BARNSLEY
Metropolitan Borough Council

PLANNING CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Application No	2026/0232
Proposal	Erection of 119 dwellings, open space and associated infrastructure.
Address	Land to the south of Bloomhouse Lane, East of Woolley Colliery Road, Darton, Barnsley
Date of Consultation Reply	04/08/26
Consultee	Nik King, Senior Urban Design Officer

Consultation Assessment and Justification

These are the design comments for planning application 2026/0232.

Please note that these comments include two attachments:

1. 'Stretches of overdominance of front of dwelling parking' and
2. 'Location of Magnolia & Primrose house types'

The principal sources of design guidance are:

- Barnsley Local Plan (2019) Policy D1 High Quality Design and Place Making
- Design of Housing Development SPD (2023)
- Open Space Provision on New Housing Developments (2019)
- Parking SPD (2019)
- Affordable Housing SPD (2022)
- South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide (2011)
- Building for a Healthy Life (2026)

I note that bulk of the proposal is located on allocated housing site HS25, but also extends (at its south-eastern corner) to include a small part of adjacent HS11. I note that the north-western corner of site HS25 has not been included in the red line boundary of the proposals. The indicative number of dwellings stated in the local plan for site HS25 is 118. This proposal is for 119 units.

A central spine road running west-east has been provided, with the intention for it to extend eastwards as part of the future development of site HS11, as requested in the site-specific policy for site HS25.

North-western corner of site HS25. I have not found any reason given in the planning statement or the design and access statement for the omission of this north-western corner of HS25 within the boundary of the site. The intention of the site allocation was for the site to be developed in a comprehensive manner rather than potentially two separate and segregated development sites, with different access points.

Quantum of public open space. The SPD 'Open Space Provision of New Housing Developments' states (in para 5.1) '*a minimum of 15% of the gross site area of new housing*

development must be open space of a type appropriate to the character of the site, its location and the layout and nature of the new hosing and adjoining house uses.' Para 7.1 states how this 15% will be calculated. We could do with a plan showing the boundary line of the areas being proposed as POS and the area calculation.

Location of main area of public open space. The main area of public open space is provided at the south-eastern corner of the site. This location is tucked away and hidden from view of the bulk of the development. Its entrance accessway has a 'pinch point' created with a water pumping station and the POS is only overlooked by three dwellings. As a result, there could be the feel that this is more of a 'private' space. The SPD 'Open Space Provision on New Housing Development' states (in para 14.2) '*open space should.. be an integral part of the development and should generally form a central feature...(and)...not be located in peripheral areas of the site.*' However, I do note that this location is relatively near and accessible from the existing residential development to the south of the site.

Equipped children's play area. I note that the design and access statement states (in section 6.1.1) '*900mm high estate railings are proposed around the equipped open space ....*' However, I cannot find an equipped children's play area shown on the layout plan. I note that the SPD 'Open Space Provision on New Housing Developments' states, (in para 8.1), '*developments of over 100 dwellings should generally provide equipped children's play area on site'*.

The space does, however, provide for a general informal kick-about area (for balls for kids/ parent with kids)/ dog ball-throwing area, which is much appreciated.

Stretches of over-dominance of front of dwelling parking. The SPD 'Design of Housing Development' states, (in paras 12.4 and 12.5), *'Continuous strips of front of dwelling parking are not acceptable. The starting point should be a 50:50 hard/soft landscaping balance at the front of dwellings.' 'The maximum number of front-of-dwelling parking spaces acceptable in a row is four. <u>These should be used sparingly in a development</u> and be separated from other parking spaces by a considerable width of soft landscaping, i.e. <u>more than the width of a parking space</u>.'* (My emphasis shown underlined.) From attachment 1. 'Stretches of overdominance of front of dwelling parking' I count a total of 12 stretches where rows of four front-of-dwelling parking spaces are not separated from other parking spaces by a considerable width of soft landscaping. There should be no such stretches.

I do not support trees being planted in very thin widths of soft landscaping separating front of dwelling parking spaces, as they tend to cause bird dropping on cars below and cause maintenance issues between neighbours, so they are less likely to be kept long term by residents and so do not function long term as visually reducing the impact of front-of dwelling parking. Similarly hedges located on very thin strips of soft landscaping between front-of-dwelling parking spaces tend to get damaged by car door openings and raise maintenance issues between neighbours, so again are more likely to be removed by the residents in the long term. There are several examples of trees and hedges being placed on very thin strips of landscaping on the landscaping plans.

Visitor parking. The SPD 'Parking' states (on page 6) '*1 visitor parking space per 4 dwellings subject to layout. Flexibility for visitor parking will be considered on a site-by-site basis.*' For 119 dwellings this would result in a total of 30 spaces. In terms of dedicated visitor parking spaces, I have counted 23. I note that the site layout also shows informal visitor parking on

the main carriageway of the spine road. I defer to highways development control as to whether this meets their requirements for the number of visitor parking spaces.

Cycle Parking. The SPD 'Parking' states (on page 11) *'1 secure space per dwelling in garage of suitable size or separate secure covered area within plot.'* Although sheds *appear* to be shown on the layout plan there is no mention of sheds or their cycle storage in the key. We will also need the specification of these sheds, to clear the proposed standard condition for sheds.

Accessibility standards. Accessibility standards are given in the SPD 'Design of Housing Development.' Para 6.1 states *'Given the aging population and identified levels of disability amongst the population, housing development should be built to the following accessible standards: 26% of all new dwellings should be built to M4(2) accessible & adaptable standard and 6% of new dwellings should be built to wheelchair accessible M4(3)(2)(b)'*.

The proposals include 96 M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable' dwellings (65 above the requirement) and zero M4(3)(2)(b) 'wheelchair accessible' dwellings. The proposals include six M4(3) but, under building regulations, without a specific labelling of 'M4(3)(2)(b)' these are by default M4(3)(2)(a) 'wheelchair adaptable' dwellings which is a lesser standard. No reason has been provided for the zero provision of M4(3)(2)(b) 'wheelchair accessible dwellings.' I defer to development management as to the acceptable mix of accessible dwellings for this development.

As per the requirement of the local validation list, the labels M4(2) and M4(3)(2)(b) need to be shown on the site layout plan (on the individual plots), the house type plans (stating 'M4(2) compliant' or 'M4(3)(2)(b) compliant') and on the accommodation schedule.

External spacing standards. From the SPD 'Design of Housing Development' the minimum-to-back dimension between facing habitable rooms should be 21 metres. This is not being met between plots 95 and 86 and 95 and 86 (I measure both 18m), between plots 97 and 104 (20m), and 59 and 68 (20m). Where housing abuts the edge of existing settlements, the back-to-back dimension should be greater than 21 m. I note the distance from the rear of plots 54-58 to the farm buildings is less than this, I don't know if any of these buildings are residences with habitable rooms facing the new development, so I defer to development management on this distance.

Cross sections. We could do with a cross section from the rear of plots 9, 10 and 11 towards the adjacent non-residential building to the rear, to understand any differences in height and how it may affect the residential amenity of the residents. We could do with a cross section between rear of plots 54 to 58 and the nearby farm building, and clarification if there are any habitable rooms of the farm buildings facing towards the rear of the new residences.

Level changes and retaining walls. I note the level changes and the location of retaining walls shown in the level strategy plan. I defer to development management if any further information is needed to determine if this affects back-to back distances between buildings in order to maintain privacy.

Rear garden sizes. I note the design and access statement states, (in section 5.3.4), that '*the plan opposite demonstrates the high quality garden areas which are compatible with the guidance above,'* (the guidance being a minimum of 50sqm for 2 bed and 60sqm for 3 and above bed). However, the plan shown is just the general layout plan and does not annotate

the size of garden areas. The Local Validation Requirement List states, (in section 3), the need to provide '*a table giving rear garden sizes, covering each plot and stating how many bedrooms the dwelling has.*' This table is missing from the submission documents. This table needs to be provided.

Trees on highway verge. I note that the planning statement (in para 7.5) mentions that on the spine road is '*a green verge with tree planting on one side*'. However, the layout plan and the two landscape proposal plans do not show any trees located on the highway verge of the central spine road. There are hardly any other trees being provided along the spine road. Verges of just grass tend to get parked upon and become muddy and unsightly relatively quickly. I note that in the design and access statement, (in paras 4.3 and 4.3.1), the 'initial design concept' plans show trees located in the highway verge, so I am at a loss as to why they are no longer being shown.

Boundary treatments. On the boundary treatments drawing the brick screen walls look very monotonous, visually hard and forbidding. They really need more modelling with some depth and relief to help break down their massing and scale, for example by having pillars that extrude out. I note that the design and access statement states (in section 6.1.1) '*900mm high estate railings are proposed around the equipped open space and hedges created elsewhere ensuring key definition between public and private realm.*' However, the boundary treatments plan does not show these railings.

Boundary treatment/ set-back from Bloomhouse Lane. The existing edge of Bloomhouse Lane to this site is dominated by soft landscaping. However, I am unsure from the site layout drawing is if this landscape character will remain. Is there enough of a retention of existing soft landscaping along this edge? I would not want the rear boundary treatment of plots 34 to 42 to overdominate the character of this stretch of Bloomhouse Lane. We could do with some cross sections from Bloomhouse Lane to the rear gardens of some of these plots to show how the landscape character of Bloomhouse Lane will be maintained.

Boundary treatment plan- We need a separate layout plan specifically focussing on boundary treatments as, for example, it is difficult to decipher on the site layout plan what the boundary treatment is on the site boundaries (as it is overlaid by the red line boundary) where the knee-high rails are being provided and where the brick screen walls are being provided.

Landscaping maintenance. We need a plan showing which areas of landscaping will be privately maintained by a management company. We also need a five-year landscaping maintenance plan.

Safety and security of users along the public right of way, which crosses south/north through the site. The current PROW runs across a field, and the side of the farm buildings. With the proposed development the PROW is likely to be more heavily used and so some thought should be given to its potential lighting, to enhance the safety and security of this route.

Front garden boundary treatment where it is next to the public right of way, which crosses south/north through the site. I note that hedges are shown facing the PROW for to delineate front gardens (plots 119, 48, 116 and 58). I think these boundaries need to be bolstered with additional railings to make these boundaries more robust over the long term. On looking through the design and access statement I note that in section 6.1.1 it states '*900mm high estate railings are proposed around the equipped play space and hedges*

created elsewhere ensuring key definition between public and private realm' (my emphasis shown underlined). There is no showing of these railings by hedges on the layout plan and the boundary treatments drawing does not show 900mm high railings.

Heights of dwellings. I note the comment in the design and access statement (in section 5.6) that '*some higher storey buildings within the site provides visual interest in the roofscape.*' However, I find the streetscenes visually jarring with the use of the 3 storey 'Magnolia' house type and the use of 'Primrose' house types (the latter 2.5 storeys, but with a roof ridge height the same as the 3 storey Magnolia). Please see attachment 2 'Location of Magnolia and Primrose housetypes' for their distribution through the site.

Whilst I appreciate the use of 3 storey dwellings in the existing Wolley Colliery Road/ The Grange development, (as shown in the design and access statement in section 3.1.2) I note that looking at this development the 3 storey dwellings are either within an area of all 3 storeys, or else they are interspersed with 2.5 and 2 storey dwellings. I also note that in the latter arrangement there are considerable ground level differences, twists and turns in the road layout, and quite a lot of modelling to the frontages, (for example bay windows), which help to reduce the visual impact of the height differences. The differences in height look less stark and jarring. The situation on this site is quite different. For example, on cross section A-A the road is flat and relatively straight and there is little modelling on the front of the elevations. The step change from 2 storey to 3 storey, with the 3 storey dwellings being thin in width and relatively flat faced, is quite marked and visually jarring. The use of a gable on the 2 storey dwelling (on plot 68) helps to reduce the massing and scale of the 2 storey dwellings, but it is then dwarfed by the adjacent three storey dwelling, making it look out of place. Section AA is particularly important as it sets the scene for the link road for the adjacent HS11 site.

The 2.5 storey 'Magnolia' house type looks top-heavy and visually jarring with such a relatively high roof ridge line- the height of the roof ridge is the same as the three-storey Primrose.

Depth of reveal for window and door openings. The SPD 'Design of Housing Development' states (in section 7.11) *'window and door openings should have sufficient recess in the reveal to give visual articulation. Typical cross sections of windows and doors at 1:5 or 1:20 scale should show a minimum 50mm set back within the reveal.'* We need a typical cross section of windows and doors to be provided, at 1:5 or 1:20 scale to show a minimum 50mm set back within the reveal.

Clarification of brick detailing on the housetype drawings. The different shading of the bricks shown on the housetype drawings needs some clarification as to what they are representing. I *assume* what they show are a darker brick plinth, extending around some of front doors, and areas of extruded brick, (based on another 'homes by honey' development at Goldthorpe, north of Barnbrugh Lane). However, this needs clarifying within this planning application. I note that the elevations with render are annotated on the materials plan.

Building for a healthy life. Within the BfHL information contained in the design and access statement, (in section 7.1), I note the first column of text includes the wording '*as the initial assessment advises opposite, in our opinion the scheme is currently achieving green lights to 5 criteria.*' However, I cannot find any reference to red, amber or green scores within any of the 12 'considerations' in the remainder of the text for this section.

BARNSLEY
Metropolitan Borough Council

Also, I would suggest that the text provided for the considerations is revisited; to check it aligns with the guidance in the May 2026 edition of Building for a Healthy Life. For example:

- Consideration 1 'Natural Connections' is as much about soft-landscaping connections as vehicular & pedestrian connections.
- Consideration 3 'Facilities and Services' is as much about looking at the facilities being provided on-site, as well as proximity and connections to existing facilities off-site. This proposal is providing an area of POS at the south-eastern end of the site which is near existing housing to the south of the site, but this isn't mentioned in the text.
- Consideration 4 'Homes for Everyone' whilst reference is made to the dwelling mix and range, no mention is made of the affordable accommodation and accessible accommodation being provided.

~~**NO OBJECTION***~~	**Defer for amends/further information***	~~**OBJECT***~~

*Delete as applicable

Consultation Suggested Conditions:

I would suggest conditions for the details of:

- **Materials** (as only generic information is provided in the application)
- **Hard and soft landscaping** (as no details of hard landscaping have been provided on the plans)
- **Five year maintenance plan for landscaping**
- **Cycle storage** (standard condition)
- **Lighting of the public right of way**
- **Water pumping station,** (located by south-western POS), (including boundary treatment)
- **Electricity substation,** (located north of plot 1), (including boundary treatment)
- **Accessible dwellings**

  I would suggest the following wording:

  'Prior to first occupation of any dwelling, Building Control Completion Certificates must be provided to the Local Planning Authority demonstrating that the following requirements as set out in the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended) have been achieved

  *The following plot numbers are to meet Part M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings': ***, ***, ***, ***,*

  *The following plot numbers are to meet Part M4(3)(2)(b) 'wheelchair accessible dwellings': ***,***,***, ***,*

  This condition may be partially discharged by the submission and approval of Completion Certificates for individual plots during a site build out. This condition will be fully discharged upon receipt of satisfactory Completion Certificates for all plots.

BARNSLEY
Metropolitan Borough Council

Consultation Informative(s):
Planning Obligations required: