



PLANNING CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Application No	2025 0908
Proposal	Re-engineering and restoration of Yew Tree Quarry
Address	Stairfoot Brickworks, Wombwell Lane, Stairfoot
Date of Consultation Reply	09/04/2026
Consultee	BMBC PROW - S Ford

Consultation Assessment and Justification

Thanks to the applicant for the supplementary information addressing the significant concerns regarding the TPT and site access road crossings.
However it is noted that there is nothing in relation to the issues raised regarding the footpath closures beyond document 2 below. These include extent of closure, temporary diversion routes at Yew plantation and hedge management.

1. Amended site access plan 12 March 2026

Not sure what this adds in relation to TPT or PROW but the TPT crossing is covered in the Delivery management plans

2. 3rd Party land 10 Feb 2026

Thank you for the up to date information regarding land ownership/control.

Q. What do they mean by land under applicants control?

The issue we have is that the land OWNER has to agree to the temporary diversion alignments onto their land. So if they have a lease or other similar agreement we might still need separate written consent from the OWNERS.

3. Supporting documents Delivery Management Plans 12 March 2026

Concerned that there is a lot being left to the yet unconfirmed contractor running the project. This includes who liaison is with should any TPT crossing arrangements set out in this document and any planning approval not be complied with.

2.1.3 – How does the enabling work application for the junction with Wombwell Lane 2022/1218 fit in with/ impact on Transportations Stairfoot roundabout improvement works? In terms of timing/ traffic management etc. This is a general question for Transportation/ HDC/Traffic

3.3 - 70% of deliveries expected from north through stairfoot roundabout improvement scheme

3.4.2 – Banksman at TPT crossing thank you

3.4.9 / 4.24 / appendix B – These give different numbers for the amount of vehicles that can be stacked prior to crossing TPT. So not sure which is correct

3.5.2 / 5.1.2 refer to wheel wash where vehicle exit the infilling site and sweepers etc for debris on the public vehicular highways but no reference to clearing mud off the TPT crossing. Any accident on the TPT crossing as a result of mud would be liability of the contractor to address as well as physically preventing deliveries/outgoing vehicles whilst casualty is helped.

4.1.3 Gate design needs to be safe for horses particularly if they spook and crash into them

4.2.2 time taken to open gates doesn't add up!

Generally support the proposals set out in 4.2.5 that the TPT would be closed for 5 minutes up to 3 times an hour rather than constant opening and closing the gates.



BARNSLEY

Metropolitan Borough Council

But would that actually be workable from the lorry drivers point of view? Would they agree to down time spent waiting for up to 15 minutes? Not that I am arguing against the proposal but if it isn't workable from all sides then it is likely to fail in some form or another – levels of abuse to the banksman, finances, taco time, space etc.

There is no reference to signage and space for TPT users to wait up to 5 minutes with potentially horses that might spook from lorry noise.

When gates are open the queuing TPT users need space to pass each other on the crossing and past potentially people still waiting on the TPT itself which is narrow in both approaches to the crossing.

NO OBJECTION*

Defer for amends/further information*

OBJECT*

*Delete as applicable

Consultation Suggested Conditions:

Consultation Informative(s):

Planning Obligations required: