

«Address»



Enquiries to: Farzana Tabasum

Kirklees Direct
Tel: 01484 221000
Email: farzana.tabasum@kirklees.gov.uk

Ben Lysiak,
Stonehouse & Co
5, Throstle Bank
Halifax
HX2 7DB

Date: 17-May-2021
Our Ref: 2021/90426

Dear Mr Lysiak

**Application for Approval of Details Reserved by Condition
Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**

**Discharge of conditions 3, 5, 7, 12 and 14 of previous permission 2019/92114 for
erection of four dwellings
land opposite, 62, Ashbrow Road, Sheepridge, Huddersfield, HD2 1DG
Application Number: 2021/90426**

I write with reference to your application to discharge the conditions for the above development as submitted on 03-Feb-2021.

Subsequent to the council's letter dated 21st April 2021, comments have been received from the council's Biodiversity Officer in relation to conditions 12 and 14. On review of the submitted information the Biodiversity Officer has provided the following advice:

With respect to condition 12:

No information pertinent to condition 12 has been submitted within the Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (BEP). The submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) and Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) provided as part of the original planning application (2019/92114) recommended that nesting bird surveys would be required for vegetation removals carried out between March and September and that method statements for vegetation clearance and for the avoidance of harm to amphibians and badgers produced prior to starting works on the site. All of these measures would require overseeing by an ecological clerk of works, therefore the details of the method statements for the above should be submitted in order to demonstrate that the proposals will not result in significant ecological harm during construction in accordance with LP30i. These could be included within a revised BEP if necessary.

With respect to condition 14:



A Biodiversity Enhancement Plan (BEP) has been submitted in relation to Condition 14, which is welcomed. This sets out habitat creation and enhancement in line with the recommended mitigative measures suggested within the EcIA on the original application. These are largely sufficient however further detail is required in order to ensure positive ecological outcomes on the site including:

- The BEP is worded as a series of recommendations, the language of the plan needs to be decisive to ensure measures can and will be implemented post-development.*
- Lack of inclusion of invertebrate boxes as proposed within the PEA and EcIA*
- Lack of a timetable for implementation for proposed planting and faunal enhancement and subsequent monitoring management to align with the phasing of development*
- The EcIA stated that enhancement of the 550m2 retained wildlife corridor will be included within the BEP however, a much small area than this is due to be planted up with woodland wildflowers, which although welcomed, does not constitute enhancement of the entire area originally proposed. Clarification regarding this is sought including whether the new hedgerows and wildflower areas are to be included within the curtilage of the residential gardens.*

As insufficient information is submitted, conditions 12 and 14 cannot be discharged.

To address outstanding matters relating to both these conditions, the submission of further information will need to be made under a new application for which a fee would be applicable.

Yours sincerely

Victor Grayson
Development Management Masterplanner
Majors and Minerals Team