KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
INVESTMENT & REGENERATION SERVICE

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) – SECTION 70

DELEGATED DECISION TO DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Reference No:	**2021/62/94497/W**
Site Address:	62, Acre Street, Lindley, Huddersfield, HD3 3DY
Description:	Demolition of existing medical centre and erection of two storey medical centre (class E(e)) with associated landscaping and car parking
Recommending Officer:	Stuart Howden

DECISION – Conditional Full Permission

I hereby authorise the approval of this application for the reasons set out in the officer's report and recommendation annexed below in respect of the above matter.

Teresa Harlow

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 28th June 2022

Officer Report

Site Description

62 Acre Street, Lindley, Huddersfield, HD3 3DY

The site comprises the existing and operational Lindley Group Practice GP surgery located on the east side of Acre Street. To the rear, the site also includes a former car parking area that was associated with the neighbouring Huddersfield Royal Infirmary (HRI), along with soft landscaped areas. The site measures ~0.2 hectares in size. The site consists of a 2-storey stone building with a flat roofed single storey front projection, with car parking to the front and rear, denoted from the street by a stone wall. The surgery is currently accessed from Acre Street, whereas the car park to the rear is accessed from a road that serves the HRI. In addition, a pedestrian route through the site can be found connecting Acre House Avenue with the HRI access road.

A public footpath (Reference: HUD/349/10) and NHS offices can be found to the north. The Huddersfield Royal Infirmary (HRI) and car park can be found to the south. A footpath and residential properties are to the east. An NHS Outpatients is to the west. There are also a number of protected trees on the site as well as immediately to the north of the site. In addition, listed buildings and structures can be found to the north and west of the site, which are associated with either the NHS offices or the NHS Outpatients.

Description of Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing medical centre and erection of a two storey medical centre (class E(e)) with associated landscaping and car parking.

The proposal therefore seeks to redevelop the existing Lindley Group Practice GP surgery to provide a larger GP surgery on site. The submission outlines that one reason for this is due to the existing surgery not being fit for purpose as the existing surgery building is too small for current levels of staff and associated operational requirements. The submission also outlines that there is insufficient space to accommodate a growing registered population and that the building is not purpose built which leads to accessibility issues within the building

It is claimed that the new surgery building will provide a modern purpose-built facility better to accommodate all existing surgery operational requirements. The practice catchment area is not noted to change and the submission outlines that the larger building would help to meet current patient demand.

The submission displays the demolition of the existing building and the removal of vegetation to facilitate a two storey building broadly in an ‘L-shape’. The building would be set back further into the site than the existing

building and would run close to the rear boundary of the site, with the building being sited between No.19 and No.21 Acre House Avenue. The building would face Acre Street with a pitched roof element to the front, mainly constructed from natural stone with some render detailing under a slate effect roof. Solar panels are displayed on the rear roof pitch of this element. To the rear of this, a largely flat roof element is proposed which would protrude for some distance, and this is to be constructed from buff brick with some render detailing. On the top of this flat roof, a plant enclosure is proposed. To the very rear of the building, a single storey pitched roof element is proposed, constructed mainly from buff brick under a slate effect roof. The building is proposed to be approximately 41 metres long and approximately 23 metres wide, and have a total gross internal floorspace of approximately 1149m^2.

A car parking area is proposed to the front of the building comprising 35 spaces (4 of these being electric vehicle charging points) and this would be accessed from Acre Street. A cycle shelter is proposed to the front of the building. The vehicular access is proposed to be widened and a lockable steel gate is proposed at the access. A new separate pedestrian access is proposed adjacent to the vehicular access including a new lockable steel gate, but apart from this the stone wall to the front of the site is to be largely retained (although it is noted that a gap in the wall would be infilled with stone to match the existing wall). A bin store is proposed to the very front of the site. New soft landscaping is proposed within the site.

History of negotiations/amendments received

A pre-application advice request was submitted prior to the submission of this planning application, and the application has addressed a number of comments raised within the pre-application response. However, with this application, Officers initially raised a number of concerns with the proposal.

Of note, Officers raised concerns with the design of the scheme, including with the layout, form and appearance of the building and requested a number of amendments. Whilst some amendments were provided, notably to the finishing materials, others were not. However, on balance, Officers considered the design acceptable in the context of the public benefits. Visualisations were requested too, and these were provided and helped Officers gain a better understanding of the finished appearance of the proposed development.

Further arboricultural and soft landscaping details were requested and were later provided thereby addressing concerns of both KC Trees and KC Landscape. In addition, clarity was requested in relation to the potential for harm to bats and biodiversity enhancement, and these concerns were also addressed.

Furthermore, the applicant's agent has raised no objections to the pre-commencement conditions attached.

Relevant Planning History

At the east end of the site

2006/91645 – Erection of temporary office accommodation – Approved on 29th May 2006.

2009/90272 – Continuation of use of temporary office accommodation – Approved on 7th May 2009.

2010/91283 – Continuation of use of temporary office accommodation – Approved on 12th August 2012.

2011/92175 – Continuation of use of temporary health care office accommodation – Approved on 4th November 2011.

2019/90379 – Outline application for erection of 1no. dwelling – Approved on 4th April 2019 (not implemented).

Representations

Final publicity date expired:
Neighbour letters expired on 27th January 2022. Site notice expired on 8th March 2022. Press advert expired on 4th March 2022

1 representation has been received as a result of this publicity which raised an objection to the application. The comments received are summarised below, but are available to view in full on the Council's Planning Webpage:

- If the two rights of way are removed, access to Acre Street, the hospital and access therefore to Huddersfield centre and beyond would be a severe issue.

Whilst additional information has been provided during the processing of this application (as outlined above in the 'history of negotiations section') these do not result in material changes to the siting, layout, scale and appearance of the scheme, therefore it was not considered necessary to reconsult (i.e. not third party would be prejudiced).

Consultation Responses

KC Environmental Health: No objections subject to conditions.

KC Highways Development Management: No objections subject to conditions and legal agreement securing Travel Plan monitoring fee

KC Landscape: No objections raised in principle. Provided advice and requested a Landscape Management Plan.

KC Lead Local Flood Authority: No objections subject to conditions.

KC Public Health: No objections raised in principle. Provide advice in relation to break area with planting and smokefree environment, as well as reducing travel by private car.

KC Trees: Following the submission of additional details, no objections subject to compliance conditions.

KC Waste Strategy: Additional details on the size and design of the general waste storage on the car park and confirmation of how clinical wastes are managed would be welcomed.

West Yorkshire Ecology: Further information is required in relation to bats in the Ecological and Biodiversity Statement and evidence is required that the development will result in a net gain for biodiversity.

The above is a summary of the comments received and full comments are available on the Council's Planning Webpage. The comments raised by consultees will also be discussed in the assessment section of this report below.

Policy

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory Development Plan for Kirklees is the Local Plan (adopted 27th February 2019).

The site is unallocated within the Kirklees Local Plan.

Kirklees Local Plan (LP):

- **LP 1** – Achieving Sustainable Development
- **LP 2** – Place Shaping
- **LP 3** – Location of New Development
- **LP 4** – Providing Infrastructure
- **LP 7** – Efficient and Effective Use of Land and Buildings
- **LP 20** – Sustainable Travel
- **LP 21** – Highway Safety and Access
- **LP 22** – Parking
- **LP 24** – Design
- **LP 27** – Flood Risk
- **LP 28** – Drainage
- **LP 30** – Biodiversity and Geodiversity
- **LP 33** – Trees
- **LP 34** – Conserving and Enhancing the Water Environment
- **LP 35** – Historic Environment
- **LP 43** – Waste Management Hierarchy
- **LP 47** – Healthy, Active and Safe Lifestyles

- **LP 49** – Education and Health Care Needs
- **LP 51** – Protection and Improvement of Local Air Quality
- **LP 52** – Protection and Improvement of Environmental Quality
- **LP 53** – Contaminated and Unstable Land

National Policies and Guidance:
National planning policy and guidance is set out in National Policy Statements, primarily the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published 20th July 2021, the Planning Practice Guidance Suite (PPGS) first launched 6th March 2014 together with Circulars, Ministerial Statements and associated technical guidance.

The NPPF constitutes guidance for local planning authorities and is a material consideration in determining applications.

- **Chapter 2** – Achieving sustainable development
- **Chapter 4** – Decision-making
- **Chapter 8** – Promoting healthy and safe communities
- **Chapter 9** – Promoting sustainable transport
- **Chapter 11** – Making effective use of land
- **Chapter 12** – Achieving well-designed places
- **Chapter 14** – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- **Chapter 15** – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- **Chapter 16** – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Other Material Considerations

- Highways Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2019)
- Waste Management Design Guide for New Developments (Version 5, October 2020)
- Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Advice Note (2021)
- Planning Applications Climate Change Guidance (2021)
- West Yorkshire Low Emissions Strategy and Air Quality and Emissions Technical Planning Guidance (2016)

Assessment
The following matters are considered in the assessment below –

1) Principle of development
1) Impact on visual amenity (including heritage considerations)
2) Impact on residential amenity
3) Impact on highway safety
4) Other matters – e.g. trees/ecology (e.g. bats)
5) Representations
6) Conclusion

1 – Principle of development:

The site is unallocated within the Kirklees Local Plan

Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), states that planning law requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This approach is confirmed within Policy LP1 of the Kirklees Local Plan, which states that when considering development proposals, the Council would take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within the Framework. Policy LP1 also clarifies that proposals that accord with the policies in the Kirklees Local Plan would be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Policy LP2 of the Kirklees Local Plan states that: *"All development proposals should seek to build on the strengths, opportunities and help address challenges identified in the local plan, in order to protect and enhance the qualities which contribute to the character of these places, as set out in the four sub-area statement boxes..."*

The site is within the Huddersfield sub-area. The listed qualities will be considered where relevant later in this assessment.

Chapter 8 of the NPPF relates to promoting healthy and safe communities, and Paragraph 92 of the NPPF goes on to note planning decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs. Policy LP47 of the Kirklees Local Plan also outlines that the Council will, with its partners, create an environment which supports healthy, active and safe communities and reduced inequality.

Policy LP49 of the Kirklees Local Plan outlines the general principles for assessing health care needs developments, stating the following: *"Proposals for new or enhanced healthcare facilities would be permitted where:*

a) *The scale and location is appropriate for the catchment;*
a) *There is a need for a new healthcare facility, particularly in relation to the spatial development strategy;*
b) *They are well related to the catchment they are intended to serve to minimise the need to travel or they can be made accessible by walking, cycling and public transport."*

The following supporting text also provides the following commentary as to how the council will determine healthcare needs development planning applications:

17.26 "It is essential that the planning process supports the provision of good local health care facilities of the right type and in the right locations. Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) are statutory bodies representing groups of GPs responsible for designing local health services. The council will work in partnership with the CCGs to plan for future provision and assess development proposals.

17.27 There has been a considerable change in the way health care facilities are delivered, with an ongoing shift away from hospital settings to community based settings, delivering services as close to home as possible. Co-locating services may provide benefits including a focal point for the community, promotion of healthy lifestyles as part of an integrated health and community care approach, better links with other services and opening up new possibilities for communities including increased building/site usage and increased accessibility."

The proposal is to replace an existing GP surgery to provide a larger GP surgery on site, as it is noted in the Planning Statement, a document by the Practice and a letter from the Practice that the existing surgery is no longer fit for purpose. It is noted in these supporting documents that due to its size and the building being built in a residential style in the 1950s, it has become too small to accommodate a full range of services and to accommodate more staff. The submission also notes that there are not enough rooms for all practice staff, that some of the existing consulting rooms are very small and not fit for purpose, and that there are accessibility issues throughout the building. The submission also outlines that the administration and reception area is too small to support the work of the reception and clerical team, and that this can result in large waiting times. The Planning Statement also provides photographic evidence of some of the difficulties noted above with the current building.

The letter by the Practice states that the building is suitable for a patient list size of approximately 3,500, whilst the current patient list size is over 11,000, and that the surgery cannot stop accepting patients. The letter goes on to note that the building cannot meet this patient demand at the current building.

The document from the Practice outlines engagement undertaken including with staff members and patients of the Practice. There were 2,019 responses to this engagement with 99.46% of responses from patients. The document notes that key findings from the engagement were that improvements are needed to parking and the building (layout, accessibility, waiting areas, consultation rooms and toilets), and that there was a desire for new building to offer more services.

The document from the Practice goes on to state that it is not possible to solve the problems identified 'by extending or developing the current premises'. It states that to make sure that the practice can provide high quality care for patients in the future there is a need to look to move to better premises.

The Planning Statement outlines that the scheme has been subject to extensive pre-application works with a number of different parties, and in particular the CCG. The Planning Statement goes on to note that the current application is a result of having secured CCG approval that the redevelopment scheme will provide the correct quantum of development to accommodate the requirements of the catchment area.

With regard to the information provided (as referred to above), Officers consider that it has been sufficiently evidenced that the current building is of a scale and layout which limits the ability of the Practice to provide a good service for the patients it serves (and will serve in the future). Therefore, in respect of Policy LP49(b), Officers consider that there is a need for a new healthcare facility.

The scale of the proposed replacement facility is also considered to be appropriate for the catchment it serves. As has been noted above, the existing building is considered to be suitable for a patient list size of 3,500 people, whilst the actual number of patients listed at the Practice is over 11,000. Further to this, the proposed facility has been supported by the CCG given that the proposal would provide the appropriate quantum of development to accommodate the requirements of the catchment area.

In terms of the location of the facility, this replaces the existing Practice building and is therefore an established location for the facility, which is also adjacent to Huddersfield Royal Infirmary. Further to this, it is accessible to the catchment being in an urban location and thereby accessible by walking and cycling, as well as having good public transport access, with frequent bus services at stops on Acre Street. Cycle storage is proposed too, which staff and visitors could both use (12 cycle spaces).

Thus, the proposal is considered to be compliant with Policy LP49(a) and (c), and therefore Policy LP49 of the Kirklees Local Plan overall. The need for such a facility also constitutes a public benefit which is given significant weight in the assessment of this planning application.

Given the above, the principle of the development could be acceptable, but the principle is also subject to other considerations which Officers will now go onto discuss below.

2 – Impact on visual amenity (including heritage considerations):

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservations Areas) Act (1990) states that for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building & Conservation Areas) Act (1990) are mirrored in Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Furthermore, Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan states that: *"Development proposals affecting a designated heritage asset…should preserve or enhance the significance of the asset. In cases likely to result in substantial harm or loss, development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that*

the proposals would bring substantial public benefits that clearly outweigh the harm."

The NPPF offers guidance relating to design in Chapter 12 (achieving well designed places) whereby Paragraph 126 provides a principal consideration concerning design which states:

"The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities."

Kirklees Local Plan Policies LP1, LP2 and significantly LP24 all also seek to achieve good quality, visually attractive, sustainable design to correspond with the scale of development in the local area, thus retaining a sense of local identity.

Policy LP24 states that proposals should promote good design by ensuring:

"a. the form, scale, layout and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape…"

The site is clearly visible from the public domain, notably from Acre Street, and there are no buildings directly adjacent to the site towards its front half (facing Acre Street) therefore increasing its prominence. The site is also clearly visible from the Public Right of Way (PROW) to the north of the site and Acre House Avenue. This existing building on the site is of 1950s construction and appears residential in appearance.

The existing building occupies a small area of the site and the openness of the site and greenery is considered to have a slightly positive contribution to the setting of the Grade II listed building to the north (No.64 Acre House) which is within extensive grounds. The site as it stands is considered to have a neutral impact upon the Grade II listed building to the west of the site (Acre Mills) and the Grade II listed wall to the north of the site.

In terms of siting of the building, this would be set further back from Acre Street than the existing building. However, this is considered acceptable in principle given that there is not a strong building line in the immediate vicinity of the site. Of note, to the south-east of the site the HRI is a large institutional building which is set much further back and the nearest building to the north east is approximately 60 metres away.

That said, whilst such a set-back can be considered acceptable, the amount of hardstanding to the front of the site is considered undesirable and would result in a relatively hard and urbanised frontage to the building. Officers requested additional planting to soften this frontage, but the agent noted that 35 parking spaces were required in the site thereby limiting the scope for additional planting. This was queried with Kirklees Highways Development

Management who stated that they would not want to see a reduction of parking spaces. Whilst this is acknowledged, the lack of soft landscaping to soften this aspect of the development is considered unfortunate, even if the stone wall to the front and south side of the site will help to screen parts of this.

Further to this, the proposed building would have a relatively large footprint. There is considered to be scope for a larger building on the site due to the size of the plot, whilst being close to the vast HRI building and some distance from No.64 Acre Street which is more residential in appearance. However, the proposed building runs a long way back into the site and essentially protrudes beyond the front elevations of the buildings at the adjacent No's.19 and Edgar House 21 Acre House Avenue (6 Apartments), whilst at the same time poorly addressing Acre House Avenue. This element of the building appears as a functional rear elevation facing towards this street which is undesirable. That being said, the addition of glazing and detailing has been added to the rear at ground floor, as well as the roof of the single storey element to the rear being pitched to reflect roof forms in the area following concerns raised by Officers how this element addresses Acre House Avenue. Whilst this is an enhancement, Officers still have concerns with how this element fails to sympathetically integrate with built development on Acre House Avenue.

At the pre-application advice stage, Officers outlined that if a new building is required, this should be a high-quality building that defines Acre Street. This response went on to note that this design approach would ensure that the street benefits from an active building frontage and enclosure. Of note, Acre Street is a well-used thoroughfare through Huddersfield and therefore this stance is maintained.

A two storey pitched roof element is proposed to the front with the main entrance within the front elevation (facing Acre Street), with part two storey flat roof elements/single storey elements protruding to the rear (east).

The entrance within the front elevation would help to address this well-used highway of Acre Street. In addition, the pitched roof to the front element of the building with a linear front elevation, is considered acceptable. This is because the form of development to the north of the HRI mainly consists of simple residential appearing development under pitched roofs and this aspect would reflect this. The two storey height of this front aspect would also be broadly in-keeping with the scale of the development in the immediate vicinity to the north of the HRI

However, initially the walls of front element/main body of the building consisted of less than 50% natural stone, with render and buff brick making up the rest of the walls of this element. After concerns were raised by Officers, natural stone is now proposed as the predominant construction material to the front and side walls of the pitched roof element of the building, thereby helping to reinforce local distinctiveness. Whilst some render detailing is proposed on these elevations, this is relatively limited and there is an example of such a white render at No.64, and therefore it is considered acceptable. Full details of

these materials can be conditioned for completeness and to ensure a high-quality finish.

It appears that artificial slate is proposed for the pitched roof of this front element and this is considered somewhat undesirable, especially given its close proximity to Grade II listed buildings and its proximity to a well-used highway. A natural slate roof would be preferable given this, and details of the roofing material shall be conditioned to ensure the proposal positively responds to development in the locality as well as ensure a high-quality finish.

In respect of the flat roof elements to the rear, these would also be two storey in height and set well below the ridge height of the front element. Flat roofs are not characteristic of traditional buildings in the locality. Whilst the height would be subordinate to the front aspect of the building and a two storey height is considered acceptable in respect of the height of development in the locality, these cumulatively would be a sizeable element of the building due to their overall footprint and massing and would not appear as subservient protrusions from the front main body of the proposed building. The two storey protrusion to the south and the single storey aspect from the main body would be relatively minor proportionate extensions. However, the northern flat roof element with single storey element beyond this would be a long aspect, having a much greater depth than the main body of the building to the front. Altogether, these rear elements would essentially give the building a bulky and more institutional appearance and the flat roofing would not be truly in-keeping with development to the north of the HRI. Whilst these aspects would not form the principal elevation of the building, they would still be clearly be visible given the lack of development to the south of the site, the footpath to the north of the site and Acre House Avenue to the rear.

Given the overall depth of the aspects to the rear, notably the northern two storey element, Officers recommended that the building was broken up in some way to reduce the overall bulk. Of note, the suggestion of a lightweight curtain walling link element between the main body to the front and the flat roof aspect to the rear was suggested to the applicant’s agent so as to break the massing up.

Some additional glazing has been provided in the south side elevation following this suggestion, but not curtain walling. However, visuals were also provided demonstrating how the long rear northern flat roof element would have a section next to the front body of the building at a lower height to the majority of the rear aspect that projects from it, as well as walls inset from this aspect. This would, somewhat, help to break the bulk of the northern projection. That being said, the large mass of this building proposed could not really be said to truly reflect the scale of buildings to the north of the HRI on the east side of Acre Street.

A mix of buff brick and render were proposed for the rear elements initially with white render for most of the upper floor. Officers raised concerns with such an overly elaborate and complicated approach and recommended that this was simplified. As a consequence, buff brick now forms the predominant

proposed finishing material to the rear with some render detailing next to openings. Whilst the use of natural stone on more of the building would have been preferable, the use of a high-quality buff brick to the less prominent rear element is considered acceptable, especially given the mixture of materials on buildings to the rear of the site (at Acre House Avenue). The reduction in the amount of render is also considered to help to create a more cohesive building, but the render detailing will also help to provide some visual interest, especially to the long northern flat roof projection. Further details of all finishing materials will be conditioned should permission be granted to ensure a high-quality finish.

The proposed building would run adjacent to the PROW to the north of the site and given its depth and two storey height, it is considered that this would be somewhat oppressive from the footpath, but there is a lack of buildings very close to the north side of this PROW thereby preventing this footpath being totally 'penned in'.

The plant on top of the flat roof would be relatively bulky, but this would be somewhat screened by a parapet roof and would be sited to the rear of the building to reduce its prominence, and this is considered acceptable.

Solar panels are proposed to the less prominent rear of the building, which is considered acceptable and further details of these can be conditioned should permission be granted to ensure a high quality finish.

The proposed windows would not really be in-keeping with window details on traditional buildings in the locality and Officers consider this is also unfortunate and gives the building a more institutional appearance. However, the plans display that the windows would be recessed which is welcomed.

In terms of landscaping, as noted above, there are concerns with the amount of hard surfacing to the front of the site. Landscape proposals have been submitted with few trees to the front of the building, as well as hedging and plating to the rear of the site.

KC Landscape provided comments on an initial landscape scheme submitted and raised a number of concerns. Of note, these related to the location of trees and planting, as well as the type of planting and how this would impact on the longevity of the plants initially proposed and the overall appearance of the scheme. The applicant's agent provided an amended landscape scheme following these concerns addressing some of the concerns of KC Landscape. The agent also provided further justification for the specific planting to address the concerns of KC Landscape. KC Landscape have offered no objections following this, but have requested a Landscape Management Plan. Whilst this has been provided it has not been reviewed by KC Landscape. However, Officers have reviewed this document and are satisfied with its content and should be permission, compliance with this document can be conditioned.

The cycle storage is proposed to the front of the building, but away from the roadside boundary and this is considered to be a suitable arrangement. For

completeness, full design details of this bike shelter can be conditioned should permission be granted. Full details of fencing can also be conditioned too for completeness so as to prevent stark means of enclosure in prominent locations.

The bin storage area is proposed to the front of the site, and there are concerns with this and how dominant this could appear. Officers note that a less prominent position would be more ideal for the bin storage from a visual amenity perspective, but accept that this assists with the collection of bins. Further to this, the storage, would to some extent be screened by the wall to the front of the site which is to be retained and the existing bin storage area is also to the front of the site. Requesting full details of the waste storage area will help to ensure that this element is not an overly dominant feature when viewed from the highway

In summary, the layout, scale, form and detailing of the building is not considered to sensitively integrate with development in the locality, and the significant amount of hard surfacing to the front of the site with lack of planting to soften the development would result in an undesirable urbanised frontage. As a consequence, this would harmfully transform the setting of the Grade II listed building across the road (Acre Mills Outpatients), as well as the Grade II listed buildings of No.64 Acre Street and the boundary wall to the north of site. As noted, the current site accommodates a modest building which is well landscaped. The proposal is therefore considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of these listed buildings.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF sets out that:

> *"Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use."*

In this case, as has been outlined in detail above, the proposal would result in a new Practice building replacing an existing one which is of a scale and layout which limits the ability of the Practice to provide a good service for the patients it serves. The new, and much larger building would ensure that the Practice can provide a higher quality of care for patients within its catchment. Of note, the facility has been supported by the CCG demonstrating the need for this much larger building. The social benefit of providing an enhanced health-care facility for over 11,000 people is something which weighs significantly in favour of the proposal. The new building would also be more environmentally friendly given the modern construction methods proposed, and this can be given some weight in the assessment of this application. Cycle parking and electric vehicle charging points would also be provided.

These social and environmental public benefits of this proposal are considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the nearby listed buildings identified above, therefore the proposal is considered to be in

accordance with Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 16 of the NPPF.

3 – Impact on residential amenity:

Section B of Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan states that proposals should promote good design by ensuring: *"They provide a high standard of amenity for future and neighbouring occupiers; including maintaining appropriate distances between buildings".*

Further to this, Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning decisions should ensure that developments have a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

The properties most likely to be affected by the proposed development are considered to be those adjacent to the site, these being No. 19 Acre Street and the apartments at No. 21 Acre Street (Edgar House).

No.19 is situated to the east of the site and comprises a detached two storey dwelling set back somewhat into the plot. This dwelling faces towards Acre House Avenue, whilst the rear elevation of the proposed development would face towards this same street. The side walls of the proposed building and this neighbouring building would not run parallel with each other, and instead they would be set at an angle to each other with the rear elevation of No.19 facing away from the proposed building.

It is considered that the rear element of the proposed building, which is only single storey in height at the very end, would be appropriately set off from the front wall of No.19 so as to prevent an undue loss of light, overbearing impact and overshadowing impact to rooms served by the front windows of No.19.

There are also no first floor windows within the side elevation of No.19 which face towards the site, and the side window at ground floor level appears to serve a garage. The proposed building has the potential to impact upon the outlook of this window and the light this window receives, but as this window serves a non-habitable room such an arrangement is considered acceptable.

As the rear elevation of No.19 is orientated away from the proposed building this will help to appropriately limit the impact upon the outlook of this dwelling as well as limit the loss of light the rear facing windows.

Given the overall depth of the proposed building, in that it runs beyond the rear boundary of No.19 it is considered that this has the potential to cause some overshadowing (especially in the later afternoon) and have an overbearing effect on the rear garden of No.19. However, the proposed layout would ensure that the building would have some set off from this property, having a greater set off from No.19 the further it goes beyond to the rear of this property. Thus, it is considered that the proposed overbearing and overshadowing impacts upon this garden would not be undue.

In respect of privacy and overlooking, there would be a number of windows in the side elevation of the proposed building facing towards No.19. Views from ground floor windows of the neighbouring property would be somewhat limited due to the fencing on the shared boundary helping to screen views. In terms of the side facing first floor windows, it is considered that these would be set at oblique angle from the windows in the side and rear elevations of the dwelling at No.19. As noted, the rear elevation of No.19 faces away from the proposed building. However, there is potential for new and clear views into the rear garden of No.19 from the first floor side windows and these windows would not be sited too far away from the shared boundary (especially the windows closer to the rear wall of the proposed building). Given this, it is considered that the three most rear windows on this side elevation should be obscurely glazed to prevent undue overlooking into this neighbouring garden and this can be conditioned should permission be granted.

The rear elevation of the main body of the building would be over 7 metres from the shared boundary with No.19 and ~24 metres away from the rear wall of No.19 and these distances are considered sufficient to prevent undue harm in terms of loss of privacy or overlooking.

Moving on to No.21 Acre House Avenue (Edgar House), this is a two storey building containing apartments to the north west of the site. This building is somewhat set back into its plot and faces Acre House Avenue, with the rear elevation slightly angled away from the proposed siting of the building.

It is considered that the rear element of the proposed building, which is only single storey in height at the very end, would be appropriately set off from the front wall of No.21 so as to prevent an undue loss of light, overbearing impact and overshadowing impact to rooms served by the front windows in the apartments at No.21.

There are two first floor windows in the side elevation of No.21 facing towards the site which would be approximately 12 metres away from the proposed building. However, it appears from viewing the approved plans for the apartment (2020/91858) building, that these windows serve a kitchen/lounge, which is served by a larger window to the rear which is set some distance from the side boundary and thereby the proposed building, and this rear window would be slightly orientated away from the proposed building. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in an undue loss of outlook or light for this kitchen/lounge room.

There are two side facing windows at ground floor level facing towards the site which are even closer to the site than the first floor side facing windows, but one of these does not appear to serve a habitable room, whilst the other window is a secondary source of light to a kitchen/lounge which benefits from another window to the front. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in an undue loss of outlook or light for this kitchen/lounge room at ground floor level

As alluded to above, the rear elevation of No.21 is slightly orientated away from the proposed building, and is set some distance of away from the site, and this is considered to be sufficient to prevent undue harm to the outlook from the rear facing windows of No.21 as well as prevent an undue loss of light to the rear facing windows.

Given the overall depth of the proposed building, in that it runs beyond the rear boundary of No.21, and that it is located to the south of the No.21, it is considered that this has the potential to cause overshadowing within what appears to be the communal garden (especially in the later afternoon), as well as have an overbearing effect on this garden. The proposed building would run nearly adjacent to its north west boundary, but when considering the good amount of communal garden area that No.21 benefits from, it is considered that the proposed overbearing and overshadowing effects on this garden as a whole would not be adverse enough to warrant a reason for refusal.

In respect of privacy and overlooking, there would be a number of windows in the side elevation of the proposed building facing towards the No.21. Views from ground floor windows of this apartment building and its communal garden area would be somewhat limited due to the fencing on the boundary of the site shared with the right of way and the fencing to the south of No.21, thereby helping to screen views.

In terms of the side facing first floor windows, whilst these would struggle to achieve clear views of rear facing windows within No.21 as these would be orientated over 90 degrees from the rear elevation, a number of these could directly overlook the communal garden area of No.21 as well as gain views into the first floor side windows of one of the apartments (at approximately 12 metres away). Given this, it is considered that the six most rear windows on this side elevation should be obscurely glazed to prevent undue overlooking into this neighbouring garden and loss of privacy. This can be conditioned should permission be granted.

Paragraph 185 of the NPPF outlines that planning decisions should ensure that new development is appropriate for its location taking into account the likely effects of pollution on living conditions. In addition to this, Policy LP52 of the Kirklees Local Plan also states that proposals which have the potential to increase pollution from noise, vibration, light, dust, odour and other forms of pollution must be accompanied by evidence to show the impacts have been evaluated and measures have been incorporated to prevent or reduce the pollution, so as to ensure it does not reduce the quality of life and well-being of people to an unacceptable level or have unacceptable impacts on the environment.

The proposal would result in a larger building at the site and closer to the residential dwellings at Acre House Avenue, but the use is not considered to be a high noise generating use. Further to this, whilst opening hours have not been specified it is anticipated this will not operate at unsociable hours (and a condition can be attached limiting the time open to patients to ensure this – 07:00 to 20:00 daily). The car park would be sited to the front of the proposed

building, away from these residential properties on Acre House Avenue thereby helping to reduce noise experienced by these properties, and it should be noted a car park at the site currently abuts these properties, although the use would be intensified compared to existing. The aforementioned condition restricting hours for patients would also help to prevent vehicular movements to and from the site at unsociable hours. Thus, it is considered that the development would not cause undue harm to the living environment of neighbouring properties in terms noise nuisance/pollution.

In relation to the plant on top of the flat roof, this would be relatively close to neighbouring residential properties, and it is considered necessary to condition that this shall be effectively controlled so that the combined rating level of noise from all such equipment does not exceed the background sound level at any time.

It is considered that a Construction Management Plan (CMP) is provided (this could be conditioned) to ensure the potential amenity impacts of construction work at the site are considered and addressed especially given the scale of development proposed and the proximity to a well-used highway and to residential properties. This could be conditioned should permission be granted.

Subject to conditions, it is considered that the proposed development would not cause undue detrimental harm to the amenity of nearby residential properties in accordance with Policies LP24 and LP52 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 12 and 15 of the NPPF.

4 – Impact on highway safety:

Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Policy LP21 of the Kirklees Local Plan echoes this.

Policy LP20 of the Kirklees Local Plan states that:

> *"New development will be located in accordance with the spatial development strategy to ensure the need to travel is reduced and that essential travel needs can be met by forms of sustainable transport other than the private car. The council will support development proposals that can be served by alternative modes of transport such as public transport, cycling and walking...*
>
> *…The council will support demand management measures which discourage single occupancy car travel within new development and encourage the use of low emission vehicles to improve areas with low levels of air quality. Proposals should include measures to encourage the use of sustainable travel options, including public transport, the promotion*

of personal journey planning, walking, cycling, car sharing, electronic communication and home working"

Of note, KC Highways Development have not objected to this application in principle.

Vehicular access to the current GP Practice is taken from Acre Street, whilst vehicular access to the adjacent car park is taken from an access road that serves the adjacent HRI. A Public Rights of Way (PROW) (Ref: HUD/349/10) can be found immediately north of the site connecting Acre Street with Acre House Avenue. There is also an on-site public footpath connection between the Infirmary access road to Acre House Avenue.

Under this application, it is proposed to stop the access from the road that serves the HRI, whilst widening the existing access off Acre Street to improve the flow of vehicles in and out of the facility. The PROW to the north of the site is to be retained, although the on-site public footpath connection between the HRI access to Acre House Avenue would be stopped by the proposal.

To the site frontage there are waiting restrictions on street in the form of double yellow lines and a bus stop clear way on the opposite side of Acre Street. Unrestricted parking is available approximately 40m from the site access, however KC Highways Development Management (HDM) note that given the site's location, this is well occupied due to the proximity of the site being adjacent to the infirmary.

In terms of traffic generation, a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan have been submitted alongside the planning application.

The submitted Transport Assessment (TA) assesses trip generation and distribution and is derived from the TRICS database using 'GP Surgeries'. The proposed development will equate to 56 two-way movements in the AM peak and 45 two-way movements in the PM peak respectively. KC HDM state that given the nature of the development, it is considered that trips to and from the site will be spread out through the day with a daily total of trips forecast to be 671 two-way vehicle movements.

In relation to parking provision, a total of 35 parking spaces are to be provided on the site inclusive of electric vehicle charging and disabled provision. KC HDM state that overall, the proposed car parking would be considered acceptable, with the sustainable travel measures provided on site in the form of 12 cycle stands and also the good links to public transport and accessibility for pedestrians. KC HDM go onto note that it is considered by implementing a travel plan with a full commitment to creating a modal shift to sustainable travel modes, the need to rely on the car will be significantly reduced.

It should be noted that Officers raised concerns with the number of parking spaces proposed as this decreased the possibility to soften the development from Acre Street. However, KC HDM set out verbally to officers that they

would not want to see any reduction in the number of spaces proposed at the site.

KC HDM have stated that the applicant should contribute to the cost of monitoring Travel Plan progress and have therefore requested a monitoring fee of £2,000 per annum for the first five years after opening to be secured by legal agreement. KC HDM note that this fee will cover assistance with the development of the Framework Travel Plan or approval of a Full Travel Plan and discharging the Travel Plan condition directly with Medical Centre. Thereafter, the fee which equates into approximately £50/hr x 40hrs = £2,000 for the officer time, will be used to assist the appointed Travel Plan Co-Ordinator in implementing, maintaining, and monitoring the Full Travel Plan.

Further to this, KC HDM have stated that a condition should be attached outlining that within 3 months of any part of the development being brought into use a travel plan should be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. They go onto note that this shall include measures to improve and encourage the use of sustainable transport.

In respect of Travel Plans, Policy LP20 of the Kirklees Local Plan sets out that:

> *"Travel plans will normally be required for all major planning applications in accordance with current guidance and should set targets and monitoring arrangements to ensure sustainable travel patterns are maintained…*
>
> *…The requirement of a travel plan will also be considered on case by case basis where the proposed development falls below the major application category where it has the potential to generate significant transport movements and/or has insufficient off-street parking within the vicinity of a stressed part of the highway network."*

Given the scale of the development and the number of patients the Practice serves, the request for a revised travel plan and associated monitoring fee by KC HDM is understood. That being said, the Practice already exists at the site and this is for a replacement building for this use, and this is not proposed to serve a wider catchment therefore it is questionable as to whether it is necessary or reasonable to request this. Further to this, it is considered that as a result of the development the Practice would become more accessible to low carbon forms of transport with 12 cycle spaces proposed on site as well as 4 electric vehicle charging points. There is also considered to be sufficient parking on and around the site as well as sufficient traffic controls so as to limit on-street parking. Further to this, most patients visiting the Practice would do so on an infrequent and intermittent basis and as a consequence it is considered that it will be somewhat challenging to effectively promote the aims of the travel plan to these patients. Of note, the option of walking, cycling, or even public transport maybe difficult for some patients due to health reasons given the nature of the development. Staffing levels are also proposed to be relatively modest (with 28 members noted in the application form). Given these above factors, including the relatively low number of staff

proposed, Officers do not consider it necessary to request a revised Travel Plan and a monitoring fee for a Travel Plan in this instance to make the development acceptable.

This is not to say, however, that measures of sustainable travel cannot be encouraged. It is considered the measures outlined within the Travel Plan submitted alongside the application will help to promote sustainable travel and it can be conditioned that the Travel Plan shall be retained throughout the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.

KC HDM have noted that a schedule of the means of access to the site for construction traffic should be conditioned to ensure the proposal does not cause undue harm to highways safety. It is considered that this can be included within a Construction Management Plan should permission be granted.

KC HDM have also requested a condition that the buildings shall not be occupied until the areas to be used by vehicles and/or pedestrians have been surfaced and drained in accordance with details that have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in the interests of highways safety and to achieve a satisfactory layout. The matter of drainage is covered below in the report. KC HDM also consider that these spaces and pedestrian areas should be provided prior to the first occupation of the building, especially to ensure adequate on-site parking for users of the site. This matter can be conditioned should permission be granted.

Cycle storage for 12 bicycles is proposed to assist in promoting low carbon forms of transportation to the site which is welcomed, and full details of this should be conditioned, with the condition stating that such a facility is provided prior to the first occupation of the building in accordance with Policies LP20 and LP24(d(ii)) of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 9 of the NPPF.

In relation to waste storage provision, the proposed bin storage point is located adjacent to the main access to and from the site. KC HDM have noted that this is considered in a suitable location to enable emptying of containers from Acre Street without the need to enter the site with a refuse collection vehicle. KC Waste Strategy have also raised no objections to such an arrangement

Officers note that a less prominent position would be more ideal for the bin storage from a visual amenity perspective, but accept that this helps with collection of bins. Further to this, the storage area would to some extent be screened by the wall to the front of the site which is to be retained and the existing bin storage area is also to the front of the site.

KC Waste Management have noted that additional details on the size and design of the general waste storage area on the car park should be provided and along with confirmation of how clinical wastes are to be managed. They note that consideration will need to consider providing a store capable of accommodating containers for both residual and recyclables. Requesting full

details of the waste storage area will help to ensure that this element is not an overly dominant feature when viewed from the highway and that sufficient provision has been made for the storage of waste, in accordance with Policy LP24(d(i)) of the Kirklees Local Plan.

The Public Right of Way (PROW) HUD/349/10 to the north of the site is not proposed to be altered by the development and an informative can be attached that this is to remain free from obstructions. The on-site public footpath connection between the Infirmary access road to Acre House Avenue would unfortunately be lost as a result of the proposal. However, this is not a defined PROW or down on the Kirklees Geographic Information System as a claimed PROW. Further to this, the retention of PROW HUD/349/10 would still allow for access for pedestrians between Acre House Avenue and Acre Street, therefore, on balance, the loss of this footpath through the site is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

Overall, subject to conditions, Officers consider that the proposal would not cause detrimental harm to highways safety, in accordance with Policies LP20, LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 9 of the NPPF.

5 – Other matters:

Climate Change:
On 12th November 2019, the Council adopted a target for achieving 'net zero' carbon emissions by 2038, with an accompanying carbon budget set by the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research. National Planning Policy includes a requirement to promote carbon reduction and enhance resilience to climate change through the planning system and these principles have been incorporated into the formulation of Local Plan policies. The Local Plan predates the declaration of a climate emergency and the net zero carbon target. However, it includes a series of policies, which are used to assess the suitability of planning applications in the context of climate change. When determining planning applications, the Council will use the relevant Local Plan policies and guidance documents to embed the climate change agenda.

A Climate Change Statement has been submitted alongside the application. This outlines measures to reduce the energy demand associated with the development including a fabric first design approach, energy efficient MEP service systems and plant and the use of energy efficient equipment. The statement goes onto note that the materials proposed have been chosen for their ready availability, facilitating local sources, and their longevity, reducing the need for replacement over the lifetime of the building.

In terms of sourcing low carbon/renewable energy, air source heat pump systems in the form of Variable Refrigerant Flow systems are to be utilised to heat all occupied areas and provide mechanic cooling only when necessary. Further to this, solar panels are proposed on the roof slope, and it is noted a battery storage and control system shall be utilised to prioritise PV generated electricity to the domestic hot water system in order to decarbonise domestic hot water generation. The Statement predicts a 42.5% reduction in regulated

carbon emissions will be achieved against the Part L of the Building Regulations requirements.

The Statement notes that a 'significant' number of non-occupiable rooms have been located on the southern elevation to minimise the southerly exposure to occupied rooms, and therefore reduce mechanical cooling energy consumption and the risk of overheating. Brise soleil are also proposed over windows on the southern elevation to reduce the solar gain during summer months thereby reducing the need for cooling.

The reduction of water consumption within the building and for the landscaping has also been considered.

In terms of reducing air pollution, the statement outlines that the energy provision for the development will be all-electric and will not include any combustion processes or release any combustion emissions. Further to this, 12 cycle spaces are proposed, whilst 4 of the 35 car parking spaces are to be electric vehicle charging points. This provision of electric vehicle charging points is considered to be in accordance with the West Yorkshire Low Emission Strategy for non-residential development and both this and the cycle parking can be conditioned to be provided prior to the first use of the development

Overall, Officers are satisfied with the measures proposed under this application in order to combat climate change.

Ecology:
Chapter 15 of the NPPF relates to conserving and enhancing the Natural Environment. Paragraph 179 of the NPPF outlines that decisions should promote the protection and recovery of priority species, and identify and pursue opportunities for securing net gains for biodiversity. Paragraph 180 goes on to note that if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

Policy LP30 of the Kirklees Local Plan echoes the NPPF in respect of biodiversity. Policy LP30 outlines that development proposals should minimise impacts on biodiversity and provide net biodiversity gains through good design by incorporating biodiversity enhancements and habitat creation where opportunities exist.

A Preliminary Ecological Assessment Report was submitted alongside the application. This sets out that the proposal is unlikely to impact upon protected species, including bats.

West Yorkshire Ecology have requested further information about the bat qualifications/experience of the person who undertook the assessment. West Yorkshire Ecology also stated that a desktop review displays a slipped tile on the roof, potential gaps between tiles and lead flashing around the chimneys and missing pointing along the ridge tiles of the front extension which could

allow bats to get into the gap between the tiles and the timber undrawn boarding. West Yorkshire Ecology state that such features would suggest that the building should have been classified as of low, not negligible potential for roosting bats and should have had emergence surveys.

The applicant's agent has outlined the credentials of the individual who undertook the report, and they are acknowledged to be a qualified ecologist and licenced bat surveyor therefore Officers are satisfied in respect of this matter raised by West Yorkshire Ecology.

In respect of bat potential, the agent notes that the survey included an external and internal survey of the building. They go onto note that no slipped roof tiles were observed, no gaps between tiles and lead flashing around the chimneys were observed and that no missing pointing along the ridge tiles were observed. It is maintained that there is a negligible potential to support bats and that should the building have had observable features with the potential to support bats then there would have been no hesitation with recommending further surveys. Having visited the site and with the reassurances provided by the applicant's agent, Officers are satisfied that the proposal is unlikely to harm protected species, of note bats.

In terms of net gains, due to the type and scale of the development and the loss of trees proposed, ecological opportunities and landscaping opportunities are limited, and West Yorkshire Ecology have requested that they would wish to see evidence that the proposed development will result in net gains.

Of note, the Preliminary Ecological Assessment Report outlines that the vast majority of the site will be developed, with almost all trees and vegetation removed to facilitate the development and there is very limited scope for large scale habitat creation as part of the development. However, the report goes on to state that the proposed Landscape Plan includes a range of biodiversity/landscape features to both enhance the amenity value of the site for users, offset ecological impacts and ensure the site retains habitat features to support a variety of wildlife in the long term. This includes:

- Grassland creation. For instance, 80m2 of species rich native wildflower turf and 97m2 of amenity grassland along the boundaries of the eastern part of the site.
- 14m2 of native scrub to be planted in the eastern section of the site and 101m2 of ornamental shrub to be planted along the boundaries of the site.
- 63m of native species hedgerow and 21m of ornamental hedgerow.
- The planting of 10 heavy standard trees.
- Bat roosting opportunities, these being 2 bat boxes.

A BREEM Pre-Assessment has also been submitted alongside the application as has a Biodiversity Metric Table. The "Significant Gains" or "No Net Loss" criteria could not be met although the BREEAM "Minimising Loss" is noted to have been achieved.

However, it is noted that whilst in terms of area habitats there would be an 3.52% net decrease of Biodiversity Unit Value, in terms of hedges and lines of trees there would be a 97.31% increase of Biodiversity Unit. Thus, when taking into account the minimal decrease in area habitats and increase to hedges and lines of trees, on balance, Officers consider that the biodiversity impacts of the development are acceptable. However, this is subject to the landscape plan being implemented (with the landscape management plan being adhered to) and 2 bat boxes being installed on the building, as well as 2 bird boxes being installed on this building.

Trees:

Policy LP33 of the Kirklees Local Plan states that the Council will not grant planning permission for developments which directly or indirectly threaten trees or woodlands of significant amenity. Policy LP33 goes on to note that proposals should normally retain any valuable or important trees where they make a contribution to public amenity, the distinctiveness of a specific location or contribute to the environment. Further to this Policy LP24(i) states that proposals should promote good design by ensuring the retention of valuable or important trees and where appropriate, the planting of new trees and other landscaping to maximise visual amenity and environmental benefits.

There are a number of protected trees on the site as well as immediately to the north of the site.

The submitted tree report outlines that the development requires site preparation works that result in the loss of trees within the site. It goes onto note that the impact to trees will be offset in part by replacement tree planting. It states that it would require mostly category C trees be lost with only one category B tree (T3). It is noted more noteworthy trees are to be retained and that the trees planned for retention can be adequately protected during the construction stages of the development. Further to this, the report concludes that relationship and clearances between retained trees on or adjacent to the building appears satisfactory and will remain so for the future.

The Kirklees Arboricultural Officer stated that the scheme is retaining a mature tree in the car parking area, which will help the new centre fit into the existing context. The Arboriculutral Officer has noted that there are a high number of tree removals, but not all of these are protected. A Tree Protection Plan was later submitted to reflect the most up to date layout.

In relation to the initial proposal, the Arboricultural Officer stated that whilst the landscaping proposed included enough replacement planting, the species choice and location of a few proposed trees did not appear to be practical. Of note, concern was raised in relation to a hornbeam adjacent to the building, stating that this is impractical due to the size and spread this tree would reach in the future and therefore the Arboricultural Officer suggested a cultivator of Rowan instead. In addition to this, the Arboricultural Officer stated that two trees close to the southern boundary would likely result in significant conflict with the new building given their proximity (whatever the species). Furthermore, the Arboricultural Officer stated that they wished to see some

provision of trees at the frontage, either at the southern boundary in the plant bed or in part of the land allocated for the bin store.

A revised landscaping scheme was later submitted following these above comments from the Arboricultural Officer. This included the removal of trees to the side of the building, the adjustment of trees species, the planting of one tree too large for the rear in the bed to the front near the motorcycle bays.

Following the submission of this information, the Arboricultural Officer commented that the landscaping has been better planned and thought through and that they have no objection to the proposal subject to compliance conditions to secure the replacement planting at the site and the ensure the long-term health of the trees to be retained.

Given the above, subject to conditions, it is considered that the proposal would be compliant with Policies LP24(i) and LP33 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 12 and 15 of the NPPF.

Drainage:
The site is within Flood Zone 1 and there are no watercourses within the site. However, with reference to Policy LP27 of the Kirklees Local Plan the effects of 1 in 100 year storm events should be considered, with an additional allowance for climate change, on drainage infrastructure and surface water run-off pre and post development between the development and the surrounding area, in both directions.

Policy LP28 of the Kirklees Local Plan outlines that proposal should achieve a minimum 30% reduction in surface water run-off where previous positive surface water connections from the site can be proven. Policy LP34 of the Kirklees Local Plan setw out that proposal will need to follow the surface water hierarchy.

A Flood Risk Assessment, a Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy and a survey drawing were submitted alongside this application.

The development proposes to discharge surface water run-off from the new building roof and car park to a soakaway located in the new car park once the existing building has been demolished. The proposal to use permeable paving (wherever practicable) is welcomed by Kirklees Lead Local Flood Authority (KC LLFA).

KC LLFA have stated that the foul and surface water drainage Strategy is generally acceptable, subject to a number of comments. Of note they set out:

- It is noted that the hydraulic calculations discount infiltration through the base of the soakaway which the LLFA confirms is a requirement for the detailed design of the soakaway.
- The half drain down time of the soakaway is noted to be approx. 3.7 days which is considered to be excessive, and attempts to reduce this should be made at detailed design stage (if practicable).

- As noted in the submitted documents, further infiltration tests will need to be undertaken at the location and depth of the proposed soakaway. These tests (minimum 3 No.) should be undertaken in accordance with BRE 365 guidance. The presence of contaminated ground should also be determined, and the risks associated with the transport of contaminants to the groundwater should be assessed.
- Detailed design hydraulic calculations (MicroDrainage or similar) should be submitted at detailed design stage to provide evidence that no significant flooding within or off the site occurs during the critical 1 in 100 year (plus 30% CC) rainfall event.
- The detailed design should include methods to prevent silts entering the soakaway (e.g. silt trap MHs).
- Details of a Maintenance Strategy, including a schedules of maintenance activities, should submit at detailed design stage for the surface water drainage infrastructure (including the soakaway). The Maintenance Strategy should identify the body that will be responsible for maintenance during the lifetime of the development.
- Flood Exceedance Routing should be submitted which should indicate no flood risk to existing or proposed housing or commercial properties. The route should avoid property curtilage and use the road network and open space to achieve a safe design.
- Temporary Drainage Proposals should be submitted (with the discharge of surface water flows off site limited to 2.5 l/s per ha for the 1 in 2 year storm). Measures to prevent silts being washed off site following site strip should be included.

On the basis of the information submitted with the application, Kirklees LLFA have not objected to the application subject to conditions (i.e. drainage details, overland flow routing and a construction phase surface water floor risk and pollution prevention plan).

Following this, revised information was submitted with a response from the technical expert acting on behalf of the applicant. Following this, KC LLFA still requested the same conditions be attached outlining that several issues remain unresolved until detail design is provided. After dialogue between Officers and applicant's agent the agent has accepted the attachment of the recommended conditions by the KC Drainage. These can be attached should permission be granted.

Contaminated Land:
KC Environmental Health have stated that their mapping system has not identified contaminated land present at the site, but that significant groundworks will be undertaken therefore it will be necessary to recommend a condition relating to unexpected ground contamination. This could be attached should permission be granted.

Public Health

KC Public Health have requested that there is a staff garden area, and that this is smokefree (with signage to note so) and that the greenspace includes

fruit bearing trees to promote healthy eating. Whilst both these options are desirable, Officers contend that these are not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms or reasonable in this instance. However, it is considered likely that it will be requested by the Practice that the site is a smokefree environment. KC Public Health also requested that plant species are carefully considered to encourage biodiversity. Biodiversity is discussed above.

KC Public Health have also encouraged that the applicant liaises with the Kirklees Transport Strategy and Policy and Public Health departments about the opportunities to access concessionary travel programmes, active travel programmes for workplaces and car sharing initiatives current at time of enquiry. The matter of sustainable travel is discussed above in the Highway Safety subsection of this assessment.

6 – Representations:

1 representation has been received, objecting the proposal raising concerns with the impact of footpaths. This matter is addressed in the highway safety section of the assessment above.

7 – Conclusion:

The NPPF has introduced a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The policies set out in the NPPF taken as a whole constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development means in practice.

This application has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan and other material considerations. It is considered that the proposed development, on balance, would constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation **Approve**

Decision Authorisation - Delegated Powers
Application Number: 2021/94497
Officer Recommendation: Approve
Conditions and Reasons

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun within three years of the date of this permission.
Reason: Pursuant to the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications schedule listed in this decision notice, except as may be specified in the conditions attached to this permission, which shall in all cases take precedence.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is being permitted and so as to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development on completion, and to accord with Policies LP1, LP2, LP3, LP7, LP20, LP21, LP22, LP24, LP27, LP28, LP30, LP33, LP35, LP43, LP47, LP49, LP51, LP52 and LP53 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. Prior to the construction of the GP Practice building hereby approved above slab level, and notwithstanding the details of the materials specified in the submission, details of all the external facing materials of the walls and roof of the GP Practice building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the construction of the GP Practice building shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained as such.
Reason: In the interest of the visual amenity of the area, to preserve the significance of the nearby Grade II listed buildings and to comply with Policies LP24 and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Prior to the first occupation of the GP Practice building hereby approved, and notwithstanding the details of the solar pv panels displayed on the submitted drawings, full design details of the solar pv panels, including siting, specification, quantity, scale and projection beyond the roof plane, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The solar pv panels approved shall be installed in accordance with the details hereby approved prior to the first occupation of the GP Practice building and retained as such.
Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, to preserve the significance of the nearby Grade II listed buildings, to mitigate the development's impact on climate change, and to accord with Policies LP24, LP35 and LP51 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 12, 14 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Prior to the first occupation of the GP Practice building hereby approved, and notwithstanding the details of the cycle storage area displayed on the submitted drawings (including Drawing No. 1921-102 Revision P-01), full

design details of the temporary and permanent cycle storage areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including elevations and materials. The approved temporary cycle storage area shall be installed in accordance with the details hereby approved prior to the first occupation of the GP Practice building and retained as such until the approved permanent cycle storage area is installed in accordance with the details hereby approved, which shall be within 1 year of the first occupation of the GP Practice building, and thereafter retained as such.
Reason: In the interests of visual amenity, to preserve the significance of the nearby Grade II listed buildings, to encourage low carbon forms of transport, and to accord with Policies LP20, LP24, LP35 and LP51 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 12, 14 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. Prior to the first occupation of the GP Practice building hereby approved, and notwithstanding the details of the bin storage area on the submitted plans (including Drawing No. 1921-102 Revision P-01), details of the temporary and permanent bin storage and collection areas, including elevations, materials and confirmation of how clinical wastes are to be managed, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved temporary bin storage and collection area(s) shall be installed in accordance with the details hereby approved prior to the first occupation of the GP Practice building and retained as such until the approved permanent bin storage and collection area(s) is installed in accordance with the details hereby approved, which shall be within 1 year of the first occupation of the GP Practice building, and thereafter retained as such.
Reason: In the interests of residential and visual amenity, in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety, to ensure that sufficient provision has been made for the storage of waste and to accord with Policies LP24, LP43 and LP52 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 9, 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. Prior to the first occupation of the GP Practice building hereby approved, a scheme detailing the boundary treatments of all the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall detail the position, height and materials of the boundary treatments. Thereafter, and prior to the first occupation of the GP Practice building hereby approved, the boundary treatments shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.
Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity, and to comply with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Landscape Scheme (Drawing No. R3-438-03-LA-01 Revision D) and Landscape Management Plan by Root 3 (Ref: R3-438-03-LA-02 Revision A) dated 19th September 2021. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with BS 4428:1989 Code of Practice for general landscape operations (excluding hard surfaces), or the most up to date and current British Standard, in the first planting and seeding seasons following the completion of the development.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory landscape treatment of the site in the interest of the visual amenity of the area, to enhance biodiversity and to comply with Policies LP24, LP30 and LP33 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. Two bat boxes and two bird boxes shall be incorporated into the GP Practice building hereby approved; the boxes shall be long-lasting Schwegler `woodcrete' type or similar and shall be located away from sources of light, at least 5 metres above ground. The bat and bird boxes shall be provided prior to first occupation of the building hereby approved and thereafter be retained.
Reason: To enhance the biodiversity of the site in accordance with Policy LP30 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. The development shall be carried out in complete accordance with the measures outlined within the Tree Protection Plan (Drawing No. R3-438-03-AR-03 Revision C) and Sections 4 and 5 of the Arboricultural Report by Root 3 (Ref: R3-438-03-AR-01) dated 8th September 221. These shall be implemented and maintained throughout the construction phase.
Reason: To protect trees in the interests of visual amenity, to preserve the significance of the nearby Grade II listed buildings and to accord with Policies LP24, LP33 and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. Prior to the first occupation of the GP Practice building hereby approved, details of the temporary areas to be used by vehicles and/or pedestrians shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The temporary areas to be used by vehicles and/or pedestrians shall be laid out in accordance with the details hereby approved prior to the first occupation of the GP Practice building and retained as such until the approved area to be used by vehicles and/or pedestrians has been laid out. Within 1 year of the first occupation of the GP Practice building, the permanent areas to be used by vehicles and/or pedestrians shall be surfaced and laid out in accordance with details that have previously been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter retained.
Reason: In the interests of amenity and traffic safety, to ensure adequate space within the site for vehicle movements, parking, and in accordance with Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 9 and 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

12. Within 1 year of the GP Practice building hereby approved first being occupied, electric vehicle recharging points shall be installed at 4 of the parking spaces as displayed on Drawing No.1921-102 P-01. Cable and circuitry ratings shall be of adequate size to ensure a minimum continuous current demand of 16Amps and a maximum demand of 32Amps. The electric vehicle charging points so installed shall thereafter be retained.
Reason: In the interest of supporting low emission vehicles and to accord with Policies LP20, LP24 and LP51 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 9 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

13. The Travel Plan by Sanderson Associates (Consulting Engineers) Ltd (ref: 300299 – 02) dated October 2021 shall be implemented upon the commencement of the development hereby approved and in line with the provisions and timescale set out within the Travel Plan. The Travel Plan shall thereafter be retained throughout the lifetime of the development.
Reason: In the interest of supporting the use of sustainable forms of transport, in the interest of highways safety and to accord with Policies LP20, LP21, LP24 and LP51 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 9 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

14. The development hereby permitted shall not be open to patients outside the hours of 07:00 to 20:00 Monday to Sundays.
Reason: To ensure the amenities of nearby noise sensitive properties are not compromised and to accord with Policies LP24 and LP52 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

15. Notwithstanding the drainage information submitted alongside this application, development shall not commence until a scheme detailing foul, surface water and land drainage, (including off site works, outfalls, balancing works, plans and longitudinal sections, hydraulic calculations, phasing of drainage provision, existing drainage to be maintained/diverted/abandoned) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include a maintenance and management plan for surface water infrastructure. The building shall not be brought into use until such approved drainage scheme has been provided on the site to serve the development and retained thereafter.
Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate and sustainable systems of drainage are employed, in the interests of amenity, environmental well-being and to accord with Policies LP24 and LP28 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 12 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

16. Notwithstanding the drainage information submitted alongside this application, development shall not commence until an assessment of the effects of 1 in 100 year storm events, with an additional allowance for climate change, blockage scenarios and exceedance events on drainage infrastructure and surface water run-off pre and post development between the development and the surrounding area (both upstream and downstream of the development), has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the development shall be brought into use until the works comprising the approved scheme have been completed and such approved scheme shall be retained thereafter.
Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate and sustainable systems of drainage are employed, in the interests of amenity, environmental well-being and to accord with Policies LP24 and LP28 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 12 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

17. Notwithstanding the drainage information submitted alongside this application, development shall not commence until a scheme, detailing temporary surface water drainage for the construction phase (after

hardsurface, soil and vegetation/site strip) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall detail:

- phasing of the development and phasing of temporary drainage provision.
- include methods of preventing silt, debris and contaminants entering existing drainage systems and watercourses and how flooding of adjacent land is prevented.
- the strategy shall include a plan showing the location of the attenuation storage and supporting calculations, which shall be based on the critical 1 in 2-year storm. It should be assumed that once the site has been stripped that the percentage run-off will be 100 %. The maximum allowable off-site discharge rate shall not exceed 2.5 litres per second per ha, unless otherwise agreed with the LLFA.

The temporary works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme and phasing. No phase of the development shall be commenced until the temporary works approved for that phase have been completed. The approved temporary drainage scheme shall be retained until the approved permanent surface water drainage system is in place and functioning in accordance with written notification to the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure the provision of adequate and sustainable systems of drainage are employed, in the interests of amenity, environmental well-being and to accord with Policies LP24 and LP28 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 12 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

18. In the event that contamination, or the presence of coal not previously identified by the developer prior to the grant of this planning permission is encountered during the development, all groundworks in the affected area (except for site investigation works) shall cease immediately and the Local Planning Authority shall be notified in writing within 2 working days. Groundworks in the affected area shall not recommence until either (a) a Remediation Strategy by a suitably competent person has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority or (b) the Local Planning Authority has confirmed in writing that remediation measures are not required. The Remediation Strategy shall include a timetable for the implementation and completion of the approved remediation measures. Thereafter remediation of the site shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the approved Remediation Strategy.

Following completion of any measures identified in the approved Remediation Strategy a Validation Report shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. No part of the site shall be brought into use until such time as that part of the site has been remediated in accordance with the approved Remediation Strategy and a Validation Report in respect of those works has been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To ensure the safe occupation of the site in accordance with Policy LP53 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework

19. No development shall take place, until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Management Plan shall provide details of:

a) timetable of all works;
a) vehicle sizes and routes (including means of access for construction traffic), times of vehicle movements, identification of the location of any HGV waiting areas and inclusion details of the management of said areas;
b) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
c) details and location of signage;
d) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
e) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
f) measures to be taken to minimise the deposit of mud, grit and dirt on public highways by vehicles travelling to and from the site, including the provision, use and retention of adequate wheel washing facilities within the site;
g) measures to control and monitor the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
h) a Site Waste Management Plan, detailing recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works;
i) mitigation of noise and vibration arising from all construction related activities to (these details should also include suitable restrictions on the hours of working on the site including times of deliveries);
j) artificial lighting used in connection with all construction related activities and security of the construction site;
k) site manager and resident liaison officer contact details (including their remit and responsibilities); and
l) details of engagement with local residents and occupants or their representatives.

The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved CMP and no change there from shall take place without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties, in the interest of highways safety and in accordance with Policies LP21 and LP52 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 9 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

20. Prior to the first occupation of the building hereby approved, the six most rear upper floor windows on the north side elevation and the three most rear upper floor windows on the south side elevation in the approved building shall be obscurely glazed (Level 3 or above), and shall be retained as such thereafter.
Reason: To restrict overlooking so as to preserve the amenity of neighbouring residents and to comply with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

21. The combined noise from any fixed mechanical services, extract and ventilation systems and external plant and equipment, including air source heat pumps, shall be effectively controlled so that the combined rating level of

noise from all such equipment does not exceed the background sound level at any time. “Rating level” and “background sound level” are as defined in BS 4142:2014+A1:2019.
Reason: To ensure the proposed development does not cause harmful noise pollution within neighbouring noise sensitive locations, in the interest of amenity, and to comply with the aims and objectives of Policies LP24 and LP52 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

NOTE: The applicant’s attention is drawn to the need to comply with all conditions imposed on this permission. Failure to do so could result in the council serving a breach of condition notice against which there is no right of appeal.

NOTE: Planning permission only means that in planning terms a proposal is acceptable to the Local Planning Authority. Just because you have obtained planning permission, this does not mean you always have the right to carry out the development. Planning permission gives no additional rights to carry out the work, where that work is on someone else's land, or the work will affect someone else's rights in respect of the land. For example there may be a leaseholder or tenant, or someone who has a right of way over the land, or another owner. Their rights are still valid and you are therefore advised that you should seek legal advice before

NOTE: The granting of planning permission does not authorise the carrying out of works within the highway, for which the written permission of the Council as Highway Authority is required. You are required to consult the Design Engineer (Kirklees Street Scene: 01484 221000) with regard to obtaining this permission and approval of the construction specification. Please also note that the construction of vehicle crossings within the highway is deemed to be major works for the purposes of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (Section 84 and 85). Interference with the highway without such permission is an offence which could lead to prosecution.

NOTE: To minimise noise disturbance at nearby premises it is generally recommended that activities relating to the erection, construction, alteration, repair or maintenance of buildings, structures or roads shall not take place outside the hours of:

- 07.30 and 18.30 hours Mondays to Fridays
- 08.00 and 13.00hours, Saturdays
- With no working Sundays or Public Holidays

In some cases, different site specific hours of operation may be appropriate.

Under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, Section 60 Kirklees Environment and Transportation Services can control noise from construction sites by serving a notice. This notice can specify the hours during which work may be carried out.

NOTE: All contamination reports shall be prepared by a suitably competent person, as defined in Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019. Reports must be prepared in accordance with the following guidance:

- Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM)
- BS 10175:2011+ A2:2017 Investigation of Potentially Contaminated Sites. Code of Practice
- Development on Land Affected by Contamination - Technical Guidance for Developers, Landowners & Consultants - (v11.2) June 2020 by the Yorkshire and Lincolnshire Pollution Advisory Group

NOTE: Public Right of Way Footpath Huddersfield 349 is adjacent to the development site and must not be interfered with or obstructed, prior to, during or after development works.

NOTE: Birds and their nests are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), which makes it an offence to intentionally take, damage or destroy the eggs, young or nest of a bird whilst it is being built or in use. Disturbance to nesting birds can be avoided by carrying out vegetation removal or building work outside the breeding season, which is March to August inclusive.

NOTE: This decision notice does not grant permission for advertisements, which may require advertisement consent.

Plans and specifications schedule:-

Plan Type	**Reference**	**Version**	**Date Received**
Application Form	-	-	1st December 2021
Site Location Plan	1921-100	P-01	1st December 2021
Existing Floor Plans	1921-201	P-01	1st December 2021
Existing and Proposed Site Section	1921-400	P-01	1st December 2021
Proposed Site Plan	1921-102	P-01	1st December 2021
Proposed Elevations	1921-300	P02	25th March 2022
Proposed Roof Plan	1921-201	P-01	1st December 2021
Proposed Floor Plans	1921-200	P-01	1st December

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
			2021
Proposed Visualisations	-	-	25th March 2022
Surface Water Drainage Calculation by ARP Associates dated February 2022	2102/07/r3	a	17th March 2022
Proposed Private Drainage Layout	2102/07/08	T1	25th February 2022
Drainage Standard Details	2102/07/01.1	T1	25th February 2022
Proposed Site Level Plan	2102/06/05	T1	25th February 2022
Proposed Private Drainage Schedule	2102/07/08.1	T1	25th February 2022
Flood Risk Assessment by ARP Associates dated November 2021	2102/07r1	a	1st December 2021
Foul and Surface Water Drainage Strategy by ARP Associates dated November 2021	2102/07/r2	a	1st December 2021
Preliminary Ecological Assessment Report and BREEAM UK New Construction 2018 Pre-Assessment by Root 3 dated 12th July 2021	R3-438-03-EC-01	3	4th May 2022
GN40: BREEAM, CEEQUAL, HQM Ecology Assessment Issues Reporting Template	-	-	4th May 2022
Biodiversity Metric Table	-	-	4th May 2022
Tree Constraints Plan	R3-438-03-AR-02	-	1st December 2021

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Arboricultural Report by Root 3 dated 8th September 2021	R3-438-03-AR-01	-	1st December 2021
Tree Protection Plan	R3-438-03-AR-03	C	4th May 2022
Landscape Management Plan by Root 3 dated 19th September 2021	R3-438-03-LA-02	A	4th May 2022
Landscape Scheme/Proposal	R3-438-03-LA-01	D	4th May 2022
Climate Change Guidance Statement	-	-	1st December 2021
Heritage Assessment by West Yorkshire Archaeological Services dated November 2021	3672	-	1st December 2021
Travel Plan by Sanderson Associates (Consulting Engineers) Ltd dated October 2021	300299 002	02	1st December 2021
Transport Assessment by Sanderson Associates (Consulting Engineers) Ltd dated October 2021	300299 001	-	1st December 2021
Planning Statement by Peacock + Smith dated November 2021	-	-	1st December 2021
Design and Access Statement by Corstorphine & Wright dated November 2021	-	P-01	1st December 2021
Report of Findings on the Engagement for 'Lindley Practice Group' dated August 2018	-	-	1st December 2021
Kirklees RAPID	-	-	1st

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Health Impact Assessment			December 2021
Letter from Lindley Group Practice dated 14th November 2021	-	-	1st December 2021

Pursuant to article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority have, where possible, made a pre-application advice service available, complied with the Kirklees Development Management Charter 2015 and otherwise actively engaged with the applicant in dealing with the application.

A pre-application advice request was submitted prior to the submission of this planning application, and the application has addressed a number of comments raised within the pre-application response. However, with this application, Officers initially raised a number of concerns with the proposal.

Of note, Officers raised concerns with the design of the scheme, including with the layout, form and appearance of the building and requested a number of amendments. Whilst some amendments were provided, notably to the finishing materials, others were not. However, on balance, Officers considered the design acceptable in the context of the public benefits. Visualisations were requested too, and these were provided and helped Officers gain a better understanding of the finished appearance of the proposed development.

Further arboricultural and soft landscaping details were requested and were later provided thereby addressing concerns of both KC Trees and KC Landscape. In addition, clarity was requested in relation to the potential for harm to bats and biodiversity enhancement, and these concerns were also addressed.

Furthermore, the applicant's agent has raised no objections to the conditions put forward.

Report Dated: 28.06.2022