



## PLANNING CONSULTATION RESPONSE

|                                   |                                                                                                    |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application No</b>             | 2026/0420                                                                                          |
| <b>Proposal</b>                   | 2026 0420 Erection of 10no. 2 and 3 Storey Detached Dwellings Land West of Sheffield Road Birdwell |
| <b>Address</b>                    | Land West of Sheffield Road Birdwell                                                               |
| <b>Date of Consultation Reply</b> | 040826                                                                                             |
| <b>Consultee</b>                  | Tony Wiles Senior Conservation Officer                                                             |

### Consultation Assessment and Justification

The main consideration is: -

- Whether or not the proposal would harm the heritage significance or impact on the setting of a designated asset or other asset of demonstrable heritage significance

#### Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 66 (1): The local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest

#### Policy

NPPF 207/208: Identify and assess heritage significance including the setting and the effect of a proposal

NPPF 212: Great weight given to an asset's conservation, irrespective of the degree of harm

NPPF 213: Any harm to or loss of significance will require clear and convincing justification

Barnsley Local Plan HE1 The Historic Environment

Barnsley Local Plan HE3 Developments affecting Historic Buildings

#### Conservation Comments:

The application relates to land west of Sheffield Road, Birdwell, immediately adjacent to the grade II listed Tankersley Mine Rescue Station ([NHLE 1376008](#)) at 333 and 334 Sheffield Road. It seeks permission to redevelop a currently vacant plot to the immediate south of the listed building, with ten dwellings arranged around a small cul-de-sac.

The proposed dwellings are two-storey, four-bedroom, pitched-roof houses, with a mix of detached and integral garaging and an external palette of brick and render. The design approach is contemporary, although historic Birdwell has a particular character and architectural language, most notably in the Victorian sandstone terraces to the south around Wood View and to the north beyond the junction with The Walk.

Brick is also part of the immediate built context, while stone remains evident in local detailing, including on the Aldi supermarket directly opposite the site on Sheffield Road. Although there are other designated heritage assets within 1,000m, the main conservation issue is the effect of the proposal on the setting of the former Tankersley Mine Rescue Station, given the very close relationship between the red line boundary and the listed building, which is approximately 5m away.

Given the modest scale of the proposal, I do not consider it likely to cause harm to listed buildings further afield. The assessment therefore turns on whether the application site contributes to the



# BARNSELEY

## Metropolitan Borough Council

significance of the Tankersley Mine Rescue Station, and whether development within that part of its setting would affect the ability to appreciate that significance. The submitted Heritage Impact Assessment is comprehensive and is useful in reaching this view, as it considers both the values which underpin the significance of the listed building and the contribution made by its setting, including the application site.

The Heritage Impact Assessment identifies that, "as the first purpose-built mines rescue station in England, the building possesses considerable evidential, historical and communal value". I agree with that assessment. The building has strong associative value through its clear connection with the mining industry, and communal value as a physical reminder of the development of mine safety and the wider mining industry. Architecturally, its institutional character and use of red engineering colliery brick are consistent with structures of this period and type, although later alterations have reduced aspects of its aesthetic value.

I agree that the application site makes little, if any, meaningful contribution to the setting of the listed Mine Rescue Station. The building's special interest is drawn principally from its historic interest and association with the former mining industry, rather than from any particular designed or functional relationship with the land now proposed for development. The surrounding area has also changed considerably, and the listed building now sits within a clearly defined curtilage, which contains the elements (a quadrangle of outbuildings) that make the strongest contribution to its significance. Functionally, the application site appears to have had little direct association with the listed building. Any relationship would have been limited to the former railway, which has since been removed, and its possible role in transporting miners; the site itself did not have a direct association with the colliery. It is now vacant land which allows views towards the rear compound of the listed building, but this openness does not appear to make a positive contribution to its setting or significance.

Overall, I feel the proposed development would not harm the setting or significance of the adjacent listed building. The site makes no meaningful contribution to that significance, and the proposal remains relatively modest in scale. Views into the development site will be available along the access road, but the two new roadside dwellings, plots 1 and 10, would sit broadly within the scale and pattern of nearby housing and other buildings. As such, I do not consider that the proposal would appear overbearing or amount to overdevelopment of the site.

In conclusion, I consider that the proposal accords with section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Barnsley Local Plan policies HE1 and HE3, and paragraphs 207, 208 and 212 of the NPPF. As such, I raise no objection on conservation grounds.

**NO OBJECTION\***

\*Delete as applicable

**Consultation Suggested Conditions:**

**Consultation Informative(s):**

**Planning Obligations required:**



# **BARNSLEY**

**Metropolitan Borough Council**

|  |
|--|
|  |
|--|