

APPENDIX 4

Email correspondence setting out the views of the Policy Team

From: Geoffrey Dyson [geoffrey@malahat.co.uk]
Sent: 22 July 2008 00:02
To: 'Alyn Nicholls'
Subject: Hangmanstone Depot, Birdwell

Alyn

After the Council indicated that the scheme originally proposed by Hartwood Estates was too large, their planning consultant sought clarification regarding the scale of development they would consider appropriate.

Their reply is set out below.

Regards,

Geoffrey Dyson BSc(Hons), MRICS, RI
Director

T: 01477 415003
M: 07701 089811
E: geoffrey@malahat.co.uk

Cheshire House, Parkway, Holmes Chapel, Cheshire, CW4 7BA
Registered in England No. 5824206 Registered Office: 59-63 Station Road Northwich Cheshire CW9 5LT
Regulated by RICS

 Save a tree...please don't print this e-mail *unless you really need to*

From: Cotton, Alexandra [mailto:AlexandraCotton@barnsley.gov.uk]
Sent: 18 July 2008 11:38
To: 'Ian Baseley Associates'
Cc: Geoffrey@malahat.co.uk; allan@hartwoodestates.com
Subject: RE: Hangmanstone Depot

Dear Mr Fletcher,
Please see email below from the Policy Team.
Regards

Alexandra Cotton
Planning Officer
Development Control Team
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Planning and Transportation Service
PO Box 604
Barnsley

S70 9FF

Tel: (01226) 772590

Fax No: (01226) 772591

Email: alexandracotton@barnsley.gov.uk

From: Ellis , Robert

Sent: 10 July 2008 14:52

To: Swift , Kevin

Subject: Hangmanstone reply - final Version

I am writing in response to the email that you forwarded to me on 24 June with regard to the proposed redevelopment of Hangmanstone Depot in Birdwell.

The Policy team have further considered the applicants request for clarification and are able to offer the following guidance on the retail element of any development on the site:

- Any retail unit on this site will need to be small in scale and be designed to meet the local needs of Birdwell that are not already met by existing local shops. This need must be demonstrated as part of any subsequent application.
- The size of the unit must be in keeping with other local shops in Birdwell
- The retail element of any proposal on this site must be designed in such a way as to not encourage additional car trips.

Whilst it is appreciated that pre-application discussions took place regarding these proposals last year, it can only be re-iterated that any such advice is officer opinion only and is given without prejudice to the outcome of any subsequent planning application.

We would also like to reiterate that the proposal is on land allocated as employment land in the adopted UDP and that the preferred use of this site is for employment purposes. It is in a location that has excellent access to the highway network and would present limited amenity issues with neighbouring uses.

I hope this helps. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Rob Ellis
Planning Assistant
Planning Policy Team
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Tel: (01226) 772603

From: Ian Baseley Associates [mailto:ask@ibaplanning.co.uk]
Sent: 24 June 2008 11:56
To: Cotton , Alexandra
Cc: Geoffrey@malahat.co.uk; allan@hartwoodestates.com
Subject: Hangmanstone Depot

Dear Ms Cotton

Hangmanstone Depot

I refer to our recent dialogue in connection with the above matter culminating in receipt of your email dated 18 June 2008.

I appreciate that within it you are simply forwarding the response of the Policy Section and in particular their reluctance to provide any indicative floor space levels for the retail part of the scheme but have to say that my clients and I find this to be not only disappointing but unsatisfactory.

As I indicated at our recent meeting, we did not submit this application without any pre-submission consultation but made an approach to the Policy Section at that time, the officers involved being Rachel Jones and Philip Wadsworth. We made an appointment to meet them at your offices on 9 August 2007 and in the event only Philip Wadsworth was able to attend but he confirmed that he would report the outcome of the meeting to Rachel Jones so that she could look out for the application when it was submitted. On showing the scheme for the whole of the site to him he indicated that the Authority '*would welcome*' this proposal as clearly he considered that there is *an existing gap in provision*' in Birdwell. That formed the basis on which we proceeded with the application.

Having done so and reached the position which we did culminating in the recent meeting at your office with yourself and colleagues, it was obviously disappointing that Kevin Swift from the Policy Section could not attend although we fully appreciate and understand the personal reasons for this. Nevertheless, his colleague who did attend did give an undertaking to discuss the subject

within the Section and provide us with an acceptable floor space level for the retail part of the scheme. That was a fundamental reason for the meeting and discussion and we fail to see why the Policy Section cannot provide a figure because, for instance, there are figures within some of the Council's publications on a general basis, such as that within Policy SL6 of the Barnsley Policies Preferred Options Document dated October 2005.

In these circumstances, as we do not consider what we are asking to unreasonable and we are in a position where the Authority now seems to be acting contrary to its previously given pre-submission advice, I would be obliged if you could urgently re-consult with your colleagues in Policy and firmly reiterate our request for an advisory figure.

I therefore look forward to hearing from you at an early date.

Yours sincerely

Robert Fletcher
DipTP MRTPI
Partner

 chartered town planners

web: www.ibaplanning.co.uk
email: ask@ibaplanning.co.uk
phone: 01623 - 822006
fax: 01623 - 824725

*** Barnsley MBC Disclaimer:

This e-mail and any files attached are confidential for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this e-mail 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 e-mails and files sent are checked for viruses. The Council will not accept liability for damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. No guarantees are offered on the security, content and accuracy of any e-mails and files received. Be aware that this e-mail 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.