

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Willows , Helen \(PLANNING OFFICER\)](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: 2025/1065 - West Green Recycling Revised Application
Date: 10 March 2026 20:15:28
Attachments: [g64.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image001.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms Willows

Please see my comments interleaved in red beneath. If you could review and revert please that would be great.

Kind Regards

Susan Crowley

**HERA
PLANNING** 

[REDACTED]
Creative Solutions for Challenging Places

The information included in this email is of a confidential nature and is intended only for the addressee. If you are not the intended addressee, any disclosure, copying or distribution by you is prohibited and may be unlawful. Please contact us if you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by using the reply facility on your e-mail system. Disclosure to any party other than the addressee, whether inadvertent or otherwise is not intended to waive the privilege or confidentiality. Although this e-mail and any attachments are believed to be free from any virus, or other defect which might affect any system into which they are received or opened, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that they are virus-free and to check that they will not adversely affect its systems and data. No responsibility is accepted by HERA Planning for any loss or damage arising in any way from their receipt, opening or use.

On 10 Mar 2026, at 17:49, Willows , Helen (PLANNING OFFICER)
<helenwillows@barnsley.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Ms Crowley

A noise condition would have to be worded to require a further noise report. The noise report may demonstrate a degree of harm such that the proposed development is not acceptable in relation to the adjacent housing allocation. The condition would have to be worded to require the proposed development to be removed if the noise report demonstrated that degree of harm. Clearly, a condition which required the removal of

the proposed development would fail to satisfy the six tests and would be unreasonable. Therefore, a fully detailed noise report addressing Pollution Control comments would be required before the decision is made, to inform the principle of development.

When arriving at his decision on noise impact the Inspector stated:

24. When measured from a point in the field to the southwest, noise from the site does not exceed background levels, and that when measured from a point in the field to the northwest, the noise is not excessively above background levels.

25. It is clear from the noise assessment that the noisiest plant on site is the Crusher and Trommel which is not part of the appeal proposal ...The noise assessment also shows that 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 this appeal.

26. The dominant noise source at the receptors was traffic on the road and diesel engine noises, not that generated by the plant [In relation to noise readings from within the field to the southwest] the dominant noise source was from plant on the site and not the road. However even if a noise character correction of 3dB were added as suggested by the EHO, the development is only 2dB above background levels, which is not considered to constitute an adverse impact.

27. Applying the same character correction to the calculations for the receptor to the northwest could result in noise levels being 7dB above background noise levels. But most of this excellence is accounted for by the permitted plant at the site, not the plant subject of the appeal. In any case the EHO also confirmed that when in the field to the northwest he could not hear the plant at the site, and I saw at my site visit that this land is further from the site than that land to the southwest and is separated by the elevated active freight railway line.

28. The development could result in an additional four HGV movements an hour if the inputs to the site rose to 150,000 tonnes per year (tpa). However the appellant considers that such tonnages would be unlikely and indeed inputs could be limited by condition to be 75,000tpa as allowed for by the existing Environmental Permit. It is unlikely therefore that there would be any material increases in traffic and therefore noise from that traffic if inputs were restricted in this way.

29. In light of the above and given there is no detail as to how close to the site houses would be, what mitigation may be put in place as part of that development, or indeed if houses are built here at all [he could not] conclude that the future residents would suffer unacceptably from noise generated by the development.

The Inspector found that the noise assessment submitted in support of the appeal was appropriate in its approach.

The plant and equipment proposed as part of the development under consideration has not altered and there remains existing lawful plant and equipment in operation.

The noise assessment prepared to support the appeal (the findings of which were accepted

by the Inspector) and the noise report prepared to support this planning application have been prepared using the same methodology and they arrive at the same conclusion; that there would arise no harm to relevant receptors. Neither assessment proposes mitigation measures.

Since the appeal decision was issued, and as far as the Applicant is aware the context to the appeal site has not altered - in which regard in relation to land contained within MU3 *there is no detail as to how close to the site houses would be, what mitigation may be put in place as part of that development, or indeed if houses are built here at all.*

In response to the December 2025 submission, the Pollution Control team raised “**No Objection**” and recommended that permission (were it to be granted) be granted subject to a condition requiring the submission of a “new noise assessment”. For the Pollution Control team to arrive at a position of ‘no objection’ and noting that it is content for permission to be granted subject to a suitably worded condition it must be comfortable that the development under consideration is capable of being delivered without harm/unacceptable harm.

The email response from the Pollution Control team dated 25 February 2026 does not object to the proposal, it merely highlights that the noise report submitted to you on 19 February 2026 doesn’t address the content of the suggested condition - as stated the noise report submitted on 19 February was prepared absent sight of the Pollution Control team’s original consultation response.

The Applicant does not consider it unreasonable, in view of all of the above, and noting that you are relying on the Inspector’s findings in your approach to the assessment of other aspects of the current proposal, to request that you reconsider your approach to the matter of noise assessment and impact such that it does not override the Inspector’s approach to noise assessment and his conclusions on noise impact; and such that it takes into consideration the Pollution Control team’s position which is one of ‘no objection’ and recommends the use of a suitably worded condition in the event that planning permission is to be granted.

Perhaps you could revert on this matter so as to allow the Applicant to determine next steps.

The planting plan does not seem to me to be substantial in scale to fully mitigate the general visual effect of the proposed development in wider views. Neither the planting plan nor the LVIA address the impact of the wider proposed development. The planting plan lacks details of a fully detailed landscaping scheme which would include details of the subsoil and topsoil depths to be secured.

The Inspector arrived at his decision in terms of the visual impact of the appeal proposal having regard to the *built form and scale of the filter press* (emphasised in paragraphs 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 16 of the decision). More specifically the Inspector was concerned at the prominence of the built form and scale of the filter press in wider views (paragraphs 10 and 14 of the decision refers).

When comparing the visual impact of the filter press to a neighbouring industrial development, the Inspector weighed in the balance how much of the neighbouring building was visible from West Green Way alongside the fact that said industrial building was *flanked by vegetation ... similar in height to it* (paragraph 14 of the decision).

As evidenced within the LVIA, the general visual effect of the proposed development is fully mitigated in wider views. In this regard and in views from West Green Way, the filter press is 'smaller and has less visual mass' and it is set to be 'flanked by vegetation which it is similar in height to it. The proposed planting is modelled in all viewpoints contained within the LVIA at year 1 and year 15.

Perhaps in view of the above, the Local Authority would be willing to revisit its position on this particular point.

The Applicant can of course provide details of subsoil and topsoil depths.

Perhaps you could revert on this matter so as to allow the Applicant to determine next steps.

Regards

Helen Willows BA (Hons) MRTPI
(She/Her)
Planning Officer
Regeneration and Culture Service
Barnsley Council

Telephone: 01226 772642

Email: helenwillows@barnsley.gov.uk

Mail: Barnsley Council, PO Box 634, Barnsley, S70 9GG

(Westgate Plaza One, Westgate, Barnsley, S70 2DR for meetings)

My working days are Monday to Thursday

**Please take a moment to let us know what you thought of our
Planning service by completing this short customer feedback form:
[Planning Customer Feedback Form](#)**

**Please be aware that the Development Management Team are
currently experiencing temporary resourcing pressures.
Unfortunately, this means we may not respond to correspondence as
quickly as we would like. This situation is expected to last for a**

temporary period whilst a recruitment exercise is undertaken. I would like to thank you for your continued patience at this time.



From: Susan Crowley [REDACTED]
Sent: 09 March 2026 15:07
To: Willows , Helen (PLANNING OFFICER) <HelenWillows@barnsley.gov.uk>
Cc: Anthony Lidster [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: 2025/1065 - West Green Recycling Revised Application

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms Willows

Thanks for your email.

Please see my comments interleaved in red. Perhaps you could respond to our queries as appropriate?

Kind Regards

Susan Crowley

**HERA
PLANNING** 



Creative Solutions for Challenging Places

The information included in this email is of a confidential nature and is intended only for the addressee. If you are not the intended addressee, any disclosure, copying or distribution by you is prohibited and may be unlawful. Please contact us if you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by using the reply facility on your e-mail system. Disclosure

to any party other than the addressee, whether inadvertent or otherwise is not intended to waive the privilege or confidentiality. Although this e-mail and any attachments are believed to be free from any virus, or other defect which might affect any system into which they are received or opened, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that they are virus-free and to check that they will not adversely affect its systems and data. No responsibility is accepted by HERA Planning for any loss or damage arising in any way from their receipt, opening or use.

On 9 Mar 2026, at 14:19, Willows , Helen (PLANNING OFFICER) <HelenWillows@barnsley.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Ms Crowley

Thank you for your email.

1. I consulted Pollution Control on the 'new noise impact assessment' and attach their response which I summarised in my previous email of 25 February. The comments advised the submission of a new noise impact assessment informed by further evidence which I note you have not submitted.

As I understand it the original comments (dated 3 February 2026) from the Pollution Control team read as a condition. The revised noise assessment was prepared without sight of the 3 February comments. Regardless, does it not seem that the recommendations made in the 3 February response still stand? If so I hope you would agree that there is no reason why the matter of noise impact cannot be addressed by condition?

- 1.
2. Thank you for the proposed planting plan. I note that you have not submitted a revised LVIA as I requested nor addressed the impact of the wider proposed development.

The LVIA (dated 22 December 2025) submitted on 28 January 2026 relies on the detail of the planting plan (dated 19 December 2025) submitted to you on 6 March 2026. The LVIA already addresses the matter of how the development will be screened by the planting plan at year 1 and year 15. I trust that this is satisfactory, but please of course revert if matters remain unclear.

- 2.
3. Thank you for your comments about the reduction in the

height of the filter press.

The response does not fully address my request for additional information. Unless I hear from you otherwise, I shall proceed to determine the application in its current form.

Regards

Helen Willows BA (Hons) MRTPI
(She/Her)
Planning Officer
Regeneration and Culture Service
Barnsley Council

Telephone: 01226 772642

Email: helenwillows@barnsley.gov.uk

Mail: Barnsley Council, PO Box 634, Barnsley, S70 9GG
(Westgate Plaza One, Westgate, Barnsley, S70 2DR for meetings)

My working days are Monday to Thursday

Please take a moment to let us know what you thought of our Planning service by completing this short customer feedback form: [Planning Customer Feedback Form](#)

Please be aware that the Development Management Team are currently experiencing temporary resourcing pressures. Unfortunately, this means we may not respond to correspondence as quickly as we would like. This situation is expected to last for a temporary period whilst a recruitment exercise is undertaken. I would like to thank you for your continued patience at this time.

<image002.png>

From: Susan Crowley <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 06 March 2026 17:52
To: Willows , Helen (PLANNING OFFICER)
<HelenWillows@barnsley.gov.uk>
Cc: Anthony Lidster <[REDACTED]>
Subject: 2025/1065 - West Green Recycling Revised Application

Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms Willows

With reference to the matter in the subject field and in response to your email dated 25 February 2026 (for which thank you):

1. The consultation response from the Pollution Control team (attached) raises no objection to the proposal; the case officer recommends two conditions. The Applicant is content to have any permission granted subject to the case officer's recommendations. Notwithstanding, the Applicant submitted a "new noise impact assessment" to you on 19 February 2026. Perhaps you could consult with Pollution Control on its contents as a next step.

2. Please see attached a proposed Planting Plan. The Applicant is content to address any comments or queries you/your landscape team may have on this submission.

3. The change in height to the filter press housing has been made possible simply by building in efficiencies to the internal access and circulation arrangements - nothing more.

I trust the Applicant has answered your queries; they agree to an extension of time to the 31 March in the first instance, at which point they are content to review matters with you.

Kind Regards

Susan Crowley

<image001.png>

The information included in this email is of a confidential nature and is intended only for the addressee. If you are not the intended addressee, any disclosure, copying or distribution by you is prohibited and may be unlawful. Please contact us if you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by using the reply facility on your e-mail system. Disclosure to any party other than

the addressee, whether inadvertent or otherwise is not intended to waive the privilege or confidentiality. Although this e-mail and any attachments are believed to be free from any virus, or other defect which might affect any system into which they are received or opened, it is the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that they are virus-free and to check that they will not adversely affect its systems and data. No responsibility is accepted by HERA Planning for any loss or damage arising in any way from their receipt, opening or use.

*** Barnsley Council Disclaimer: This email and any files attached are confidential for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender as soon as possible and delete the communication from your system without copying, disseminating or distributing the same in any way by any means. Any views or opinions expressed belong solely to the author and do not necessarily represent those of the council. In particular, the council will not accept liability for any defamatory statements made by email communications. Recipients are responsible for ensuring that all emails and files sent are checked for viruses. The council will not accept liability for damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email. No guarantees are offered on the security, content and accuracy of any emails and files received. Be aware that this email communication may be intercepted for regulatory, quality control, or crime detection purposes unless otherwise prohibited. The content of this email and any attachment may be stored for future reference. Link to privacy statement - <https://www.barnsley.gov.uk/services/information-and-privacy/your-privacy/> <Mail Attachment.eml>

*** Barnsley Council Disclaimer: This email and any files attached are confidential for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender as soon as possible and delete the communication from your system without copying, disseminating or distributing the same in any way by any means. Any views or opinions expressed belong solely to the author and do not necessarily represent those of the council. In particular, the council will not accept liability for any defamatory statements made by email communications. Recipients are responsible for ensuring that all emails and files sent are checked for viruses. The council will not accept liability for damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email. No guarantees are offered on the security, content and accuracy of any emails and files received. Be aware that this email communication may be intercepted for regulatory, quality control, or crime detection purposes unless otherwise prohibited. The content of this email and any attachment may be stored for future reference. Link to privacy statement - <https://www.barnsley.gov.uk/services/information-and-privacy/your-privacy/>