

6. FULL APPLICATION - INSTALLATION OF NEW PLANT INCLUDING, TWO PAYMENT MACHINES, ANPR CAMERA AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AT LANGSETT BARN CAR PARK LANGSETT (NP/B/0622/0824, KW)

APPLICANT: YORKSHIRE WATER

Summary

1. The application site is the existing public car park at Langsett Barn car park, which is owned by Yorkshire Water.
2. Permission is sought for the installation of two parking ticket machines and an ANPR camera within the existing public car park.
3. The ticket machines and camera would not have a significant visual impact on the site, the conservation area, or the landscape character of the area.
4. The existing car parking provision would remain as existing, and there would be no material, (planning), change of use.
5. Consideration of the wider impacts upon the amenity of local residents and highways by displaced parking will be addressed in the report, with appropriate weight given to these issues.
6. The application is recommended for conditional approval.

Site and Surroundings

7. Langsett Barn car park is owned and managed by Yorkshire Water, and is located on the edge of the village of Langsett. The carpark is an established and popular destination for parking to access to the local walking and biking routes around the reservoir and surrounding area.
8. The A616 Manchester Road bounds the site immediately to the north, with a residential area to the east and agricultural fields to the west. Langsett Reservoir is located immediately to the south of the site. Langsett Barn, a Grade II Listed barn abuts the east side of the car park along with two residential Grade II listed properties, (The Larches & Waterside Cottage), whose gardens also abut the eastern boundary of the car park. There are public footpaths to the southeast and to the west, which connects the car park to Langsett village.
9. Vehicular access to the site is via the established access point off the A616. The car park has 62 spaces alongside 3 disabled parking spaces, 1 coach and a trailer parking area for 2 cars and 2 trailers.
10. The car park is largely screened from wider landscape views because it is located within the edge of the woodland, therefore the existing infrastructure and signage is mostly screened from views outside the site.
11. The site is within the Langsett Conservation Area.

Proposal

12. Planning permission is sought for the installation of two parking ticket machines, which are proposed to be located centrally within the car park, and an ANPR camera proposed to be located close to the vehicular entrance, but set back from the road.
13. The two ticket machines are proposed to be 1.6m in height, with a depth of 0.3m, and a width of 0.4m. Solar panels are proposed for the top of the machine.
14. The ANPR camera 600mm wide x 500mm deep x 700mm high is proposed to be mounted on a pole of 4m in height and powered by mains electricity. The post and camera would be black.
15. Associated signage will need to be considered under a separate application for Advertisement Consent.
16. No trees or vegetation are proposed to be removed as part of the development.
17. No new lighting is proposed as part of the development.

RECOMMENDATION:

18. I) That the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. 3 year implementation time limit.
2. Carry out in accordance with the defined submitted plans.

And;

II) That the Authority welcomes Yorkshire Water's stated intention to continue to work with local authorities and parish councils regarding on-street parking issues and requests that a written statement be agreed with officers outside the planning process setting out precisely how they propose to liaise closely with the local community, Highway Authority and this Authority over initiatives to better manage visitor parking on local roads and within the village.

Footnote – Re signage is subject to a separate consent regime under the Advertisement Regulations.

Key Issues

19. The key planning issues relating to the development are:
 - Principle of development
 - Impact on the landscape character of the area.
 - Impact on highway safety.
 - Amenity of local residents.

History

20. 1986 – Approval for development of the site into a car park and picnic site – NP/B/1286/005.
21. 2013 – Approval for increased size of the car park - NP/B/0113/0044.

Consultations

22. Barnsley MBC as Highway Authority – The application is supported by a planning, design and access statement which outlines the need for development, proposal, policy review, and planning assessment. Within Section 3, the report states that the site is a long established car park and it is not anticipated that the introduction of pay and display facilities will generate a greater use of or cause any greater impact than arising from the current usage of the site by visitors.
23. However the report fails to recognise the propensity of remote, indiscriminate parking to avoid these charges both on A616 (in layby and verge parking) and surrounding area including the Waggon and Horses car park and road(s) serving Langsett village. Displaced parking to these areas gives rise to road safety and amenity concerns (due to damage of verges and residential impact). In terms of road safety, the A616, between the existing layby to the north west of the car park access is devoid of street lighting or formal footway provision requiring visitors to negotiate the route from layby to car park entrance on foot via narrow verges along this stretch of road that is subject to 40 and 50mph speed limits. In addition, verge parking in and around the car park entrance raises road safety concerns in this regard as well as potentially impeding visibility on exit from the car park as well as the inherent risk when entering and exiting the parked vehicle. Whilst it is acknowledged that such a scenario may exist during extremely busy times, the introduction of this charging regime will undoubtedly result in more frequent instances of indiscriminate parking occurring in order to avoid payment. The application appears to take no account of this nor present details of what actions will be taken should this occur.
24. Langsett Parish Council – Object to the proposal. The concerns expressed are summarised below:
- The impacts of potentially displaced vehicles avoiding charges, especially on Gilbert Hill, Midhope Cliffe Lane, the Wagon and Horses pub and the A628/A616.
 - Concern about highway safety, emergency vehicle access, access for local farmers, and the amenity of local residents. During the pandemic, people parked outside of the car park, which created these issues, which might be exacerbated by introducing parking charges. No solution has so far been found by Yorkshire Water, despite the issues arising during lockdown periods.
 - Concern that Yorkshire Water have not consulted the relevant bodies
 - Impact on local businesses. If people have to pay to park nearby, they might be discouraged from visiting.
 - Lack of public transport means that people can only access by car. Charging may limit access for people who cannot afford to pay.
 - Impact of running the camera etc on the WIFI network, which is currently poor.

25. National Highways - No objections

Representations

210 letters of objection have been received, expressing the following concerns:

1. The introduction of parking charges would result in visitors choosing to park elsewhere in Langsett to avoid charges. This already occurs when the car park is full and has a harmful impact which would be exacerbated by the parking charges. The impacts would be as follows:
 - Detrimental impact on residential amenity by people parking inconsiderately, blocking driveways and damaging property.
 - Impact on highway safety of badly parked vehicles on or adjacent to the very busy

- A616.
- Concern about the safety of people trying to cross the very busy A616 if parked outside the car park
 - Visual impact on the conservation area of parked vehicles
 - Impact on the listed buildings within Langsett
 - Impact on the business of the Wagon and Horses pub, with patrons being unable to park in the car park belonging to the pub.
2. There are no public transport links to Langsett, so people cannot choose an alternative way to access the area.
 3. Yorkshire Water have not carried out adequate public consultation on the proposal.
 4. Concern that the ANPR camera would only be able to operate using existing broadband infrastructure, which is already very slow for residents, and would impact on the service for local residents.
 5. The proposal is contrary to Policies T1 and T7, which seek to properly manage demand for parking and seek to ensure care is taken *to avoid displacing impact to other sensitive areas and nearby settlements*.
 6. The parking should remain free to allow people access. Should not introduce charges during current economic climate.

Main Policies

26. Relevant Core Strategy policies: GPS1, GSP3, DS1, L3, CC1, T1, T7,
27. Relevant Local Plan policies: DM1, DMC3, DMC5, DMC7, DMC8.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

28. The Government's intention is that the NPPF should be considered as a material consideration and carry particular weight where a development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date. In the National Park the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy 2011 and policies in the Peak District National Park Development Management Policies document 2019. Policies in the Development Plan provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application. It is considered that in this case there is no significant conflict between prevailing policies in the Development Plan and more recent Government guidance in the NPPF.
29. In particular, paragraph 176 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
30. In the National Park, the development plan comprises the Authority's Core Strategy and the Development Management Policies (DMP). These Development Plan policies provide a clear starting point consistent with the National Park's statutory purposes for the determination of this application.

Main Development Plan Policies

Core Strategy

31. GSP1 *Securing National Park Purposes and sustainable* - sets out the broad strategy for achieving the National Park's objectives having regard to the Sandford Principle, (that is, where there are conflicting desired outcomes in achieving national park purposes, greater priority must be given to the conservation of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area, even at the cost of socio-economic benefits). GPS1 also sets out the need for sustainable development and to avoid major development unless it is essential, and the need to mitigate localised harm where essential major development is allowed.
32. Policy GSP3 *Development Management Principles* - sets out development management principles and states that all development must respect, conserve and enhance all valued characteristics of the site and buildings, paying particular attention to, amongst other elements, impact on the character and setting of buildings, scale of the development appropriate to the character and appearance of the National Park, design in accordance with the National Park Authority Design Guide and impact on living conditions of communities.
33. DS1 - *Development Strategy* - indicates what types of development are acceptable in principle in settlements and in the countryside. The emphasis is on sensitive, managed delivery in order to meet our purposes to conserve and enhance the Peak District
34. L1 - *Landscape character and valued characteristics*. Seeks to ensure that all development conserves and enhances valued landscape character and sites, features and species of biodiversity importance.
35. L3 - *Cultural Heritage assets or archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic significance*. Explains that development must conserve and where appropriately enhance or reveal the significance of historic assets and their setting. Other than in exceptional circumstances, development will not be permitted where it is likely to cause harm to the significance of any cultural heritage asset or its setting.
36. T1 – *Reducing the need to travel and encouraging sustainable transport*. States that sustainable access for the quiet enjoyment of the National Park, that does not cause harm to the valued characteristics will be promoted.
37. T3 – *Design of transport infrastructure – sets out the requirements for transport related infrastructure requiring the design to be appropriate for the National Park setting, and kept to a minimum necessary*.

T7 - *Minimising the adverse impact of motor vehicles and managing the demand for car and coach parks* – seeks to manage traffic movement and parking within the National Park.

Development Management Policies

38. DMC3 - *Siting, Design, layout and landscaping*. Reiterates, that where developments are acceptable in principle, policy requires that design is to high standards and where possible enhances the natural beauty, quality and visual amenity of the landscape. The siting, mass, scale, height, design, building materials should all be appropriate to the context. Accessibility of the development should also be a key consideration.
39. DMT3 - *Access and design criteria*. States amongst other things, that a safe access should be provided in a way that does not detract from the character and appearance of the locality and where possible enhances it.

40. DMC5 - *Assessing the impact of development on designated and non-designated heritage assets and their setting.* The policy provides detailed advice relating to proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, requiring new development to demonstrate how valued features will be conserved, as well as detailing the types and levels of information required to support such proposals. It also requires development to avoid harm to the significance, character, and appearance of heritage assets and details the exceptional circumstances in which development resulting in such harm may be supported.
41. DMC8 – *Conservation Areas* - indicates that development in Conservation Areas must preserve and enhance the Conservation Area setting, taking account of the effects of development to its setting and character. Applicants should be mindful of the appearance and materials chosen. Tree felling will not be permitted without agreement.

Assessment

Principle of Development

42. The development requiring planning permission is limited to the installation of the two ticket machines and the ANPR camera and pole.
43. It is noted that the Yorkshire Water's decision to introduce parking charges is a management issue and therefore does not require planning permission. There would be no change of use of the site and no additional parking spaces or loss of spaces would occur.
44. The introduction of new equipment to help manage the existing car park is acceptable in principle, provided an assessment of in visual impact of the equipment on the site, demonstrates that the conservation area, the nearby heritage assets and the wider landscape will be conserved and where possible enhanced.
45. It is noted that Yorkshire Water have stated that they plan to invest the money from the parking charges to enhance the management of the site. The funding will 'support a new Ranger team allowing them to provide a better visitor experience and contribute towards ongoing nature conservation initiatives and countryside management'.

Visual impact of the proposed development.

46. The equipment is modest in scale and largely dark coloured. It would also be located within the existing car park, which is a well-established site, already laid out with formal parking, and containing paraphernalia such as fencing, lighting, signage etc. Therefore, in this established context, it is not considered that the equipment would appear incongruous, and would not alter the established visual character of the site.
47. The car park is located within woodland and therefore, being surrounded by trees, the proposed equipment would not be clearly visible from outside the site. Given the context of the site, and the nature of the equipment which would not be prominently in views outside the site, it is not considered that the proposal would conserve the valued character of the National Park.
48. The proposed equipment would not be visible in close context with any nearby heritage assets and would therefore have a neutral or no impact on their setting thus conserving their significance.

49. Concern has been expressed that displaced vehicles parking within the conservation area would have an adverse visual impact. Parking already takes place in those areas and hence whilst it is accepted that this may increase at times due to charging, it is not considered that the temporary parking of vehicles would have a significant and permanent adverse visual impact on the character of the conservation area.
50. It is therefore concluded that the proposed payment machines and ANPR pole and camera would have an acceptable visual impact on the site and the wider area, including the impact on the conservation area, the nearby listed buildings, and also in wider landscape views.
51. The proposal therefore complies with the relevant Core Strategy and Local Plan policies.

Impact on the amenity of local residents

52. The machines and ANPR camera equipment would not have a physical impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents in terms of loss of light, privacy, or an overbearing impact due to their scale and the distance from the nearest dwellings.
53. Local residents, (and others), objecting to the scheme have raised wider concerns about the proposal in terms of the impact of the change in the site's management via the introduction of parking charges, and the potential for this to displace vehicles to park on surrounding roads in the village in order to avoid paying to park.
54. Residents report that this displaced parking is already happening at busy times such as bank holidays and weekends, which has been exacerbated during the pandemic. They report that the displaced vehicles are already causing significant problems to local residents in terms of inconsiderate and dangerous parking, blocking of the highway, damage to property, anti-social behaviour etc.
55. These local concerns are fully acknowledged and understood. The increases in visitor pressure since the beginning of the pandemic is an issue that is being faced at most, if not all popular tourist destinations across the National Park and we note that the submitted planning statement states that 'Yorkshire Water will continue to work with local authorities and parish councils regarding on-street parking issues.'. The introduction of charging will inevitably mean some people choosing to find alternative, free parking spaces in the immediate local area adding to the overspill which already happens during popular times. The availability of 'free' parking in and around the village, and the broader matter of parking management on the nearby local streets to mitigate the impacts on local residents amenity, local businesses and highway safety currently falls to be mainly addressed by the local highway authority; in this case Barnsley MBC who have the main responsibility for traffic management and road safety matters, and can liaise with local stakeholders including Yorkshire Water and the Parish Council to manage parking demand and impacts.
56. Although your officers recognise this as an issue that is currently faced by local residents, and is likely to continue, it does fall outside the application site area and on land outside the applicant's ownership or control. In determining the planning application, we must give significant weight to the visual impact of the proposed machines. The knock on effect of the introduction of parking charges, which in itself, does not require planning permission is a material consideration but given this overspill occurs lawfully (in the main) on local public roads is one which we must give less weight in the planning balance.

57. It is also noted that a scheme of signage is proposed as part of the development, which aims to encourage visitors to park considerately etc, but signage that requires consent does not form part of this proposal and would require a separate application for Advertisement Consent. A footnote is therefore suggested in the officer recommendation.
58. Consequently it is concluded that the impact of the proposed physical development itself on neighbouring residents would accord with the relevant policies.

Impact on highway safety

59. It is noted that National Highways have no objection to the proposal whereas Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council Highways response highlights strong concerns about highway safety and amenity issues which arise from the indiscriminate parking that already occurs in the area. They comment that charging will undoubtedly add to this and note the planning statement in the application appears to take no account of this or measures to address the issue.
60. The highway safety issues noted by Barnsley MBC and identified by the parish and local residents are acknowledged. However, as noted above, given that this application is only for the machines and camera equipment and because the introduction of parking charges itself does not require planning permission, little weight can be given in the assessment, to the impact of people potentially choosing to park in the village and on side roads elsewhere when visiting the area.
61. How this is managed on the public side roads currently falls to Barnsley MBC. Officers note that the planning statement explains that it is Yorkshire Waters' intention that the new on-site ranger team would "ensure that the public engage safely with their surrounding environment" but that will focus on their own water assets. The statement also states that "Yorkshire Water will continue to work with local authorities and parish councils regarding on-street parking issues". This is welcomed, especially given the weight we can attach to off-site parking issues as a material consideration in the planning balance is limited. In concluding on balance that there are no highway matters raised by the application that would justify refusal of the proposal we have also recommended that, outside the planning application process, YW formally engage with ourselves, Barnsley MBC and the local community to look into this issue to better understand and then implement measures to manage this problem.

Conclusion

62. The visual impact of the proposed ticket machines and the camera are considered to be acceptable, and would not have a detrimental visual impact on the character and appearance of the National Park or local designated heritage assets.
63. The impacts on the amenity of local residents and highway safety from the people choosing to park outside the car park to avoid parking charges is acknowledged but cannot be given significant weight in the consideration of this application. The issues identified by local residents falls to be addressed through local parking control and management initiatives delivered by the local Highway Authority working with Yorkshire Water, ourselves and the local community.
64. Consequently, the application is recommended for conditional approval with a separate approach made to YW to liaise over local parking management issues.

Human Rights

65. Any human rights issues have been considered and addressed in the preparation of this report.

List of Background Papers (not previously published)

66. Nil

Report Author and Job Title

67. Kathryn White – Planning Officer