



To whom it may concern

**Re-submission of Planning Application 2023/0758 for the site of West Green Recycling, West Green Way, Monk Bretton, Barnsley, S71 5SN. Following the dismissal of an appeal by A. Owen Planning Inspector.**

The Inspector in his Appeal Decision APP/R4408/W/25/3369666 dated 20 November 2025 determined the plant as proposed in the Appeal to be acceptable in terms of noise in respect of the relevant receptors for both the existing and future residents in the locality (including on the allocated MU3 site).

My understanding of the Inspector's position on noise in the Appeal Decision is as follows:

***Existing Residents***

- The parties agreed that there was no noise objection to the proposal insofar as it relates to existing receptors and the Inspector also raised no issue or concern in this respect.

***Future Residents (MU3 allocation)***

- The noise levels from the permitted plant do not exceed the background levels when measured in the field to the south west (located between the Application Site and West Green Way forming part of Phase 5 in the MU3 allocation) (paragraph 24).
- The noise levels from the permitted plant are not excessively above the background levels when measured in the field to the north west (located on the other side of the operational freight railway line to the north west of the railway comprising Phase 2 in the MU3 allocation) (paragraph 24) and the Council's Environmental Health Officer could not hear the appeal plant at the site, and this land is further from the Site than the land to the southwest and is separated by the elevated active freight railway line.
- The noisiest plant on site is the crusher and trommel, neither of which are part of the appeal proposal (paragraph 25).
- There is very little difference between the noise levels resulting from the plant permitted to be at the site and the addition of the plant subject of the appeal (paragraph 25).
- Even with the application of the noise character correction to the proposed receptors on the south western boundary as suggested by the EHO, the development is only 2 dB above background levels, which is not considered to be an adverse impact (paragraph 26).
- Most of the exceedances are accounted for by the permitted plant at the site, not the plant subject of the appeal (paragraph 27).

- The future residents would not suffer unacceptably from noise generated by the development (paragraph 29).
- The development would not prejudice the development of the masterplan area, either in spatial terms or by blighting adjacent potentially residential parts through unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance and does not conflict with policy MU3, GD1 or Poll1 in this respect (paragraph 31).

### **Conclusion on Revised Proposal**

In the re-submission, the aggregate wash plant will be turned through 90 degrees and reduced in height by approximately 3.5m to 7.06m and length halved to 20m, with its width increasing to 10m, the south western boundary wall being shifted approximately 5m to the east and increasing in height to 3.3m and green vegetative screening placed along the south-western boundary of the Application Site (outside of the relocated boundary wall). The remaining elements of the proposal are to remain the same. The operation of the revised plant proposal will have no greater impact on the relevant receptors for the existing and future residents in the locality (including on the allocated MU3 site) than the plant in its existing position that was considered and concluded to be acceptable in noise terms by the Inspector in the Appeal Decision.

Yours Sincerely



Andrew Green (Director)