



JohnsonMowat
Planning & Development Consultants

FAO Jessica Duffield

Planning and Building Control
Barnsley MBC
PO Box 634
Barnsley
S70 9GG

Telephone 0113 8870126
Email hamish@johnsonmowat.co.uk

Our ref.
Your ref. 2025/0121

16 June 2025

By email only

Dear Ms Duffield

**RESERVED MATTERS PLANNING APPLICATION REF. 2025/0121
SUBMISSION OF REVISED MATERIAL**

Thank you for sharing with us the consultation responses on the above application and for your time in the meeting of 19 May 2025.

In response to the consultation comments, we hereby submit the following plans and documents. Please see the appended table that indicates which of the previously submitted plans and documents are superseded:

- 334-UW-Unit 7 rev. B– Mitigation Measures - 13 Jun 25 (regarding landscape and visual matters)
- 12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1022(P03)-Phase 1 Elevations
- 12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1024(P03)-Phase 1 3D
- 12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1026(P04)-Phase 2 Elevations
- 12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1027(P03)-Phase 2 Elevations
- 12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1029(P03)-Phase 2 3D
- 12006-5-THP-XX-XX-RP-A-DA01G Design and Access Statement
- 24096_MOS_TS Transport Statement V2

All other plans and documents submitted with the reserved matters application remain unchanged.

Further explanatory information in response to the comments received is appended to this letter. I trust that this information is of assistance and provides assurance to the local planning authority in respect of the scheme proposed.

Should you have any queries or wish to discuss further then please contact me by email or phone on the number above.

Coronet House
Queen Street
Leeds
LS1 2TW

t 0113 887 0120
e mark@johnsonmowat.co.uk
e richard@johnsonmowat.co.uk
w www.johnsonmowat.co.uk

Yours sincerely

HRobertshaw

Hamish Robertshaw
Director

Enc.

cc. Harworth Group

Schedule of Plans/Documents hereby submitted and superseded

Now submitted	Now superseded
334-UW-Unit 7 rev. B – Mitigation Measures - 13 Jun 25	-
12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1022(P03)-Phase 1 Elevations	12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1022(P02)-Phase 1 Elevations
12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1024(P03)-Phase 1 3D	12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1024(P02)-Phase 1 3D
12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1026(P04)-Phase 2 Elevations	12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1026(P03)-Phase 2 Elevations
12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1027(P03)-Phase 2 Elevations	12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1027(P02)-Phase 2 Elevations
12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1029(P03)-Phase 2 3D	12006-5-THP-XX-XX-DR-A-1029(P02)-Phase 2 3D
12006-5-THP-XX-XX-RP-A-DA01G Design and Access Statement	12006-5-THP-XX-XX-RP-A-DA01E Design and Access Statement
24096_MOS_TS Transport Statement V2 dated 13 June 2025	24096_MOS_TS Transport Statement V2 dated 18 October 2024

Explanatory Notes

Consultee Comments

The consultee comments received are summarised as follows:

Consultee	Comment summary	See response below under heading:
LPA planning officer	<u>Floorspace / use</u> – Request to clarify floorspace proposed by use in relation to condition 21 of 2019/1573.	Development Proposal
	<u>Phased construction</u> – Request to clarify requirement for height proposed and construction of the building in two phases and landscaping.	Development Proposal
	<u>Landscape / visual</u> – Request to indicate the differences in the LVIA Addendum provided by pre-app and submitted with the RM application. Request to set out the design and landscape interventions to mitigate impact, including in response to LPA’s landscape consultant comments (pre-app).	Landscape / Visual / Setting
	<u>Job creation</u> – Request clarification of the number of jobs expected to be created by prospective occupier business.	Other
Urban design officer	<u>Height / siting</u> – Objects to height/siting of building as imposing and visually over dominant at visually sensitive site. Negative impact on character of local landscape.	Landscape / Visual / Setting
	<u>Landscape bund / planting</u> – Visual softening effect of landscaping reduced if planted beneath the plateau level.	Development Proposal
	<u>Building appearance</u> – cladding colour concern / inconsistent with colour palette in Hoyland North Masterplan Framework.	Development Proposal
	<u>Relationship with adjacent housing allocation site</u> – No comfort that building will not affect the setting of future residential development at site HS64.	Landscape / Visual / Setting
Conservation officer	<u>Impact on setting of heritage assets</u> – Concerned over the increase in massing and scale. Cumulative increase adverse impact on setting and how viewed against landscape backdrop. Amounts to ‘less than substantial harm’	Landscape / Visual / Setting
	<u>Landscape / visual</u> – Indicates significant change at some receptor locations. Suggests reducing height to make visual mass less dominating; and change to colours/ cladding to reduce apparent sense of large looming unit.	Landscape / Visual / Setting
	<u>Relationship with adjacent housing allocation site</u> – Asserts that housing allocation site will surely suffer from increase in height of employment units.	Landscape / Visual / Setting
Highways officer	<u>Vehicle manoeuvring</u> – seeks amended tracking diagrams	Development Proposal

Biodiversity officer	<u>Off-site habitat enhancement</u> – requests copy of Off-Site Habitat Management Plan.	Development Proposal
	<u>On-site landscaping</u> – Query regarding planting adjacent to building and associated maintenance plan.	Development Proposal
Forestry officer	<u>Tree planting</u> – Query regarding planting and phased delivery of building.	Development Proposal

Besides the above, it is noted that the following consultees have responded and confirmed no comment or objection to the application:

- National Highways
- BMBC Drainage
- BMBC Pollution Control (subject to condition requiring an updated noise impact assessment to be submitted in regard to the proposed external plant)
- Mining Remediation Authority
- SY Mining Advisory Service
- SY Superfast Broadband
- Yorkshire Water

Applicant’s Response to Comments

The applicant’s response to the comments received as summarised above is set out below.

Development Proposal

Floorspace / Use

The proposed building extends to 23,969.0 sqm GIA (24,626.7 sqm GEA), which comprises 23,504.5 sqm ground floor footprint and 464.5 sqm at upper floor office and circulation space. The building is proposed for either industrial (Class E(g)(iii)/B2) or storage/distribution (Class B8) use. The element of office space within the building is ancillary to the industrial or storage/distribution use.

Full height operational industrial or storage/distribution space (i.e. excluding the first-floor space, space beneath this and the circulatory space) therefore extends to 23,040 sqm GIA.

The proposed floorspace is not yet committed to either industrial (Class E(g)(iii)/B2) or storage/distribution (Class B8) use. Whilst reserved matters approval is sought to allow occupation for either use, the identified prospective occupier requires the building for storage/distribution (Class B8) use.

Cumulatively, 54,134.1 sqm has reserved matters approval and 23,969.0 sqm (this building) is pending approval, totalling 78,103.1 sqm. All floorspace is approved or proposed to be occupied by either industrial (Class E(g)(iii)/B2) or storage/distribution (Class B8) use.

To date, the use is only crystallised in for 5,713.6 sqm of floorspace in storage/distribution (Class B8) use by occupation of Units 1 and 3.

Within the limits of condition 21 of the outline planning permission, there therefore remains allowance for occupation of 96,479.4 sqm industrial (Class E(g)(iii)/B2) floorspace or 70,931.4 sqm storage/distribution (Class B8) floorspace, or a combination between the two.

Phased Construction

Planning permission is sought for the building as described above, which is the full development.

To allow the building to respond to the identified prospective occupier's requirement, construction may be progressed in two stages. Drawings are therefore submitted to show the site arrangement, built form and landscaping both in the initial and full-build scenarios (i.e. phase 1 and phase 2 build).

The initial-build scenario can be constructed and operate as a standalone building in its own right i.e. it does not require the full-build to be completed to ensure satisfactory development of the plot. The façade treatment is the same as for the full-build and the expansion space (i.e. land adjacent to the building) is to be landscaped with amenity grass planting.

The assessments that support the application are based on the full-build scenario. Should the interim-build be constructed as a first phase, then any impacts will be lesser than the full-build. The landform and planting that mitigate landscape and visual impact will be delivered in either build scenario.

There is no issue of land sterilisation resulting from this phased approach. The site is arranged into development plots, of which this is one, that will be developed as a single entity (as indicated in the Parameters Plan). Allowing space for expansion does not come as a compromise or cost to the development to be delivered elsewhere at the site. It simply allows an efficient means of meeting an occupier requirement within the full development of the plot.

Should it be deemed necessary, the local authority may consider a planning condition to ensure that if the building is constructed to the phase 1 design that the adjacent land area is to be landscaped in accordance with the submitted plans and the landscaping to be retained until development is progressed in accordance with the phase 2/full-build plans.

Building Appearance

The comments on cladding colour are incorrect as the proposed colours are consistent with the colour palette outlined in the Hoyland North Masterplan Framework and with the reserved matters approvals for other plots at the site.

However, the comment may have resulted from a 'drafting error' relating to the colour indicated within the drawings. We therefore submit a set of revised elevation drawings, 3D image and Design and Access Statement with the colours addressed.

Landform and Planting Scheme

Please refer also to the landscape and visual Mitigation Measures document submitted as this contains further information on the landform and planting scheme.

The query/concern about the visual softening effect of landscaping being reduced if planted beneath the plateau level is not applicable as the planting is proposed up to and upon the plateau level, which also

includes the creation of a c.1.5m high bund to the southwest of the building to elevate the planting above the plateau level.

The Tree Officer is correct in his interpretation that the Urban Wilderness landscaping/planting scheme relates to the site-wide structural landscaping areas, whereas the Smeeden Foreman planting scheme is the 'on-plot' planting which incorporates specimen trees. The reason for distinction between the two areas is that Harworth will remain responsible for the maintenance of the site-wide structural landscaping whereas the on-plot planting maintenance will become the responsibility of the building occupier.

The Biodiversity Officer's query regarding the planting adjacent to building and associated maintenance plan has been addressed by earlier email, but essentially it is representation of the structural planting shown on the on-plot planting drawing. The planting in question is detailed on the structural planting drawing (334-UW-P-081 rev.B - Unit 7 - Landscape Planting Plan - 26 Feb 25) and associated management plan (334-UW-P rev. F - LEMP for Unit 7 - 26 Feb 25).

The Off-Site Habitat Management Plan was submitted by email on 12 May 2025.

Vehicle Movement

Amended swept path tracking drawings are submitted within the revised Transport Statement. These now illustrate turning manoeuvres within the site by the 'large car (2006)' as requested, and demonstrate that an articulated vehicle taking a right turn out of the access can maintain adequate clearance between the vehicle overhang and the kerb line.

Landscape / Visual / Setting

Height / Siting

The requirement for the height and siting of the building proposed are set out fully in the planning application. The height is required to meet occupier requirement and institutional standards for this form of building. The siting responds to the plot dimensions, access point and geotechnical constraints.

The Design Officer's comments on height and siting are noted. The proposal seeks to mitigate the landscape and visual impact of its height and siting by landscape and design interventions. Analysis of these is provided in the Mitigation Measures document by Urban Wilderness, which responds to the comments made by the Council's landscape consultant at pre-application stage.

It is not feasible to reduce the building height or siting within the arrangement currently proposed.

Landscape Mitigation Measures

The landscape mitigation measures incorporated include:

- Optimisation of the plateau level 1.5m below the maximum allowed plateau level
- Incorporation of larger landscape bund (of greater length and height) to the southeast of the building (relative to that shown in outline-stage drawings). The outer aspect is to be planted with native woodland and the southern part of this supplemented with mature multi-stem trees.
- Incorporation of additional landscape bund to the southwest of the building constructed upon the development plateau (relative to that shown in outline-stage drawings). This bund is planted with native woodland.

- All planting is optimised for its sustainability/resilience and screening effectiveness. See the Mitigation Measures document by Urban Wilderness for detailed explanation of this.
- Nuanced work on the building materials/detailing has been undertaken between the architect and landscape architect. However, implementing a change in colour from grey to green and adopting a multi-tonal approach would increase the building's visibility in the setting, particularly during winter, and alter the overall cohesiveness of design.

Adjacent Housing Allocation

The comments on the relationship between the proposed development and the adjacent housing allocation site are noted. Assertions that the housing site will suffer from the increased height of the employment unit and the setting of the future residential site will be affected (negatively) are not supported.

Aspects of the proposed building may be visible from the housing allocation site, albeit this visibility will diminish as the landscape planting matures. See the section drawing images within the Mitigation Measures document by Urban Wilderness (p22-23) to illustrate this.

Furthermore, development at the allocated housing site will alter or reduce the visibility of the proposed development from within and around the allocation site, thereby reducing the baseline sensitivity of these receptors i.e. views in these locations will incorporate and be interrupted by new housing development.

Heritage Assets

The comments of the Conservation Officer are noted, including the assessment that the increase in massing and scale will impact on setting of heritage assets and how these are viewed against landscape backdrop, which amounts to 'less than substantial harm'.

Suggestions in respect of the height and design of the building are noted, and are addressed in the sections above.

Should the local planning authority consider the development proposed to cause 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal (NPPF paragraph 215).

We note that the assessment of the development at outline application stage did not indicate any harm to the setting of heritage assets, so interpret that this assessment of harm results only from the *change* to siting and height proposed in this application.

We contend that public benefits of the development as now proposed do outweigh any 'less than substantial harm' caused by the impact of increased height on the setting of the heritage assets. The public benefit is fundamentally the delivery of a development in a form that will be funded and occupied, and thereby generate inward investment and job creation, versus a plot remaining undeveloped generating no economic or employment benefits.

Other

Job Creation

We understand that occupation of the building by the prospective occupier will create approximately 100 jobs at the site, split c.40% office (management/administrative) and c.60% fulfilment and distribution.

We understand that c.80% of the jobs will be created with operation of the building in its phase 1 build, with the remaining c.20% being created with the expansion of the building to its full-build and associated with its increase in operational capacity.

We understand that this will be the prospective occupier's first facility in the UK that is bespoke to pharmaceutical sector. The prospective occupier's existing facilities in the UK will continue to operate, meaning that all jobs created are additional and new to Yorkshire.