



PLANNING CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Application No	2026/0412
Proposal	Variation of conditions 2 (Approved Plans), 3 (Levels), 4 (Air Quality Mitigation), 5 (Trees), 6 (Highways Adoption Plan), 10 (Cycle Parking), 11 (Noise Mitigation), 13 (Boundary Treatment to Plots 1- 7), 15 (CEMP) and 16 (Hampton Windows) of planning application 2021/1405 : Reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and Scale) application for development of 91 homes, structural planting and landscaping, surface water attenuation and associated infrastructure in connection with outline planning permission 2017/1718 (Outline planning for up to 102 homes) (Amended Plans)
Address	Former William Freeman Site, Wakefield Road, Mapplewell, Barnsley, S75 6ND
Date of Consultation Reply	18/06/26
Consultee	Nik King, Senior Urban Design Officer

Consultation Assessment and Justification

These are the design comments for planning application 2026/0412.

Please note the attachments 'reserved matters approved layout_annotated' and 'current planning application layout_annotated', which form part of the comments.

The principal sources of design guidance which I have referred to in my comments are:

- SPD 'Design of Housing Development' (2023)
- SPD 'Parking' (2019)

My main comments relate to the variation of **condition no.2 (Approved Plans)**.

For the layout plans, I have annotated both the approved layout plan for the reserved matters (2021/1405) and the proposed layout plan (of the current application), in order to compare some aspects.

One of the main issues with the current application is the **overdominance 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 guidance from Building for a Healthy Life where front of dwelling parking is used is there should be a generous landscaping to settle parking into the street*'. *The maximum number of front of dwelling parking spaces acceptable in a row is four. These should be used sparingly in a development and be separated from other parking spaces by a considerable width of soft landscaping, i.e. more than the width of a parking space.*' (My emphasis shown underlined.).

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.

On the reserved matters approved layout (Proposed Site Layout, Rev L) I have only found one stretch of overdominance of front of dwelling parking. I note that the officer's report states (in the section 'visual amenity' on page 6), '*initially the development had a lot of frontage parking and amendments to the internal layout have been made to break runs of parking and provide more landscaping to the front of the dwellings.*'

However, on the layout plan for the current application, (I have used the drawing 'Landscape General Arrangement'), I count three stretches of overdominance of car parking. Given my stated concern above, about the use of thin strips of hedging to separate runs of parking bays, I count a further five stretches of overdominance of front of dwelling parking by default.

So, before with the reserved matters approval there was only one stretch of overdominance of front of dwelling parking, but now in the current application there are eight stretches of overdominance of front-of-dwelling parking.

This has also significantly reduced the number of trees being proposed to be provided in front gardens. The NPPF (in para 136) asks for new streets to be tree lined.

Another issue is with **the amount of visitor car parking**. I note that the approved reserved matters layout plan shows 17 visitor parking spaces whereas the proposed layout plan shows 14, a reduction of 3 spaces, for the same number of dwellings (91). The SPD 'Parking' recommends (on page 7) '*1 visitor space per 4 dwellings subject to layout. Flexibility for visitor parking will be considered on a site by site basis.*' I defer to Highways Development Control for any further comments on visitor parking provision for this proposal.

Other aspects:

- We need more information about the **specification of the materials**, (for example for the walling, tiling, window frames, doors), preferably listed on the housetype plans.
- **Regarding the provision of accessible dwellings**, for the approved application I note that one M4(2) and two M4(3) are listed in the accommodation schedule (on the 'proposed site layout, Rev L'). In the current application, below the accommodation schedule on the 'M4 and Affordable Housing Plan, Rev P03', there is a note 'F50/70a GF will be delivered as M4(3) compliant and plot 78 is to suit M4(2) standards



currently'. With three F50/ 70a units being provided, I make this a total of one M4(2) and three M4(3) units, so there is a net increase of one M4(3) unit. Please note that in our most recent update for the local validation requirements, we now ask for the M4(2) and M4(3) labels to be shown on the site layout plan, the house type plans (stating 'M4(2) compatible' or 'M4(3) compatible') and on the accommodation schedule.

- The **boundary treatment plan** could do with showing what boundary treatment is proposed around the pumping station, (to help prevent unwanted access and vandalism).

Regarding **the variation of condition 10, cycle parking**, from speaking to a development management officer I understand that besides receiving a layout plan we also need either the spec of the shed or the elevations/plan of a shed.

Regarding **the variation of condition 16, Hampton windows**, I note that the planning statement states (on page 14):

'Condition 16 is proposed to be deleted: "~~Notwithstanding the plans as submitted, the ground floor side kitchen window of the Hampton house type shall be obscure glazed.~~"

The S73 permission amends the housetypes so the Hampton House type is no longer applicable, therefore the condition can be removed as it is no longer necessary or relevant to the planning permission approved through this S73 application.'

However, there is still a Hampton housetype in the current application, although the kitchen is now shown on the upper floor rather than on the ground floor. I could do with some clarification as to why the original obscure glazing was required and why it isn't now, (is it due to this switch of bedrooms to the ground floor?).

NO OBJECTION*

Defer for amends/further information*

OBJECT*

*Delete as applicable

Consultation Suggested Conditions:

I would suggest the following conditions:

- Materials, (unless the specs are listed on the housetype drawings).
- Boundary Treatment of the Pumping station, (unless this is shown on the Boundary treatment plan).
- A five-year landscape management plan

Consultation Informative(s):

Planning Obligations required: