



9th June 2025

Jessica Duffield
Barnsley Council
Economic Regeneration,
Development Management
PO Box 634,
Barnsley,
S70 9FE

Dear Jess

RE: Doncaster Road, Darfield - Ref 2024/0580

Further in the above matter, please find attached the following plans and documents for your consideration:

- 23 5638-01-L - SITE LAYOUT & LANDCAPE - 23.05.25 COLOURED
- Alton House Type (previously not part of the original house type package)
- Watergrove House Type Plans and Elevations (previously not part of the original house type package)
- 1299 1002A - Vehicle Tracking
- 1299 1001A – Visibility
- Doncaster Road, Darfield - TA June 2025 PART 1
- Doncaster Road, Darfield - TA June 2025 PART 2
- Doncaster Road, Darfield - TA June 2025 PART 3
- Arboricultural Report and Impact Assessment Land at Doncaster Road AWA6683
- Entire Site - Doncaster Road, Darfield, Statutory Metric (Macros Disabled)
- Phase One - Doncaster Road, Darfield, Condition Assessments
- Phase One - Doncaster Road, Darfield, Statutory Metric (Macros Disabled)
- Phase Two - Doncaster Road, Darfield, Statutory Metric (Macros Disabled)

Taking each of the consultation comments provided in turn, I can advise the following:

Trees

The retention of the trees in north-east corner is welcomed; however this isn't clearly shown on the Phase 1 plan and appears more like a green/lawned area. Please can the tree retention be clearly shown.

The layout has now been updated to ensure this is clearly identified, as requested.

There are still some concerns regarding the proximity of Plots 88 – 97 in terms of the TPO trees and potential impacts, can these be pulled away any further?

As the extract demonstrates, the layout has been revised to ensure that there is minimal impact on the Root Protection Zone. A path is located however this can be dealt with via no dig construction methods.



The access point into the southern phase is more acceptable.

Thank you for confirming this element.

The layout includes a number of footpaths either along the edge of the wooded area to the west and through the woodland (between phase 1 and phase 2). Clarification regarding these works is required, is tree removal proposed/surfacing etc?

Please find attached the updated AIA for your consideration which supports the development proposals.

Urban Design

1 bedroom Quad house types are still unacceptable and should be changed for a more traditional 1bedroom property (semi/terrace)

We feel that this comment provides a very subjective view towards this type of dwelling. Taking each of the concerns in turn to why these are not considered acceptable, we would advise as follows:

The ‘quarter house’ have now been rearranged to one location, with a layout change to parking arrangements and the addition of secure areas for wheelie bins for each dwelling.

This is correct. The solution provides a high quality environment for future residents with their own private amenity space.

I have looked at the house plan type and it does not meet the internal space standards of the SPD ‘Design of Housing Development’, para 5.1. I measure the area of the ‘kitchen & lounge’ as being 13.4 sq. m. I am assuming that dining occurs in this space too. The South Yorkshire Residential Design Guide states (on page 130) that ‘open plan combined kitchen/ dining/ living’ should be 24 sq. m, for either a 1 bed one person or a 1 bed two person dwelling.

Please refer to the updated Alton House Type Plans and Elevations.

The internal arrangements have been revised and are now fully compliant with internal space standards.

My previously stated concerns about their internal residential amenity remain - quad houses can be rather claustrophobic inside and they do not give sufficient crossflow air ventilation.

This is surely the decision of the future occupier. These types of dwellings are becoming more popular within a variety of Local Authorities, providing an alternative option to the standard house type. We have provided below some examples of where quarter houses have been approved within Barnsley and successfully developed and occupied for other Authorities.

Application 2011/0309
Former Perfecta Beds Site, Barnsley Road, Wombwell



Woodside Vale – Leeds
Taylor Wimpey



Carnforth Avenue, Wakefield
Strata Homes



The types are in line with Building Regulations Part F in relation to crossflow air ventilation.

Externally, plots 77, 78, 81, 82, 85 and 86 are south facing onto public open space and their front elevations not overlooked by any properties other than other quad houses. In terms of secured by design they are likely to more subject to potential burglary and anti-social behaviour due to this limited surveillance.

Plots 74 and 88 are orientated to face the quarter houses and provide natural surveillance.

In addition, windows are positioned along the southern elevations to provide some surveillance.

Further boundary treatments are also now proposed to the paths to clearly define the public and private realm and prevent casual intrusion.

Lighting will be provided to those units also.

I note that the details of affordable accommodation provision are due to be discussed, however I anticipate that the one bedroom quarter houses may be being offered as potential affordable accommodation. I have therefore spoken to Alison Dalton, the Group Leader for Strategic Housing. I have shown Alison the floor plan for the quarter house and the revised external arrangement. Alison has stated that she has some concerns.

The discussion on the affordable housing is yet to take place in respect of the provision and type of units on this site. The quarter house is a type of unit which has been readily made available for both open market and affordable homes in other Authorities. Further discussion on this matter would be welcomed as we progress the viability discussions.

The main POS is to the south of Phase 2 thus very far for residents in the northern end of Phase 1. There also appears to be limited POS within Phase 1, only small pockets. Concerns that if phase 2 did not come forward then residents would have insufficient POS.

Is 15% POS provided within phase 1? Please note this needs to be useable POS and not include green verges/planting etc.

The development proposes a high quality open space to the entrance of the site, a centrally positioned LEAP which is easily accessible and ensures sufficient buffers to the surrounding dwellings in addition to the provision of smaller pocket parks. These areas provide opportunities for informal recreation, seating and socialising.

The provision of open space within Phase 1 equates to 11% of the site area (11.7Ha Gross, 1.4Ha POS) and this includes the usable areas of POS only.

As you have noted, the site is one allocation and as such, should be designed in such a way that the scheme is designed holistically. In respect of Phase 2, although at outline stage only, the level of POS is significantly greater than policy at a level of 29% (Gross 7.5Ha, POS 2.2Ha). When taking to level of POS overall and as a comprehensive development, a level of 18% POS area is provided (Gross overall 19.2Ha, POS 3.6%).

The proposed housing numbers still exceeds the indicative number in the Local Plan, a scheme which accords with the Local Plan (max 441) would be more suitable in terms of design and layout and will address issues such as frontage parking.

The scheme provides an overall density of 25 dwellings per hectare for Phase 1 which is not considered to be overly high. The proposal has considered previous areas of concern and those areas have been addressed as part of the revised proposals. No further concern areas have been specifically highlighted so we would be grateful to receive further clarity on this point.

The M4(2) and M4(3) house types need to be clearly labelled.

The schedule of accommodation attached to the layout now clearly identifies the M4(2) and M4(3) dwellings.

Highways

I understand that we are awaiting a response to the updated TA and TP submitted. This submission therefore looks to address the matters raised in respect of design only. Taking each of the comments raised in turn:

The site access shows the 2m footway on the western side continuing along the radii on to Doncaster Road however, there is no continuation of footway on this side. The footway should terminate at the tactile paving to prevent pedestrians from walking along this section which will stop with no means to cross on to the opposite side of the carriageway.

The layout has now been revised to identify the latest access designs for the site in line with the comments provided. This has been designed in conjunction with the latest transport work completed by PAH Highways.

Swept paths are required throughout the site to ensure that both the layout and the access/positioning of the pedestrian crossing is acceptable.

The layout has been assessed to ensure swept paths can be accommodated. Confirmation of this accompanies the application package. Please refer to the following plans: -

- 1299 1002A - Vehicle Tracking
- 1299 1001A – Visibility

There appears to be several ramps throughout the layout, specifically at suggested crossing points. We would not expect to see ramps positioned at crossing points and are concerned that there are a number of very narrow ramps at only 1m in width positioned throughout the layout. Concerns in relation to the proximity of the proposed ramps to driveways and for reference, see images below showing the requirement of such proposals.

The design has been reviewed and the updated layout ensures all ramps are 2m wide and in line with the guidance provided.

Transition between traditional footways and hard margins should reflect the above image where the footway is squared off at the point of transition.

The layout has been updated to ensure this is reflected throughout the site.

There is a distinct lack of visitor parking throughout the site. Barnsley's Parking SPD specifies a requirement of 1 visitor parking space per 4 dwellings, provided as defined bays within the public highway. Whilst on street visitor parking has been indicated on the site layout, it should be noted that in order to facilitate on street visitor parking, the carriageway should be widened to a minimum of 6m.

The layout has been revised and bays are now provided for visitors in line with the local authority requirements.

There is a pedestrian footway that extends to the site boundary at the southern part of phase 1, in the region of plot 86, however this footway does not appear to connect to any existing provision and there is no indication that there are proposed offsite highway works to provide a connection through to the existing residential areas to the east of the site at this location. Clarification regarding this is required.

The layout provides the opportunity to provide a connection to the boundary of the site however the land beyond the red line of the application is beyond the control of the applicant. It is therefore not within the power of the applicant to provide a connection beyond the remit of this application boundary.

It is assumed that a footway crossover arrangement is to be proposed for the shared surface serving plots 32-60 on the western side of the development, however this has not been detailed on the site plan and should be amended to ensure that the footway crossover meets requirements.

This has been updated and is identified on the updated site layout.

With regards to the 3m shared footway/cycle route that extends to the south of the site and connects to the existing public right of way, what is the intention? Will this be provided in full as part of phase one, or will this be delayed until the development of phase 2 commences? Without this link to the south, connectivity to the wider area will be limited and, in particular, this link provides an important walking/cycling route through to Netherwood Academy.

The connection of this link within the development will be constructed as the development progresses, moving through Phase 1 as part of the phasing plan. The detailed design of Phase 2 is reserved for a later stage and therefore cannot be constructed as part of the Phase 1 development. The applicant is however aware of the importance of maintaining pedestrian connectivity and is open to work with the LPA closely. The intention is to keep open the existing footpaths as long as possible however as soon as conflicts arise in connection with construction and health and safety, alternative diverted routes will be discussed and provided.

Whilst I appreciate that we are awaiting a revised Transport Assessment, and forward visibility splays were included within the TA, I would reiterate that it is a requirement that forward visibility is contained within the public highway and should not cross private boundaries such as gardens or driveways. It should be noted that whilst a minimum of 25m is required at the internal junctions within the development, it is acceptable to reduce this to a minimum of 15m at other, none junction, locations.

The layout has been assessed and revised accordingly to ensure the requisite visibility can be achieved. Confirmation of this accompanies the application package.

There are very narrow landscaped verges throughout the site, particularly to the rear of the on street longitudinal parking bays. These will be difficult to maintain and should be amended to hard surfacing.

This has been completed on the layout attached as requested.

In relation to the trees within the site, wherever possible they should be placed in gardens/POS, planted adjacent the highway. For trees located within the public highway, it will be necessary to provide tree pit details. All proposed trees in gardens and Public Open Spaces (POS) which lay within 5.0m of the existing/proposed highway boundary should have a root barrier in accordance with the requirements set out by Green Blue Urban or an equivalent approved supplier.

Upon confirmation of the layout attached, the detailed landscape proposals will be formalised and issued for consideration. This will include relevant tree pit details wherever relevant.

In addition to the comments raised above, the following documents have been updated to the revised proposals in line with the comments raised towards ecology and BNG.

- Entire Site - Doncaster Road, Darfield, Statutory Metric (Macros Disabled)
- Phase One - Doncaster Road, Darfield, Condition Assessments
- Phase One - Doncaster Road, Darfield, Statutory Metric (Macros Disabled)
- Phase Two - Doncaster Road, Darfield, Statutory Metric (Macros Disabled)

As requested, this provides an Overall Biodiversity Gain assessment as well as a phased assessment. In addition to the queries raised I can advise the following:

When referring to the site layout plan a number of proposed trees are associated with the new dwellings. Can it be confirmed whether these trees are proposed within gardens and if so, that these have not been counted towards the total area of urban trees proposed as per the statutory metric user guide and guidance relating to habitat creation in private gardens?

This is correct, only trees have been included which are outside of private ownership.

Woodland to the north-east corner of the proposals site has been input into the metric as lowland mixed deciduous woodland, a priority habitat of high distinctiveness. Surveys undertaken on behalf of BMBC in 2013 (included within this response and sent previously alongside pre-application advice) identified this area of woodland as an area of broadleaved plantation. On the governments MAGIC website this section of woodland habitat has not been mapped as priority deciduous woodland. It may be more appropriate for this habitat to be mapped as a lower distinctiveness woodland habitat type.

This has now been revised to 'Other Broadleaved Woodland' as suggested.

The assessment and metric include off-site habitat creation to address loss in biodiversity units and address the habitat trading rules; however, this just seems hypothetical at this stage and an off-site mitigation area has not been identified. It is acceptable to include this information within the report as advice for the applicant but should not be included within the metric, which should provide an indication of the change in biodiversity units as a result of the proposals.

The metrics provided do not include the off-site habitat creation now. This detail can be conditioned as is not necessary at this stage.

The viability appraisal is almost complete and will be issued for your consideration under separate cover.

Drainage Solution through to Phase 2 Solution

Temporary access route will follow the line of the indicative road identified on the Phase 2 masterplan to allow connections and access to the basin. Further discussions welcomed should you require further detailing. We will secure this under easement for the benefit of Yorkshire Water as we have undertaken on other development sites.

I trust the above and attached is acceptable and allows you to further assess the development proposals. However should you have any queries or require anything further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely



Vikki Sykes MRTPI

**Managing Director
John R Paley Associates**