (SAF27) as proposed in the submission plan. It follows that the exceptional circumstances for the release of Site CA2a from the Green Belt for additional safeguarded land have not been demonstrated and the site should not be included within the proposed MMs.
13. Site EC9 and safeguarded land Site CA2a formed part of the Examination Consultation on additional sites and were not proposed as part of the submission plan. Consequently their deletion would not form part of the proposed MMs. Nonetheless, in the interests of fairness, I intend to invite representations on their omission from the plan as part of the consultation on the MMs.



#### Site EC11 - Land at Silkstone Common

14. Development of this site would result in the loss of an undeveloped gap which forms a transition between the main built-up area of the village and the more dispersed development within the open countryside to the south of the Transpennine Trail. The consolidation of development at this point would be harmful to the existing compact form and character of the village.
15. Furthermore, the mature trees along the Transpennine Trail banks make a significant contribution to the landscape setting and visual amenity of this part of the village. Whilst they would be outside the site boundary and individual garden curtilages, the location of development to the north of the trees would be likely to cause pressure for removal or tree works from individual householders.
16. For the reasons outlined above, I consider that Site EC11 would not be soundly based and that the exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt for housing development have not been demonstrated. However, Site EC11 also formed part of the Examination Consultation on additional sites and was not proposed as part of the submission plan. Consequently its deletion would not form part of the proposed MMs and in the interests of fairness, I intend to invite representations on its omission as part of the consultation on the MMs.
17. Sites EC6 and proposed safeguarded Site EC7 at Oxspring also formed part of the Examination Consultation on additional sites but the Council concluded that they should not be taken forward having regard to Historic England's representations on the effect on designated heritage assets. Nonetheless, in the interests of fairness I intend to invite representations on the omission of Sites EC6 and EC7 as part of the consultation on the MMs.

#### Sites EC1 and EC2 - Land to the north of Staincross Common

18. Site EC1 formed part of a larger area proposed to be released from the Green Belt and identified as safeguarded land in the submission plan (SAF5). It was consulted on as an additional site during the Examination Consultation for 669 dwellings. Site EC2 to the north is proposed to be removed from the Green Belt and designated as safeguarded land and could accommodate approximately 675 dwellings.
19. The combined development of Sites EC1 and EC2 would represent a significant scale of development. Limited supporting technical evidence has been supplied in relation to capacity in local infrastructure, the impact of the proposed development and specific requirements to mitigate its impact. The effect of additional traffic movements on the local highway network is a matter of concern given the proximity and cumulative impact of other proposed developments including at Royston and Mapplewell. At the hearing sessions it was indicated that scoping work for a Transport Assessment was underway but the extent of the necessary highway works is unclear. The Council has also indicated that secondary school capacity at Darton College would also need to be addressed.



20. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that 'Where sites are proposed for allocation, sufficient detail should be given to provide clarity to developers, local communities and other interests about the nature and scale of development (addressing the 'what, where, when and how' questions). Whilst production of a masterplan framework for the site could form a MM, at a plan level I am concerned that the proposed allocation of Site EC1 has not been fully justified and that exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt for housing development. As such, the proposed allocation is not soundly based and I consider that the site should remain as safeguarded land as proposed in the submission plan. The exceptional circumstances for the release of Site EC2 from the Green Belt for additional safeguarded land have not been demonstrated and it should not be included as additional safeguarded land within the schedule of proposed MMs.
21. Site EC1 and proposed safeguarded Site EC2 also formed part of the Examination Consultation on additional sites. Consequently their deletion would not form part of the proposed MMs. Nonetheless, in the interests of fairness I intend to invite representations on the proposed omission of Sites EC1 and EC2 as part of the consultation on the MMs.

#### Habitats Regulations Assessment

22. On 12 April 2018 the CJEU issued a judgement in the case of People over Wind, Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta which ruled that Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive must be interpreted as meaning that mitigation measures (referred to in the judgment as measures which are intended to avoid or reduce effects) should be assessed within the framework of an appropriate assessment (AA) and that it is not permissible to take account of measures intended to avoid or reduce the harmful effects of the plan or project on a European site at the screening stage.
23. I would therefore advise the Council to confirm the extent to which they consider the Habitats Regulations Report is legally compliant in the light of the judgement and to review the screening assessment as part of this consideration. If the review of the screening assessment concludes that an AA is required it will be necessary to carry this out and consider whether the AA necessitates any additional MMs to identify and secure additional avoidance and reduction measures. In undertaking this review, the Council should consult Natural England and have regard to any representations made by them.
24. Assuming that the Council would be content to adopt the plan subject to these modifications, I will continue to liaise via the Programme Officer to finalise the Proposed MMs, the changes to the Policies Maps and arrangements for consultation on the MMs. Should this not be the case I would be grateful if you would advise me of the Council's position. I am not inviting or proposing to accept comments on the contents of this letter from any other Examination participants. However, there will be further public consultation on the proposed MMs.



25. Please let me know via [REDACTED] if there are any questions in the meantime.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

INSPECTOR



25/04/2022, 12:00

Yahoo Mail - Response to the Draft Silkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan 2022-33

## Response to the Draft Silkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan 2022-33

From: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]

Date: Monday, 11 April 2022, 16:05 BST

Dear Neighbourhood Planning Committee,

Re: Response to then Draft Silkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan 2022-33

---

Thank you for preparing the plan.

I've grouped my remarks, objections and suggestions in line with your suggested format as it appears on page 3 of the printed version the draft.

1. Do you support the draft vision and objectives and draft planning policies?

I'm afraid I don't support the vision of the plan as it is currently drafted for the following reasons.

a). I believe here is a conflict between draft objective 2 ( which appears on page 16 of the printed booklet) as this states, amongst other things, that your objective is 'To protect, enhance and develop.....the green belt, green open spaces etc, and your draft policy HI, ( which appears on page 21) as this states, ' Proposals for new housing development in Silkstone Parish will be supported where proposals, 'comprise... development not considered inappropriate in the Green Belt, including rural exception housing in accordance with NDP Policy H3'.

I'm afraid I don't believe that supporting housing developments on Green Belt land can sensibly be regarded as protecting, enhancing or developing the Green Belt around our villages. Once it has been developed this land, to all intents and purposes, is no longer Green Belt land, and is lost as such not only to those currently living in our villages now, but to the generations following us. I note that paragraph 5.4.5 of the draft plan records that "81% of respondents to the issues and options consultation ( which I confess I was unaware of) thought it was very important to retain green and open spaces.

b) These objectives and the policies that underpin them also in tension with Barnsley MBC's Local Plan, the relevant part of which is quoted at para 5.1.23 of your draft plan. The Local Plan acknowledges that 'limited affordable housing may be allowed in or on the edge of villages', but goes on to say that ' As available and suitable sites my be limited within the villages, proposals my have to be considered on the edge in the Green Belt and are likely to be controversial'.

Given that the Local Planning Authority accepts the controversial nature of any such development within villages it is extremely difficult to see how your plan as currently drafted could be seen to be a 'shared vision' for development in the Parish. I think that is put beyond doubt by the fact that an organisation called 'Keep Silkstone Common Green' was formed in 2018 precisely to resist a proposal to build housing on Green Belt land at Silkstone Common. The Parish Council was well aware of this organisation and indeed provided limited funding to organise a public meeting in Silkstone Common which attracted well over a hundred residents who submitted a hundred objections to the proposal. Perhaps with hindsight it would have been helpful to have approached Keep Silkstone Common Green with an invitation to participate in the preparation of your draft plan.

However, following a telephone conversation with your [REDACTED] I'm aware that a member of Keep Silkstone Common Green has supplied you with a copy of a letter dated the 14th of May 2018 written by [REDACTED], Planning Inspector, to Barnsley MBC following hearings at which representations were made by all interested parties, and which records her view in respect of one particular parcel of land referred to as EC11 in the draft Local Plan. I have sent a further copy of this letter to [REDACTED] and to the Clerk of the Parish Council also. The n a letter states in respect of that development proposal on the site, at paragraphs 14 to16;-

"Development of this site would result in the loss of an undeveloped gap which forms a transition between the main built-up area of the village and the more dispersed development with the open countryside to the south of the



25/04/2022, 12:00

Yahoo Mail - Response to the Draft Silkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan 2022-33

Transpennine Trail. The consolidation of development at this point would be harmful to the existing compact form and character of the village. Furthermore, the mature trees along the Transpennine Trail banks make a significant contribution to the landscape setting and visual amenity of this part of the village. Whilst they would be outside the site boundary and individual garden curtilages, the location of development to the north of the trees would be likely to cause pressure for removal or tree works from individual householders. For the reasons outlined above, I consider that site EC11 would not be soundly based and that the exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt for housing development have not been demonstrated'.

Barnsley MBC accepted [REDACTED] view and the proposal was deleted from the draft Local Plan and the Plan adopted does not include reference to the site for housing. The controversial nature of development on Green Belt land in and around the village is well established by these facts in my view, so that it would be wrong for the draft neighbourhood plan to suggest otherwise.

2. Is there anything you object to?

a) For the reasons stated above I object to Draft Policy H3 Rural Exception Housing as this proposes that proposals to develop housing on Green Belt land on the edge of Silkstone or Silkstone Common will be supported in the circumstances detailed in the policy.

b) In addition I believe that policies that are proposed in the Plan should be evidenced by robust evidence. In paragraph 5.1.21 of the draft Plan you say that public consultation included 'a number of responses , particularly from the group of young people, setting out concerns about affordability and availability of housing in the Parish'.

Whilst I accept that such opinions may well have been stated by the young people concerned , and that others may have expressed support for an increase in the supply of family homes to provide opportunities for residents to downsize whilst remaining in the local community, as stated at paragraph 5.1.12, this is evidence of comments being made. This is not the same as having actual evidence of the need for more lower priced housing in the Parish. Paragraph 5.1.6 states that a Barnsley MBC report of 2014 identifies a shortfall in affordable housing in the Penistone and Dodworth areas these areas are not within the Parish. Indeed at paragraph 5.1.7 the draft Plan says 'The Parish does not have an up to date Parish Housing Needs Survey. A new housing survey has been commissioned by Barnsley Council this is unlikely to provide fine grained detail at the Parish level'.

However, I believe that in Silkstone Common, at least, there is a relatively large amount of housing which is priced well below the average price of houses in the Parish. The Land Registry website states that the average house price in England in May 2021 was £271,434.

There are 56 freehold houses in South Yorkshire Buildings and a quick survey of Land Registry and Zoopla data indicates the sale prices of many of these over the last five years as follows:-

Property Address	No. of Bedrooms.	Last Sold.	Sale Price
2 South Yorkshire Buildings. the Land Registry web site states that the average house price in England was £271,434)	2 bedrooms,	May 2021.	£125,000 ( in the same month
6.South Yorkshire Buildings	3 bedrooms.	June 2020.	£120,000
7 South Yorkshire Buildings	2 bedrooms.	Dec. 2018	£105,000
13 South Yorkshire Buildings	2 bedrooms.	March 2020	£130,000
14 South Yorkshire Buildings	2 bedrooms.	March 2019.	£101,500
15 South Yorkshire Buildings.	2 bedrooms	Feb. 2018	£104,000
22 South Yorkshire Buildings	2 bedrooms.	Jan. 2017	£86,500
29 South Yorkshire Buildings	3 bedrooms	March 2019	£115,000



34 South Yorkshire Buildings.	3 bedrooms	March 2018	£126,000
53 South Yorkshire Buildings.	2 bedrooms.	Aug. 2021.	£120,000

A similar very quick search regarding flats at Broomfield House at 19 Ben Bank Road, Silkstone Common shows they attract similar prices .

3 Bloomfield House	3 bedrooms.	Dec. 2018	£ 175,000
6 Bloomfield House.	2 bedrooms.	Oct. 2019	£130,000
9 Bloomfield House	2 bedrooms.	March 2021	£130,000

There are 26 two and three bedroom Houses on Moorend Lane Silkstone Common which have sold for the following prices;-

40 Moorend Lane.	3 bedrooms	Oct 2019	£180,000
54 Moorend Lane	2 bedroom.	Dec. 2020	£148,000

There are terraced houses on Ben Bank Road Silkstone Common which have sold for the following prices.

52 Ben Bank Road	2 bedrooms	Dec. 2020.	£110,000
54 Ben Bank Road	2 bedrooms	Dec. 2020	£148,000
56 Ben Bank Road	3 bedrooms.	June 2019	£145,000
78 Ben Bank Road	2 bedrooms.	Feb 2019	£127,000
82 Ben Bank Road	3 bedrooms.	June 2021	£155,000

Freehold Bungalows at Woodland View, Silkstone Common are also reasonably priced as indicated by the sale and purchase of

1 Woodland View	2 bedrooms.	Oct. 2019	£180,000
-----------------	-------------	-----------	----------

The time available has not permitted further detailed searches to be undertaken but this can be done if necessary. The point being made of course is that there is no evidence indicated in the draft plan that more 'affordable housing' is required in the Parish and that which is available for Silkstone Common suggests the reverse is true.

c). For the reasons set out in paragraph 2 b above I object to Draft Policy H3 Rural Exception Housing and request that it is deleted from the draft Plan.

### 3. Suggestions for comments or changes

a). i note that at paragraphs 3.8 to 3.12 the draft Plan refers to Sports and Recreation facilities in the Parish. The Throstlenest Equestrian Centre in Silkstone Common is not mentioned here. Similarly at paragraphs 3.17 and 3.18 Local Businesses are listed but the Equestrian Centre is not listed. Your objective 5 is 'to support the protection and improvement of community leisure, sports and recreation facilities and your objective 6 is 'to support the development of sustainable local economy, with particular emphasis of maximising local tourism assets'.



The Equestrian Centre is a very important leisure and business enterprise in Silkstone Common and has recently opened a cafe and succeeded in obtaining planning permission to extend its car park. It provides important training in equestrian skills for young people, including those with disabilities, not only within the Parish but across a wider area. Several young people act as volunteers at the weekends. I would suggest a specific reference to encouraging proposals for the development of facilities and businesses providing equestrian facilities and training in draft policy R1. I note that paragraph 5.4.15 of the draft plan says that 93.8% of respondents to the issues and options consultation wanted to see a policy in the NDP which supported investment in local recreational and sports provision.

b) At paragraph 5.2.19 of the draft Plan reference is made to Moorend Wood. It is stated that the area was threatened with housing development in 2018. This is not correct. It was the field owned by the Throstlenest Equestrian Centre designated EC11 by Barnsley MBC in its draft Local Plan as explained above in my 1 b. I would be grateful if you would correct this.

I would also be grateful if you would add this wood to the list of green space woods considered to be important at paragraph 5.2.54 of the draft plan.

4. Is there anything important that you think we have missed?

In paragraph 1 b above I have set out briefly the background to the campaign mounted by Keep Silkstone Common Green in 2018 in an attempt to prevent housing development of the field at Throstlenest Equestrian Centre designated EC11 in the then draft Local Plan of Barnsley MBC. The campaign generated significant support in Silkstone Common and a hundred objections to the proposal were lodged.

I have set out the decision of [REDACTED], the planning inspector who conducted the hearings on the draft Local Plan that development of this site would be harmful to the form and character of Silkstone Common. I believe that this campaign and the resultant decision of [REDACTED] were significant planning decisions affecting the residents of Silkstone Common and yet the draft Neighbourhood Plan makes no mention of them. This seems to me to be a significant omission which I believe should be rectified by the plan recording and approving the decision of [REDACTED] and acknowledging that no development should take place on this site. Perhaps the most obvious way to do so would be to include a suitable additional paragraph forming paragraph 2 C of the existing draft policy NE1 set out on page 29 of the printed Neighbourhood Plan.

Yours Sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Tel [REDACTED]



15/11/2022, 18:03

Yahoo Mail - Silkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan

## Silkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan

From: Neighbourhood Plan Silkstone Common & Silkstone [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Date: Tuesday, 7 June 2022 at 18:06 BST

Dear [REDACTED]

As you know, following your attendance at the steering group meeting in April 2022, I indicated that a number of amendments would be made to the draft Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) to respond to the concerns of your group in relation to possible development in the green belt.

The "final" NDP was approved by the Silkstone Parish Council at their meeting yesterday evening for submission to Barnsley Council. Deleted from this version was the proposed policy H3, namely rural exception housing, which had been the subject of your group's concerns. As mentioned at the steering group, it would not have been appropriate to make reference to the site, formerly known as site EC11, by amending policy NE1. The narrative flow of the document also made it difficult to incorporate this comment elsewhere, given that the plan does not now reference other controversial planning proposals affecting the Parish. However, the NDP does make specific reference to the controversial nature of any development in the green belt, drawing on a similar statement in Barnsley Council's Local Plan.

Following the correction of some minor typographical errors, the submission plan will be available shortly on the website [www.silktoneplan.co.uk](http://www.silktoneplan.co.uk) and, in due course, Barnsley Council's website.

Regards,

[REDACTED]  
*Chair, Neighbourhood Planning Group for Silkstone Common & Silkstone*



## Our meeting with the Neighbourhood Planning Group.

From

To

Date: Friday, 29 April 2022, 10:09 BST

Hi All,

We met with the neighbourhood planning group on Tuesday night.

We learned that they had received 56 responses to this round of consultation and 54 responses to the 'issues and options' consultation that had happened some time ago. (So the draft plan clearly isn't a burning issue that's keeping residents of the parish awake at night).

The chair of the planning group, [REDACTED] explained that the young people they had discussed the plan with had made comments about the need for affordable housing so they could remain in the village rather than move away when they were ready to establish their own homes. The planning group didn't want to simply ignore this and felt obliged to respond in some way, hence the inclusion of policy H3 about Rural Exception housing in the draft plan. He said there is an aspiration for affordable housing and 32 people who responded to the consultation supported the policy whilst 23 were against it. The intention was to support such housing in principle, to try to control it by including the conditions they had included, and find a middle ground on the issue.

He said there were no sites in mind for this, and that if any was built on the field that was designated EC11 in the Local Plan ( 'our field') it certainly wouldn't be on the whole field.

We explained the position of Keep Silkstone Common Green as follows:-

1. We did not take issue with the planning group's motives for including the H3 policy on affordable housing but we think the loss of Green Belt land is of importance to people in the parish, and certainly is to people in Silkstone Common. They were reminded of our public meeting ( which at least one of the parish councillors present at the meeting had attended! ) and the fact that 100 objections were lodged with the Council about the proposal to build on the Green Belt land concerned. We also pointed out that 81% of people who responded to the 'issues and options' consultation wanted the Green Belt protected. Our view was that we could mobilise that resistance to the potential loss of Green Belt if the H3 policy remained in the plan, if we needed to do that during the next consultation round which would be organised by Barnsley MBC.
2. Secondly, we didn't think there was adequate evidence that there was a need for 'affordable housing' in Silkstone Common, and pointed to evidence from the Land Registry and Zoopla data ( which they had) and which showed the number and relatively low price two and three bedroom properties in South Yorkshire Buildings, on Ben Bank Road and Moorend Lane. Because of this we felt the views of the young people consulted weren't supported by the evidence and as a result the policy H3 was ill founded.
3. That if the current H3 Rural Exception Housing policy was included in the plan submitted to Barnsley MBC the planning group ran the risk of the whole plan being rejected as we would mobilise opposition to it in the next consultation round. It would clearly not be a 'shared vision' for the development of the parish, as government guidance envisioned neighbourhood plans as being. It risked dividing the two villages and may well be rejected because of these problems at either the next consultation stage, by the independent examiner, or at referendum.

[REDACTED] made it clear that the plan to be submitted to the Council would include a reference to the decision of the planning inspector at the inquiry about the Council's Local Plan about 'our field'.

He told us that there is now an up to date 2021 Strategic Housing Assessment that has been prepared by Barnsley MBC and this shows apparently that 79 affordable units of housing are needed in the Dodworth and Penistone area and that our parish is included in that area.



After further discussion [REDACTED] confirmed that:-

4. The redrafted Neighbourhood Plan will say that the site designated EC11 in Barnsley MBC's draft Local Plan ('our field') is not considered suitable for development following the extensive objections received about that proposal and it will include reference to the inspector's decision on this.,
5. The current H3 Rural Exception Housing policy will be removed from the neighbourhood plan. It was pointed out to us that government planning policy and guidance refers to the possibility of housing being built on Green Belt land under the Rural Exception Policy and Barnsley's Local Plan acknowledges this. It was accepted that the Local Plan refers to such proposals as being controversial and the neighbourhood plan will refer to the proposal to build on 'our field' as an example of this.
6. The entry in the draft neighbourhood plan to 'Moorend Wood' and the wildlife survey carried out there will be revisited and corrected in the revised plan.

We were happy enough with the outcome of our discussion with the planning group, and if they do what they said they would, we should have succeeded in what we set out to achieve. The removal of the H3 policy means that the neighbourhood plan will no contain an obligation to 'support' applications for such housing when the conditions included are complied with.

We shouldn't have to spend time in the summer printing leaflets, trudging up and down streets knocking on doors and cluttering up [REDACTED] kitchen.

But.....as we all know, the devil is in the detail. So, we'll need to keep a look out for the next consultation round when we should get the final version of the plan that will be considered by the council and the independent examiner before it goes to referendum.

[REDACTED]



25/04/2022, 12:00

Yahoo Mail - Response to the Draft Silkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan 2022-33

## Response to the Draft Silkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan 2022-33

From: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]

Date: Monday, 11 April 2022, 16:05 BST

Dear Neighbourhood Planning Committee,

Re: Response to then Draft Silkstone Neighbourhood Development Plan 2022-33

-----

Thank you for preparing the plan.

I've grouped my remarks, objections and suggestions in line with your suggested format as it appears on page 3 of the printed version the draft.

1. Do you support the draft vision and objectives and draft planning policies?

I'm afraid I don't support the vision of the plan as it is currently drafted for the following reasons.

a). I believe here is a conflict between draft objective 2 ( which appears on page 16 of the printed booklet) as this states, amongst other things, that your objective is 'To protect, enhance and develop.....the green belt, green open spaces etc, and your draft policy HI, ( which appears on page 21) as this states, ' Proposals for new housing development in Silkstone Parish will be supported where proposals, 'comprise... development not considered inappropriate in the Green Belt, including rural exception housing in accordance with NDP Policy H3'.

I'm afraid I don't believe that supporting housing developments on Green Belt land can sensibly be regarded as protecting, enhancing or developing the Green Belt around our villages. Once it has been developed this land, to all intents and purposes, is no longer Green Belt land, and is lost as such not only to those currently living in our villages now, but to the generations following us. I note that paragraph 5.4.5 of the draft plan records that "81% of respondents to the issues and options consultation ( which I confess I was unaware of) thought it was very important to retain green and open spaces.

b) These objectives and the policies that underpin them also in tension with Barnsley MBC's Local Plan, the relevant part of which is quoted at para 5.1.23 of your draft plan. The Local Plan acknowledges that 'limited affordable housing may be allowed in or on the edge of villages', but goes on to say that ' As available and suitable sites my be limited within the villages, proposals my have to be considered on the edge in the Green Belt and are likely to be controversial'.

Given that the Local Planning Authority accepts the controversial nature of any such development within villages it is extremely difficult to see how your plan as currently drafted could be seen to be a 'shared vision' for development in the Parish. I think that is put beyond doubt by the fact that an organisation called 'Keep Silkstone Common Green' was formed in 2018 precisely to resist a proposal to build housing on Green Belt land at Silkstone Common. The Parish Council was well aware of this organisation and indeed provided limited funding to organise a public meeting in Silkstone Common which attracted well over a hundred residents who submitted a hundred objections to the proposal. Perhaps with hindsight it would have been helpful to have approached Keep Silkstone Common Green with an invitation to participate in the preparation of your draft plan.

However, following a telephone conversation with your [REDACTED] I'm aware that a member of Keep Silkstone Common Green has supplied you with a copy of a letter dated the 14th of May 2018 written by Ms [REDACTED], Planning Inspector, to Barnsley MBC following hearings at which representations were made by all interested parties, and which records her view in respect of one particular parcel of land referred to as EC11 in the draft Local Plan. I have sent a further copy of this letter to [REDACTED] and to the Clerk of the Parish Council also. The n a letter states in respect of that development proposal on the site, at paragraphs 14 to16;-

"Development of this site would result in the loss of an undeveloped gap which forms a transition between the main built-up area of the village and the more dispersed development with the open countryside to the south of the



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18 November 2022 11:40  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** Representations regarding the Silkstone and Silkstone Common Neighbourhood Plan  
**Attachments:** [REDACTED] letter.pdf

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

---

[REDACTED]

18th November 2022

Barnsley MBC  
Neighbourhood Planning.

Dear BMBC,

I wish to make the following representations concerning the Silkstone Neighbourhood Plan.

1. The failure to reference the decision of [REDACTED], planning inspector, regarding Green Belt land at Throstlenest Equestrian Centre, Silkstone Common, designated EC11 in the Draft Local Plan, and the Local Authority's acceptance of it.

Barnsley MBC's Draft Local Plan included the above site for housing development. Silkstone Parish Council did not respond to the draft plan and local residents formed a community group and adopted the name 'Keep Silkstone Common Green' to oppose this element of the plan.

A public meeting was held in March 2018 which was attended by well over 100 residents of Silkstone Common and 100 formal objections to the plan to build houses on this meadow were lodged with Barnsley MBC.

Stage 4 Hearings took place in April 2018, presided over by [REDACTED] the appointed Inspector, and having read these objections and heard oral evidence for over two hours, [REDACTED] wrote to Barnsley MBC on the 24th of May 2018 and stated that the exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated. Barnsley MBC accepted that decision and dropped this element of the plan from the final version of what became the Local Plan.

Silkstone Parish Council subsequently established a Neighbourhood Planning Group as a sub committee of the council. A Draft Neighbourhood Plan was prepared which did not contain reference to the decision of [REDACTED] regarding this site and I, and others, responded asking for this to be rectified.

The relevant parts of [REDACTED] letter and my e mail to the planning group dated 11th April 2022 are attached below and I would be grateful if you would read these now.

As a result of this e mail and a subsequent telephone conversation I had with [REDACTED], the chair of the planning group, I and two other members of Keep Silkstone Common Green attended a meeting of the planning group on the 27th of April 2022. After some discussion we were assured by [REDACTED], in the presence of the whole group and their planning consultant, that the submitted plan would contain reference to Ms Housden's decision and acceptance that the field in question was not suitable for housing development.

I made a contemporaneous note of this meeting which I sent in the form of an e mail to other members of Keep Silkstone Common Green on the 29th of April 2022 and I have attached that note below and would be grateful if you would read that now.



On the 6th of June 2022 the full Parish Council considered the Draft Neighbourhood Plan and, despite the assurances given by [REDACTED] and the Neighbourhood Planning Group, I received an e mail from [REDACTED] dated 7th of June 2022 indicating that no reference to Ms Housden's decision and the Council's acceptance of it would be included in the submitted version. Reasons for this decision were set out by [REDACTED] in his e mail which I attach below. Please read that now.

You will see that [REDACTED] states that 'the narrative flow of the document' makes it difficult to incorporate such a reference. I am unable to accept this. It seems to me a simple matter to incorporate such a reference at paragraphs 5.2.60 or 5.1.27. of the submitted plan.

Neither do I accept that such a statement should not be included because the submitted plan does not reference 'other controversial planning proposals affecting the village. The matter could fairly be described as 'controversial' while there was a difference of view between Barnsley MBC and those objecting to housing development on the site, but it ceased to be controversial when Barnsley MBC accepted Ms Housden's decision and removed the site from the Local Plan. It simply became agreed by the inspector, Barnsley MBC and the objectors view that development of this site should not take place; controversy evaporated at this point. Further evidence of its uncontroversial nature seems to me to be demonstrated by the fact that 81% of those responding to the parish council's own 'issues and options' consultation want the Green Belt land in the village to be protected, which makes the refusal of the parish council to include reference to this extraordinary in my view.

Also, I'm unable to accept that this matter can be regarded as similar to 'other controversial planning proposals affecting the village'. I have lived in Silkstone Common for fifteen years and am unaware of any other planning issue concerning such a large site, that has generated the degree of opposition and resulted in a planning inquiry or hearing following which an inspector has reached the conclusion that development of a site for housing would be positively harmful to the form and character of the village.

For these reasons I, and others in the village, are alarmed by [REDACTED] comment, recorded in the note of our meeting, that 'if any (housing) was built on the field that was designated EC11 in the Local Plan it certainly wouldn't on the whole field.'

In my view this raises the distinct possibility that [REDACTED], at least, has given some thought as to where the affordable housing that the submitted plan makes clear they believe is needed might be built.

2. The evidence base for the assertion throughout the submitted Neighbourhood Plan that smaller 'affordable' housing is needed.

You will have read my thoughts on the evidence for this in my response to the draft Neighbourhood Plan dated 11th April and my note of the meeting between the planning group and myself and others from Keep Silkstone Common Green records the discussion that took place on this issue then.

At this stage the draft Neighbourhood plan included a policy H3 concerning rural exception housing which has subsequently been deleted from the submitted plan. However, a major theme of the narrative of the plan remains the need for more such housing. This aspiration seems to be based on the planning group's consultation with six or seven young people from the parish. I accept that the views of these young people may be correctly reported but I do not accept that these views are the same as objective evidence of a need for more modestly priced housing in Silkstone Common.

In support of my view I would refer to the NPPG which states that "A policy in a Neighbourhood Plan should be 'concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence, reflecting and responding to both the context and the characteristics of the area ( para 41).

[REDACTED] professor of planning at Reading University states, 'Policies must be supported by robust evidence and not just based on local opinion' ( pd 87 of Neighbourhood Planning in Practice, Lund Humphries, 2019).

If this is true of policies it must also be relevant to the major aspirations set out in the narratives of a Neighbourhood Plan in my view.

For all the reasons set out above I would ask the examiner to recommend

a) amendment of the plan by insertion of a paragraph saying;-

The field at Throstlenest Equestrian Centre that was designated EC 11 in the Draft Local Plan was considered by a planning inspector who concluded that;



Development of this site would result in the loss of an undeveloped gap which forms a transition between the main built-up area of the village and the more dispersed development within the open countryside to the south of the Transpennine Trail. The consolidation of development at this point would be harmful to the existing compact form and character of the village. Furthermore the mature trees along the Transpennine Trail banks make a significant contribution to the landscape setting and visual amenity of this part of the village. Whilst they would be outside of the site boundary and individual garden curtilages, the location of the development to the north of the trees would be likely to cause pressure for removal or tree works from individual householders. For the reasons outlined above I consider that site EC 11 would not be soundly based and the exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt for housing development have not been demonstrated'.

b) relevant amendments to the submitted plan to remove references to the evidence base for more affordable or lower cost housing and paragraphs indicating that aspiration.

c) I would ask the inspector to make clear that without these amendments the plan would not reflect a shared vision for the neighbourhood area and would therefore not meet the Basic Conditions as it would not have regard to national policy within the NPPF.

If I can provide any further information I would be very happy to do so.

Yours Sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

Telephone [Redacted]



## **Barnsley Local Plan Examination**

Inspector - [REDACTED]  
Programme Officer - [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

---

[REDACTED]  
Planning Policy Group Leader  
Place Directorate  
Economic Regeneration Service  
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council  
PO Box 634  
Barnsley  
South Yorkshire  
S70 9GG

24 May 2018

Dear [REDACTED]

### **Barnsley Local Plan Examination – Post Hearings**

1. I am writing following the closing of the Stage 4 Hearings and the accompanied site visit to Site H73 on 8 May 2018 to set out my observations on the plan at this stage and on the way forward with the Examination. This letter refers to the employment land requirement, five year land supply, Examination Consultation sites EC9, CA2a, EC11, EC6, EC7, EC1 and EC2 in the submission plan and the implications of a recent Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) judgement for the Habitats Regulations Assessment.
2. My comments are based on all the representations and evidence that I have read and heard at the Stage 1, 2, 3 and 4 hearing sessions including the Council's response to my interim findings. However, I emphasise that the Examination is not yet concluded and consultation on further Main Modifications (MMs) is still to take place. Consequently the comments in this letter are made without prejudice to my conclusions in my final report on the Examination.
3. The Council has published a table of Proposed Modifications on the Examination web site (SD30 Version 1.5). This was the subject of further discussion at the final hearing session on 27 April 2018 to establish which of those should be treated as main modifications and which should be additional. This letter focuses on those areas where further changes to the Proposed MMs will be necessary and where further MMs will be needed to address matters of soundness. My final report will also cover other matters that have arisen during the Examination but which are not referred to in this letter.



4. Subject to the necessary MMs to deal with the matters below, my current view is that the plan is likely to be capable of being found legally compliant and sound. I will set out my reasoning for this conclusion in my final report. In the meantime, I intend to liaise with the Council on any further changes necessary to the wording of the current Proposed MMs and the wording of any further MMs which are produced in response to this letter. In so far as is necessary, the final Schedule would then be subject to further Sustainability Appraisal and assessment under the Habitats Regulations Assessment and full public consultation.

#### Revised Jobs Target and Employment Land Requirement

5. Main Matter 16 covered the Council's revised jobs target (reduction from 33,000 to 28,840 or 23,560 FTE) and the employment land requirement. Notwithstanding the reduced jobs target, the Council is not proposing to reduce the employment land requirement of 307 hectares set out in Policies E1 and E2<sup>1</sup> of the submission plan. The Council's position is based on a number of factors including revised assumptions about the proportion of B1(a)(b)(c), B2 and B8 uses that are likely to come forward on the proposed allocated sites and the corresponding numbers of jobs created and the need to maintain a 'forward' supply of sites towards the end of the plan period in order to support continued improvements to job density within the Borough.
6. The 307 hectare figure itself represented an 'over' supply compared with the objectively assessed need for 291 hectares of employment land set out in the Employment Land Review (EB33) and the Employment Background Paper. The mix of employment uses and associated number of jobs that may come forward on the allocated sites over the plan period remains uncertain. However, I consider that in the context of the reduced jobs target, the employment land requirement set out in Policies E1 and E2 should be 291 hectares. It will be necessary to amend MM11 and MM290 accordingly and other consequential text changes may be required.
7. MM18 already proposes to reduce the employment allocation at site HOY1 from 52.3 hectares to 49.3 hectares with a corresponding Policies Map change. In addition, I consider that Site UB16 (9.3 hectares) should be deleted as an employment land allocation. Its deletion should form a further MM with corresponding Policies Map change. The site is the subject of a current outline planning application for housing and I consider that it should be identified as an additional housing site through a further MM and Policies Map change.

#### Five Year Land Supply and the Appropriate Buffer

8. Having regard to the housing requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy, I consider there has been a persistent under delivery of housing.
9. At this point in time, a 20% buffer added to the five year supply of deliverable sites (brought forward from later in the plan period) is

---

<sup>1</sup> Proposed MM11 and MM290



appropriate and justified. However, for reasons which will be set out more fully in my final report, I consider that the backlog should be dealt with over the lifetime of the plan – the 'Liverpool' method. This permutation accords with the final table set out in the Council's document BMBC044 and indicates a five year requirement of 7345 dwellings in the 2018/19 to 2022/23 period or 1469 per year. This should be included in the proposed MMs.

10. A MM is also necessary to update to the housing trajectory to take account of the site deletions and additional site which have been referred to in this letter and to ensure inclusion of the most recent trajectory within the plan. It would also be helpful to include the most recent position on the planning status of the proposed housing allocation sites as discussed at the hearing sessions, in particular where any planning permissions have been granted.

#### Examination Consultation Sites

##### Site EC9 - Land north of Darton Road, Cawthorne

11. The existing development to the north of Darton Road extends along a prominent ridge line creating a distinctive form and character to the village. More recent residential development has occurred between Darton Road/Taylor Hill/Tivy Dale and the A635 to the south. The proposed site allocation of 86 houses extending into the open countryside to the north of the village would be harmful to its existing form and character. The site also includes allotments proposed to be designated as greenspace under Policy GS2 of the submission plan. The northern boundary of the site is not delineated by any features on the ground which would create stark and harsh edge to the northern boundary of the development for a considerable period of time.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that Site EC9 would not be soundly based and should not be included as a housing allocation within the proposed MMs to the plan. The site should remain as safeguarded land (SAF27) as proposed in the submission plan. It follows that the exceptional circumstances for the release of Site CA2a from the Green Belt for additional safeguarded land have not been demonstrated and the site should not be included within the proposed MMs.
13. Site EC9 and safeguarded land Site CA2a formed part of the Examination Consultation on additional sites and were not proposed as part of the submission plan. Consequently their deletion would not form part of the proposed MMs. Nonetheless, in the interests of fairness, I intend to invite representations on their omission from the plan as part of the consultation on the MMs.



#### Site EC11 - Land at Silkstone Common

14. Development of this site would result in the loss of an undeveloped gap which forms a transition between the main built-up area of the village and the more dispersed development within the open countryside to the south of the Transpennine Trail. The consolidation of development at this point would be harmful to the existing compact form and character of the village.
15. Furthermore, the mature trees along the Transpennine Trail banks make a significant contribution to the landscape setting and visual amenity of this part of the village. Whilst they would be outside the site boundary and individual garden curtilages, the location of development to the north of the trees would be likely to cause pressure for removal or tree works from individual householders.
16. For the reasons outlined above, I consider that Site EC11 would not be soundly based and that the exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt for housing development have not been demonstrated. However, Site EC11 also formed part of the Examination Consultation on additional sites and was not proposed as part of the submission plan. Consequently its deletion would not form part of the proposed MMs and in the interests of fairness, I intend to invite representations on its omission as part of the consultation on the MMs.
17. Sites EC6 and proposed safeguarded Site EC7 at Oxspring also formed part of the Examination Consultation on additional sites but the Council concluded that they should not be taken forward having regard to Historic England's representations on the effect on designated heritage assets. Nonetheless, in the interests of fairness I intend to invite representations on the omission of Sites EC6 and EC7 as part of the consultation on the MMs.

#### Sites EC1 and EC2 - Land to the north of Staincross Common

18. Site EC1 formed part of a larger area proposed to be released from the Green Belt and identified as safeguarded land in the submission plan (SAF5). It was consulted on as an additional site during the Examination Consultation for 669 dwellings. Site EC2 to the north is proposed to be removed from the Green Belt and designated as safeguarded land and could accommodate approximately 675 dwellings.
19. The combined development of Sites EC1 and EC2 would represent a significant scale of development. Limited supporting technical evidence has been supplied in relation to capacity in local infrastructure, the impact of the proposed development and specific requirements to mitigate its impact. The effect of additional traffic movements on the local highway network is a matter of concern given the proximity and cumulative impact of other proposed developments including at Royston and Mapplewell. At the hearing sessions it was indicated that scoping work for a Transport Assessment was underway but the extent of the necessary highway works is unclear. The Council has also indicated that secondary school capacity at Darton College would also need to be addressed.



20. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that 'Where sites are proposed for allocation, sufficient detail should be given to provide clarity to developers, local communities and other interests about the nature and scale of development (addressing the 'what, where, when and how' questions). Whilst production of a masterplan framework for the site could form a MM, at a plan level I am concerned that the proposed allocation of Site EC1 has not been fully justified and that exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated to justify its release from the Green Belt for housing development. As such, the proposed allocation is not soundly based and I consider that the site should remain as safeguarded land as proposed in the submission plan. The exceptional circumstances for the release of Site EC2 from the Green Belt for additional safeguarded land have not been demonstrated and it should not be included as additional safeguarded land within the schedule of proposed MMs.
21. Site EC1 and proposed safeguarded Site EC2 also formed part of the Examination Consultation on additional sites. Consequently their deletion would not form part of the proposed MMs. Nonetheless, in the interests of fairness I intend to invite representations on the proposed omission of Sites EC1 and EC2 as part of the consultation on the MMs.

#### Habitats Regulations Assessment

22. On 12 April 2018 the CJEU issued a judgement in the case of People over Wind, Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta which ruled that Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive must be interpreted as meaning that mitigation measures (referred to in the judgment as measures which are intended to avoid or reduce effects) should be assessed within the framework of an appropriate assessment (AA) and that it is not permissible to take account of measures intended to avoid or reduce the harmful effects of the plan or project on a European site at the screening stage.
23. I would therefore advise the Council to confirm the extent to which they consider the Habitats Regulations Report is legally compliant in the light of the judgement and to review the screening assessment as part of this consideration. If the review of the screening assessment concludes that an AA is required it will be necessary to carry this out and consider whether the AA necessitates any additional MMs to identify and secure additional avoidance and reduction measures. In undertaking this review, the Council should consult Natural England and have regard to any representations made by them.
24. Assuming that the Council would be content to adopt the plan subject to these modifications, I will continue to liaise via the Programme Officer to finalise the Proposed MMs, the changes to the Policies Maps and arrangements for consultation on the MMs. Should this not be the case I would be grateful if you would advise me of the Council's position. I am not inviting or proposing to accept comments on the contents of this letter from any other Examination participants. However, there will be further public consultation on the proposed MMs.



25. Please let me know via [REDACTED] if there are any questions in the meantime.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

INSPECTOR



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 November 2022 20:59  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** Silkstone Neighbourhood Plan Response

---

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

---

Dear Sir/Madam

I am concerned at the absence of comments or reference to the decision of the planning board inspector [REDACTED] in regard to EC11 in Silkstone Common. Her determination was clear that this part of the village should be protected from Housing development in what is currently a rural and undeveloped gap, which if developed would spoil the existing compact form and character of the village/cause pressure to remove trees/ spoil amenity from the TPT.

Her conclusions were reached following a lengthy & involved assessment/ consultation of the impact of housing development on EC11 and involved local input that generated a great deal of interest at relative short notice. It caused a local campaign group to emerge and strong opposition. Nobody attending the meeting held at Silkstone Common school was in favour of the proposals. There were at least 100 objections lodged. There was significant community concern which will likely reemerge unless the neighbourhood plan acknowledges that these factual events occurred and it would be a strange whitewash for these to be ignored and omitted. There is a letter to the council dated 28 May 2018 that should be quoted and referred to- from points 14 to 16.

Regards  
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 November 2022 10:50  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** Fwd: Response to Silkstone/Silkstone Common neighbourhood plan

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

---

Hello

Please see below my comments in respect of the proposal for the Silkstone / Silkstone Common Neighbourhood Plan.

Within the current proposal I still cannot see any reference to the decision made by the planning inspector, [REDACTED], despite agreement that there would be a clear mention of her decision by the neighbourhood planning group on the 7th of June this year. This decision set out that there would be no building on the field between Throstlenest Stables and Moorend Houses Silkstone Common known as site EC 11. I would ask that this considered, clearly referenced and recommendations respected within the Neighbourhood Plan. The decision of [REDACTED] was, set out in her letter to the Council dated 24th of May 2018 was as follows;-

*"Site EC11 - Land at Silkstone Common.*

*para 14. Development of this site would result in the loss of an undeveloped gap which forms a transition between the main built-up area of the village and the more dispersed development within the open countryside to the south of the Trans Pennine Trail. The consolidation of development at this point would be harmful to the existing compact form and character of the village.*

*15. Furthermore, the mature trees along the Trans Pennine Trail banks make a significant contribution to the landscape setting and visual amenity of this part of the village. Whilst they would be outside the site boundary and individual garden curtilages, the location of development to the north of the trees would be likely to cause pressure for removal or tree works from individual households.*

*16. For the reasons outlined above, I consider that Site EC11 would not be soundly based and the exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt for housing development have not been demonstrated."*

I would also like to make reference to the strength of local feeling around keeping this site as open Green Belt land. This was evidenced by the fact that we had well over a hundred people attend our public meeting to discuss this. There was no one present said they were in favour of housing on this site, and I understand that 100 objections were lodged with the council about this.

Many thanks







[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18 November 2022 17:08  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

---

I believe that the silkstone common neighbourhood plan should record the decision of the planning inspector regarding the Green Belt land at Throstlenest equestrian centre Silkstone Common should not be developed for housing as this was agreed by Barnsley MBC, and the neighbourhood planning group and properly reflects the views of the vast majority of residents of the parish.

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18 November 2022 08:59  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** Silkstone Common planning

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

---

Hi.  
I live at [REDACTED]  
I have reviewed the plan and attended one of the consultation sessions.  
I don't understand why the plan doesn't refer to the decision by the planning officer in 2018 that site EC11, as it was labelled, was not appropriate for development for a number of reasons.  
Surely such a recent decision by a senior officer at a national level has to be included in the plan.  
Please include a reference to that decision in the plan.  
Kind regards  
[REDACTED]

Get [Outlook for Android](#)



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 November 2022 18:06  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** NP comments

---

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

---

Dear Sir/Madam,

Here are my comments re the above:

Why is there no mention of Planning Inspector [REDACTED] decision re EC11 (in Silkstone Common) in the NP which has been lodged with the council?

We were told that there would be a definite mention of her decision (by the neighbourhood planning group ) on 07/06/22.

I would like the NP to be amended, as promised, to include a clear reference to [REDACTED] decision as set out in her letter to the Council dated 24 May 2018. To avoid any confusion, I refer you to her letter a copy of which was sent to you previously by Keep Silkstone Common Green, and was also sent to you by at least one member of our local residents. In her letter she stated her reasons , as a Planning Inspector, why she does not consider EC11 a suitable plot for housing development.

When Keep Silkstone Common Green organised a public meeting re EC11, it was very well attended. Not one person there said they were in favour of building on EC11, in fact 100 objections to building on EC11 were lodged with the Council.

On a lighter note, my wife has asked me to pass on her thanks for the new surfacing of the TPT in Silkstone Common. She forgot to do it herself in her own email regarding the NP.

We very much appreciate it.

[REDACTED]  
Sent from my iPhone



[REDACTED]

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 November 2022 22:19  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** Whom it may concern

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

---

Dear Sir or madame

With reference to the Neighbourhood Plan for Silkstone Common I would like it to be amended to include a clear reference to [REDACTED] decision, set out in her letter to the Council dated 24th of May 2018. That decision was as follows;-

"Site EC11 - Land at Silkstone Common.

para 14. Development of this site would result in the loss of an undeveloped gap which forms a transition between the main built-up area of the village and the more dispersed development within the open countryside to the south of the Trans Pennine Trail. The consolidation of development at this point would be harmful to the existing compact form and character of the village.

15. Furthermore, the mature trees along the Trans Pennine Trail banks make a significant contribution to the landscape setting and visual amenity of this part of the village. Whilst they would be outside the site boundary and individual garden curtilages, the location of development to the north of the trees would be likely to cause pressure for removal or tree works from individual households.

16. For the reasons outlined above, I consider that Site EC11 would not be soundly based and the exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt for housing development have not been demonstrated."

I look forward to your acknowledgement of my request.

[REDACTED]

Sent from my Galaxy



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 18 November 2022 16:18  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** Silkstone Neighbourhood Plan - Comments

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

---

May I express my deep concern about the recently submitted Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP).

There is still no reference to the decision by the planning inspector [REDACTED] in 2018 to reject the plan for housing development on BMC Local Plan site EC11, or indeed whether the planning policy group will comply with her recommendations. The NDP should be an opportunity for public servants to provide open and transparent information to the people they serve. Space was found within the NDP to specifically identify "preserved views" and "preserved green spaces", but none was found to describe how the policy group would action Ms Housden's recommendations. Whether intended or not, this creates a perception that [REDACTED] findings are being ignored, in effect making a mockery of the whole planning process.

I would therefore urge the planning policy group, if they wish to regain the confidence of residents, to include a statement in the NDP that makes it clear [REDACTED] recommendations will be fully implemented i.e that no development will be considered on site EC11 for at least the duration of the existing local plan. If such a statement is not included within the NDP I will have no option but to vote " NO" in the local referendum, and encourage others to do the same.

Many thanks for your time,

[REDACTED]

Tel. [REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 November 2022 20:28  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** Neighbourhood Plan - Silkstone/Silkstone Common

---

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

---

Hello,

I'm writing in regards to the neighbourhood plan for Silkstone and Silkstone Common.

I live on [REDACTED] and had previously brought up some issues around the rural housing policy, with the fear that housing could be planned on the field in front of the houses on Moorend Houses (site EC11) in Silkstone Common.

Thank you for taking earlier feedback into consideration and making amends to the plan, but I just wanted to point out that there is still no mention of the decision of the planning inspector, [REDACTED] who decided that there should be no housing built on the field (EC11) in the Council's draft Local Plan.

We were promised there would be a clear mention of her decision by the neighbourhood planning group on the 7th of June this year.

It would be great if the Neighbourhood Plan could be amended to include a clear reference to [REDACTED] decision, set out in her letter to the Council dated 24th of May 2018.

That decision was as follows:

"Site EC11 - Land at Silkstone Common.

para 14. Development of this site would result in the loss of an undeveloped gap which forms a transition between the main built-up area of the village and the more dispersed development within the open countryside to the south of the Trans Pennine Trail. The consolidation of development at this point would be harmful to the existing compact form and character of the village.

15. Furthermore, the mature trees along the Trans Pennine Trail banks make a significant contribution to the landscape setting and visual amenity of this part of the village. Whilst they would be outside the site boundary and individual garden curtilages, the location of development to the north of the trees would be likely to cause pressure for removal or tree works from individual households.

16. For the reasons outlined above, I consider that Site EC11 would not be soundly based and the exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt for housing development have not been demonstrated."

—  
Another point put forward back in June was that we wish to retain the site as Green Belt land, evidenced by the fact that we had well over a hundred people attend our public meeting to discuss this a few years ago and no one said they were in favour of housing on this site. I believe over 100 objections to housing were lodged with the council about this in 2018.



With all this in mind, it would be appreciated if the plan could be updated to take [REDACTED] decision into account.

Many thanks,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED]

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 November 2022 18:13  
**To:** NeighbourhoodPlanning  
**Subject:** Silkstone Neighbourhood plan

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.**

---

[REDACTED]

I wish to make the following comments about the Silkstone Neighbourhood Plan:

Reading through the report there is no mention of [REDACTED] comments stating that the site EC11 should not be built on. There were a significant number of objections made to this and it was stated that her comments would be on the plan to reinforce this and that the site is part of the Green Belt.

para 14. Development of this site would result in the loss of an undeveloped gap which forms a transition between the main built-up area of the village and the more dispersed development within the open countryside to the south of the Trans Pennine Trail. The consolidation of development at this point would be harmful to the existing compact form and character of the village.

15. Furthermore, the mature trees along the Trans Pennine Trail banks make a significant contribution to the landscape setting and visual amenity of this part of the village. Whilst they would be outside the site boundary and individual garden curtilages, the location of development to the north of the trees would be likely to cause pressure for removal or tree works from individual households.

16. For the reasons outlined above, I consider that Site EC11 would not be soundly based and the exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt for housing development have not been demonstrated."

I think it is important that these comments are included in the plan as there were over 100 objections made to the site being developed.

Yours faithfully

[REDACTED]

Sent from my Galaxy