

## **Barnsley Local Plan Examination**

Inspector - Mrs S Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI  
Programme Officer – Mr Richard Gilbert

---

### **STAGE 2 MAIN MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS (MIQs)**

**These MIQs relate to the Stage 2 hearings and should be read in conjunction with the Inspector’s Examination Briefing Note.**

References in brackets are to the document references in the Evidence Base which can be found on the Examination web site [www.barnsley.gov.uk/local-plan-examination](http://www.barnsley.gov.uk/local-plan-examination).

**Please Note** – Main Matter 6 deals with the soundness of the plan’s approach to the Green Belt, including whether the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the release of sites from the Green Belt for new employment and housing development (including the proposed mixed use sites). It is not part of my role to examine the soundness of rejected or alternative sites put forward by representors. Consequently, discussion at the hearing and in hearing statements on the sites listed in Main Matter 6 should focus on whether the Council’s approach as set out in the Green Belt Review (EB103 & EB104) is soundly based and justified by the evidence.

Abbreviations – BLP – Barnsley Local Plan, NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework, OAN – objective assessment of need, SA - Sustainability Appraisal,

## **Main Matter 5 – Spatial Strategy, Settlement Hierarchy and the Location of Growth (Policies LG2, E2 and H2)**

Context – The spatial strategy and Policy LG2 seek to focus growth in Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns of Wombwell, Hoyland, Penistone, Goldthorpe (Dearne Towns), Cudworth and Royston. Development in villages will be allowed if it is consistent with Green Belt policy and is necessary for the viability of the settlement and to meet local needs.

Issue –Is the spatial strategy and overall distribution of development appropriate and justified by a robust and credible evidence base?

- 5.1 Were alternative options for the distribution of development considered during the plan's preparation and subject to SA and is it clear why alternatives were discounted?
- 5.2 Will the spatial strategy and the location of growth set out in Policy LG2 promote the vitality of the main urban areas in the Borough and support thriving rural communities to meet the core planning principles in the NPPF?
- 5.3 Has the plan maximised the use of previously developed land in the plan area and is this based on a robust and up-to-date evidence base?
- 5.4 Does the proposed settlement hierarchy reflect the role and function of different settlements and is it justified by robust and up-to-date evidence? Are there any changes compared with the Core Strategy (EB11) settlement hierarchy?
- 5.5 Should all settlements in Urban Barnsley be named within the settlement hierarchy and Policy LG2? Is the modification proposed in MM5 (SD30) necessary to ensure that the settlement hierarchy is soundly based?
- 5.6 Does Policy LG2 properly reflect the role and function of the relevant settlements? Should Hoyland have a different role within Policy LG2 as a strategic growth area?
- 5.7 Is there any change to the role and function of Penistone as set out in Policy LG2 compared with the approach in the Core Strategy (EB11)? What are the implications for development and infrastructure needs in the town, if any?
- 5.8 Does Policy LG2 set out an appropriate approach to future development in villages and is it positively prepared, justified by the evidence and consistent with the advice in the NPPF in this regard?
- 5.9 Is the approach to villages in Policy LG2 consistent with Policy H5 and the approach to safeguarded land set out in paragraph 18.22 of the plan?
- 5.10 Does Policy LG2 make clear what approach will be taken to development outside the locations identified in the policy?

- 5.11 Is it clear how the notation showing' the extent of Urban Barnsley and the Principal Towns' on the Policies Map relates to the plan's policies, in particular Policy LG2?
- 5.12 Overall, how will the spatial strategy set out in Policy LG2 and distribution of employment and housing development set out in Policies E2 and H2 contribute to the plan's vision and objectives for the Borough over the plan period?

**Main Matter 6 – Is the plan's approach to the Green Belt soundly based and consistent with national policy (Policies GB1 & GB6)?**

Context – Currently 77% of the area of the Borough is within the Green Belt. The plan's proposals would result in the removal of 760 hectares (net) of land from the Green Belt, so that 74.6% of the Borough would be within the Green Belt. A Green Belt Review (EB103 & EB104) has been undertaken as part of the evidence base.

Issue – Do the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the release of land from the Green Belt?

- 6.1 What are the exceptional circumstances, as required by the NPPF paragraphs 79 – 86, that justify the plan's proposed revision of the boundaries of the Green Belt? Can the need for housing and employment development be accommodated on deliverable sites without releasing land from the Green Belt?
- 6.2 Has the capacity of areas within existing settlement boundaries been robustly assessed and what evidence underpins this? What evidence justifies the release of Green Belt land for housing and employment development?
- 6.3 How does the distribution of Green Belt releases affect different settlements and different parts of the plan area?
- 6.4 Does the plan have regard to the need to promote sustainable patterns of development, including channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary and towns and villages inset within the Green Belt?
- 6.5 Is the Green Belt Review based on a consistent, logical and clear methodology and is it clear how general areas were scored in relation to their contribution to Green Belt purposes? Is it clear how resultant parcels were identified and assessed?
- 6.6 How has the Sheffield City Region Green Belt Review Common Approach (EB128) informed the process and outcomes of the Green Belt Review? Are the Green Belt boundaries contiguous with those in adjoining authorities and are there any cross boundary issues arising?
- 6.7 Is the approach to amending Green Belt boundaries to release sites for development in the following areas soundly based and is it consistent with the conclusions on their contribution to Green Belt purposes in the Green Belt Review:

- Urban Barnsley (including Darton and Dodworth)
- Cudworth
- Goldthorpe/Dearne Towns
- Hoyland
- Penistone
- Wombwell

(sites listed in full in Appendix 1)

6.8 Is the approach to larger villages within the Green Belt Review consistent with the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy in Policy LG2?

6.9 What evidence justifies the release of Site D1 from the Green Belt and the identification of RSV1 as a reserve site justified given the findings of the Green Belt Review that these sites are strongly fulfilling Green Belt purposes?

6.10 Is the extent of the Green Belt appropriately defined having regard to the minor changes also proposed to the boundaries (as set out in the Green Belt and Safeguarded Land Background Paper 2)?

Issue – Do the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the inclusion of land within the Green Belt?

6.11 What evidence justifies the following additions to the Green Belt:

- AC28 – Land south of Broadwater Estate, Bolton upon Dearne
- H46 – Land west of Fitzwilliam St, Hoyland/Elsecar

Issue – Is the plan's approach to safeguarded land sound (Policy GB6)?

6.12 Is the approach to safeguarded land set out in Policy GB6 based on robust and up-to-date evidence?

6.13 How much safeguarded land has been carried forward from the Unitary Development Plan/Core Strategy?

6.14 What is the purpose of the safeguarded land?

6.15 Has the Green Belt Review assessed the safeguarded land designations against the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the NPPF? Has the deliverability of these sites been assessed?

6.16 What evidence justifies the review of Green Belt boundaries to remove the following areas of land from the Green Belt and their identification as safeguarded land:

- SAF5 – Land north of Staincross Common
- SAF6 – Land west of Barugh and north of A635
- SAF7 – Land east of Sheffield Road, Hoyland Common
- AC33 – Land north of Rockingham, Birdwell

- H79 – Land north of Wood Walk, Hemingfield
- H85 – Land north-east of Hemingfield
- AC42 – Land south of Pit Lane and West of Windmill Road, Wombwell
- AC41 – Pitt St, Low Valley

6.17 Has sufficient safeguarded land been identified to meet longer term development needs beyond the plan period as required by the NPPF?

6.18 Should Policy GB6 be amended to allow for the development of safeguarded sites in the event that housing land supply falls below five years?

**Main Matter 7 – Does the plan set out an appropriate strategy for the movement of people and goods and is it based on robust and up-to-date evidence(Policies T1, T2, T3, T4 & T5)?**

Note – SD30 Proposed Minor Modifications includes a revised version of the Local Plan Transport Chapter. The site specific transport proposals for development sites including mixed use sites will be examined in more detail at Stage 3.

Context – The plan seeks to minimise the need to travel and reflect the priorities of the emerging Barnsley Transport Strategy for improvements to existing transport infrastructure and supporting sustainable modes of travel.

Issue – What effect will strategic transport proposals have on the plan area and have they been appropriately identified in the plan?

7.1 How will the following strategic transport proposals/initiatives affect the plan area and are they sufficiently detailed within the plan:

- High Speed Rail HS2 eastern leg;
- New South Transpennine road and rail tunnel connections;
- Barnsley Rail Vision and long distance rail franchises.

Issue – What effect will providing for 33,000 new jobs and 20,900 new homes have on the capacity and operation of the strategic road network within and outside Barnsley?

7.2 What is the likely effect of the proposed scale and distribution of development on the existing highway network and traffic levels, in particular:

- M1 J36 Hoyland/A6195;
- M1 J37, A628/A635 corridors;
- A61;
- A616.

7.3 What other specific improvements to the highway network are proposed or will be required? How has this been assessed and is the evidence on traffic modelling up-to-date?

7.4 Should the proposed Claycliffe Road Link (site MU1) be referenced in Policy T1?

- 7.5 Have the necessary highway improvements been identified in the plan and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan including timing/phasing where necessary?
- 7.6 What is Highways England's formal position on the plan? Have their soundness issues been addressed through the Joint Position Statement (BMBC018)?

*Issue 3 – Will the transport policies be effective in reducing the need to travel and encourage sustainable modes of transport to reduce the impact of road travel?*

- 7.7 How will the Barnsley Transport Strategy and Local Transport Plan contribute to the accessibility priorities and encourage sustainable modes of travel as set out in Policies T1 and T3? What other initiatives/programmes will help to deliver the transport policies in the plan?
- 7.8 Will Policy T5 be effective in securing measures to improve air quality and reduce the impact of road travel? How will this be monitored?
- 7.9 Is a change to Policy T4 necessary to appropriately address safety at level crossings and is the modification proposed in MM64 (SD30) necessary to ensure that Policy T4 is sound?

**Main Matter 8 – Does the plan set out a positive and coherent strategy to safeguard and enhance the landscape, natural and historic environment in the plan area (Policies D1, HE1, GI1, GI2, GS1, LC1, CC1 & CC3)?**

Context – the plan includes a number of policies which seek to safeguard the distinctive character of the Borough and secure a healthy, safe and sustainable environment.

*Issue – Are the policies seeking to protect and enhance the Borough's distinctive landscape character and built environment justified by robust evidence and will they be effective?*

- 8.1 Does Policy D1 provide clear and robust guidance on the role of high quality design and are the modifications proposed in MM69 (SD30) necessary to ensure that Policy D1 is sound?
- 8.2 Should the plan have a policy dealing specifically with Conservation Areas? Is a modification required to ensure that the plan is sound in this regard?
- 8.3 Is MM6 (SD30) necessary to secure effective outcomes in relation to cross boundary cooperation on the historic environment, in particular the understanding of early coal and iron working industry around Elsecar?
- 8.4 Should Policy HE1 include reference to the Peak District National Park and is a modification necessary to ensure that Policy HE1 is sound?
- 8.5 Will the plan's policies be effective in protecting and enhancing the landscape character of the Borough as set out in the Landscape Character Assessment

(EB86 & EB87)? Will Policy LC1 be effective in achieving this? Is the modification proposed in MM105 (SD30) necessary to ensure that the policy is sound?

- 8.6 How have the Green Infrastructure corridors been identified? How do they relate to areas of Green Space and Green Belt shown on the Policies Map?
- 8.7 Should Policy GI1 be modified to include reference to the Community Infrastructure Levy as a funding mechanism and is the modification proposed in MM103 necessary to ensure that Policy GI1 is sound?
- 8.8 Is Policy GI2 soundly based and will it be effective in seeking the re-instatement of safeguarded routes as working canals? Should additional sections of the historic routes be safeguarded?
- 8.9 Is the identification of Green Space under Policy GS1 based on robust evidence and does it support the identification of the areas designated as Green Space on the Policies Map? How will the provision of Green Space against the standards set out in the Green Space Strategy be monitored and kept under review?
- 8.10 Should Policy GS1 be modified to refer to comply with the NPPF's advice regarding the loss of greenspace to development where replacement with equivalent or better provision can be sought? Is a modification necessary to ensure that Policy GS1 is sound?
- 8.11 Will Policy CC1 be effective in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, mitigating the effects of and adapting to climate change? Are the modifications proposed in MM110 (SD30) necessary to ensure that Policy CC1 is sound?
- 8.12 Should the plan include a separate policy dealing with Sustainable Design and Construction? Is the modification proposed in MM111 (SD30) necessary to ensure that the plan is sound?
- 8.13 Should Policy CC3 be modified to clarify the circumstances in which development in the functional floodplain will be permitted? Is the modification proposed in MM112 necessary to ensure that Policy CC3 is sound?

**Main Matter 9 – Will the plan contribute to the vitality and viability of Barnsley town centre and the District and Local Centres (Policies TC1, TC2, TC3 & TC4)?**

Note – SD30 'Proposed Minor Modifications' includes a revised version of the Town Centres and Retail chapter

Context - Policy TC1 seeks to direct new retail and town centre development to Barnsley Town Centre and the District Centres of Cudworth, Hoyland, Wombwell, Goldthorpe (serving the Dearne Towns), Penistone and Royston. Local centres will be the focus for meeting the needs of the local area.

- 9.1 Should Policy TC1 refer to specific retail sites within Barnsley Town Centre as sequentially preferable out of centre locations for retail development?
- 9.2 Does Policy TC2 provide sufficient clarity on how proposed uses other than retail, financial and professional services and food and drink within the primary and secondary shopping frontages will be assessed?
- 9.3 Are the thresholds for impact assessments set out in Policy TC3 based on robust evidence and will the policy contribute to the vitality and viability of Barnsley Town Centre and the District and Local Centres? Is the modification proposed in MM70 (SD30) necessary to provide further clarity?
- 9.4 Should Policy TC4 make provision for a wider range of uses on retail parks? Is the modification proposed in MM72 (SD30) necessary to reduce the minimum floor area of new units on retail warehouse parks?
- 9.5 Is Policy TC5 soundly based and consistent with Policies TC1 and TC3 having particular regard to how proposals for convenience stores in excess of 500 square metres would be assessed?



## **Appendix 1 Sites Proposed to be removed from the Green Belt**

<b>Policy Ref</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Resultant Parcel reference</b>
<b>Urban Barnsley</b>		
H83	Land East of Woolley Colliery Road, Darton	MPW3A
MU1	Land between Gawber and Higham (123.3ha mixed use allocation)	UB2A
H72 and H73	Land at Worsborough Common	UB14
AC1	Former Woolley Colliery	MPW3B
AC2	Land South of Darton Lane, Mapplewell	MPW6A
AC12	Mixed use off Fish Dam Lane, West Green bypass and Shaw Lane, Carlton (part)	UB8A
UB7	Capitol Park extension	DOD3A
<b>Cudworth</b>		
H74 & H75	Land between Cudworth & bypass	CUD2B
897	Former Willowgarth School	N/A planning permission granted
H76	Land between Cudworth & bypass (northern section)	CUD2C
<b>Goldthorpe/Dearne Towns</b>		
H84	Land south of Bridge Lane, Thurnscoe	DE1A
D1	Land south of A635 Doncaster Road, Goldthorpe	Part of DE6 General Area
<b>Hoyland</b>		
H77	Land to the north of Hoyland Common	HN11A
AC29	Land off Shortwood Roundabout	HN11A
AC30	Land at Tankersley Lane	HN4B
AC31	Land at Broad Carr Road	HN4C
HOY1 & AC32	Land west of Sheffield Road including Rockingham Sports Club field	HN4B
HOY3	Shortwood extension	HN6A
HOY5	South of Dearne Valley Parkway	HN11A
<b>Penistone</b>		
H81 & H82	Land north of Barnsley Road	PEN8A
AC34	Part of land east of Penistone Grammar School	PEN8A
P2	Land north of Sheffield Road	Part of PEN1 General Area
<b>Wombwell</b>		
AC39	Pitt St	DAR3A

**Appendix 1 Sites Proposed to be removed from the Green Belt contd**

**Other**

AC44	Former Oughtibridge Paper Mill	N/A planning permission granted
AC46	Proposed to be deleted – SD30 MM47	