



23 JUN 2010

Planning and Transportation Service

Assistant Director: Ruth Middleton BA (Hons), MRTPI, Dip Surv

Development Control Section

Central Offices, Kendray Street, Barnsley, S70 2TN

Tel: (01226) 770770 Fax: (01226) 772591

Email Address: DevelopmentControl@barnsley.gov.uk

Corporate Mail Room

My ref: DC/JH/B/05/0307/BA

Your Ref.

Date: 3 March 2006 Enquiries to: Jayne Hammond

Dial Direct (01226) 775752

Dear Mr Beevers

**Proposed residential development at land off Burton Road, Monk Bretton,
Barnsley – planning application no. B/05/0307/BA**

Thank you for your recent correspondence and the enclosed plans for this development. I write to make the following comments:

Alterations to DPC levels I can confirm that the alterations to the final plot dpc levels, as indicated on the revised plan, Drawing No. 2131/01 Rev. G, are acceptable and may be determine as a minor amendment to the original plans for the development. Please ensure that the revised scheme complies with the Environment Agency's recommendations that the floor levels of properties adjacent to the watercourse are a minimum of 600 mm above site ground level; this is intended to prevent the increased risk of flooding.

Planning Conditions In respect of planning conditions for the development, I can make the following comments:

- **Condition 3:** the amendments to the finishes schedule to omit the Worcestershire Multi Red brick, Thornbury Multi Stock brick and the terracotta and rustic roof tiles, is acceptable. You have complied with the first part of this condition; the second part requires the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. There are no objections to the proposed changes to the garage door finishes.
- **Condition 7:** the revised landscaping proposals shown on Drawing No. 2131/11 Rev. C, are acceptable. The scheme should be implemented in accordance with Condition 8, i.e. carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner.

Continued over

Ben Bailey Homes Limited
Elizabeth House
Cliff Street
Mexborough, S64 9HQ

Please address all correspondence to the Development Control Manager



Awarded for excellence

- **Highway / Drainage Conditions:** I await feedback from Barbara Wilson on the latest submitted details and will let you know the outcome as soon as possible.
- **Condition 19:** I can confirm that John Scott has agreed the remediation strategy for the site. A validation report will be required in accordance with part 4 of this condition.

Removal of Tree & Hedges to eastern boundary Condition 5 requires retention of hedges and trees on the site (except those shown to be removed on the approved plan). This is imposed 'in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality'. The site layout plans and landscaping plans show that the trees and hedges at this boundary are retained. Therefore, in this instance, the requirements of the condition would take precedence over the comments made in the Tree Report.

The condition is very precise in its requirements and a variation by new application would be necessary. Furthermore, the officers report to the Planning Regulatory Board specifically refers to the retention of the hedge at Tumbling Lane. You will appreciate that I am unable to agree to any variation without recourse to further consultation and publicity. This is one of the more sensitive boundaries of the site; for the reason that noise levels expected at the new plots are quite high for a residential area. The established planting may also perform the function of screening the commercial operations to the eastern side of Tumbling Lane. I appreciate your reasons for the proposed removal of hedges and trees adjacent to Tumbling Lane. The case for varying the condition is likely to be finely balanced. But, proposals for 'substantial replacement planting' along this boundary would help to mitigate the loss. Also the provision of a higher quality acoustic boundary treatment, in place of the approved 2.0 metre high acoustic fence, would be more visually pleasing.

I hope these comments are helpful. Please let me know if require any further advice.

Yours sincerely



for and on behalf of
Martin Winnard, Development Control Manager