



From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Good afternoon Nick,

Please find attached the relevant information we have prepared in support of the below conditions, our responses are also noted below in red.

We have provided information in relation to most of the request below but, the only conditions which require additional input are as follows;

- **Condition 14** (boundary treatments):
- **Condition 5** (retaining walls):
- **Condition 6** (Phase II Report), **7** (Remediation Strategy), **9** (Remediation Validation Report):

Condition 14 & 5 will be dealt with once the highways approval relating to the boundary retaining walls have been approved with Farhad. Our Structural Engineer is currently working through the details and we will be submitting this application shortly.

SC1 responses below;

2024/90235 (condition 10)

Condition 10 (Drainage): The lead Local Flood Authority have objected to the details. Please see their comments and request for information at: [Planning application details | Kirklees Council](#)

- *Consultation Response from KC, Lead Local Flood Authority - Further information is required before we are able to advise on condition 10. A simulation if the drainage design via Microdrainage or similar is required to clearly demonstrate no flooding occurs in the critical 1 in 100 + 45% climate change event. The LLFA prefers to see a 'wizard' summary clearly indicating other events as well as the critical event. In terms of a maintenance plan is associate with CDM regs 2015, a bespoke plan is required. For a site of this size, it needs to discuss methodology of clearing silt out, including access to and into the system shown on agreed plans. Such definition is required as a principal designer will have overseen the health and safety aspects of the installation to be handed over to the end user. We also recommend an extra point relating to whether the flow control device is ever removed due to blockages. This relates to the replacing of the neoprene seal whenever this occurs.*
- *We also recommend the planning officer look at boundary treatments to the north which suggest a wall on some plans but a fence on others. A solid wall at the base is needed to deflect external flood routing down the track rather than onto site.*
- *Yorkshire Water - Waste Water Yorkshire Water has no objection to the discharge of condition 10. The 'Sustainable Drainage Assessment' 77823.00.01R4, as prepared by GeoSmart, dated 27/04/23 ruled out surface water discharge via soakaway, and will instead discharge to public surface water sewer at a restricted rate of 3 litres per second.*

SC1 RESPONSE

- condition 10 (timescale: prior to above ground works commencing)
- please refer to the Appendix G – Condition 10: Drainage Addendum which has been prepared by GeoSmart to answer the above query.
- Please refer to detail 04 on drawing – 23-035/102 which shows an oversized continuous concrete gravel board is proposed at the base of the fence to direct water accordingly. the concrete gravel board presents a less permeable option than a masonry wall which has numerous mortar joints. For ease we have attached the detail 04 (Appendix H – Condition 10: boundary detail)

2024/90236 (condition 11, 12 & 14)

Condition 11 (ecology design strategy): May be discharged.

Condition 12 (external facing materials): The Conservation Team and I have concerns over the proposed material. They have requested a natural material, which would be welcomed by myself however not insisted upon. However, I share concerns over the specific artificial material proposed. The site is in the setting of several listed buildings and a high-quality art stone that respects and harmonises with these natural materials is needed. I'd ask that a sample panel be constructed on site for a direct comparison. Given the concerns over the current material, it is advised that either two or three different samples be prepared for comparison, in the interest of speed. If a dyed product is to be considered it should be subtle.

SC1 RESPONSE

- condition 12 (timescale: prior to occupation)
- refer to appendix J for images and further details of the sample proposals
- The council have requested that the mill building in close proximity to the site be used as a reference and the new material should be sympathetic to this. The existing stonework of the mill building has rounded corners and a relatively smooth face.
- Proposed stonework – Cromwell Rustic Weathered reconstituted stone by Marshalls or similar. Colours: Weathered, Brown, Yorkstone (buff).
- Pending acceptance in principle of the above/attached sample panels will then be built on site

Condition 14 (boundary treatments):

- You have submitted the following plan: This has a materially different arrangement to the rear gardens to the approved plans: [filedownload.aspx \(kirklees.gov.uk\)](#) Condition 2 of the permission requires your works match the approved plans, which the latest plan would not be. Either a S73 or Non-Material Amendment application would be required, depending on the extent and impact of the change.
- The site plan should clearly denote where each different boundary treatment is to be sited. A coloured key showing the route of each type of boundary should be included. The front stone wall should be faced in materials to match the dwellings, so is subject to the above being resolved.

SC1 RESPONSE

- The above statement relates to condition 14 (boundary treatments). timescale: prior to occupation.
- Our structural engineer is currently in dialogue with the local authority highways dept and is preparing perimeter boundary details for a technical approval submission.
- Once Technical Approval has been achieved the site plan will be updated and re-issued to planning under a non-material amendment.
- Ongoing.

2024/90237 (condition 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 09 & 18)

Condition 3 (CEMP): Concerns exist, see the below feedback:

- Hours of work: Oppose Saturday working until 1800. Advise this should be 1300, unless specific justification for a longer period is provided.
- Construction vehicle sizes and routes: No details of size or routing provided. Routing means to the site, not within. The route should avoid difficult local roads, such as Dodlee and Longwood Gate. Approaching from the north / west in general should be avoided, with a route via Milnsbridge being most suitable.
- Location of HGV waiting areas and details of their management: Consideration should be given to unloading within the site. If not feasible, this should be demonstrated. If on-road is needed, the location should be shown on plan along with evidence that it would be safe (i.e., not affecting sightlines, blocking junctions, bus movements).
- Parking for construction workers: 4 spaces is limited and parking on Britannia Road. Can 4 additional spaces not be provided to the left of the in point as well? If not, as above if on-road is needed, the location should be shown on plan along with evidence that it would be safe (i.e., not affecting sightlines, blocking junctions, bus movements).
- Measures to be taken to minimise the deposit of mud, grit and dirt: Confirmation of water discharge point for cleaning should be provided: muddy / silty water discharging onto the highway is a cause for concern. Also, it is stated that 'Drivers will check their wheels...'. Given that deliveries from 3rd parties will take place, therefore not necessarily being aware of this requirement, it should be the responsibility of the site manager to check and ensure wheels are clean.
- Engagement: What engagement will be undertaken; specifics should be provided.

SC1 RESPONSE

- condition 3 (CEMP). timescale: prior to commencement.
- Please refer to Appendix A (rev A) & drawing 23035-104 rev A - PLANNING CEMP which have been updated to reflect the above requests.

- FYI – the updates have been shown in blue on the revised Appendix A

Condition 4 (public right of way): We advise that a photo survey of the routes around the site be undertaken to establish the baseline. This is in your interest, to demonstrate the current state of the PROW to avoid any situation where pre-existing damage is attributed to you. I'd also ask for a definitive statement that no medium vehicles or HGV will be taken on any PROW route.

SC1 RESPONSE

- condition 4 (PROW). timescale: prior to commencement.
- Please find attached Appendix K which provides the requested information relating to the PROW. We have also made a definitive statement regarding construction traffic NOT accessing the PROW's.

Condition 5 (retaining walls): Insufficient details have been provided. See comments from K.C. Structures:

K.C. Structures

I would like to advise that condition 5 (retaining structures) can not be discharged pending the submission of a fully dimensioned X-sectional detail along the eastern boundary of the site adjacent to PROW (Ref HD/451/10) (based on max retained height) to determine whether the proposed retaining structure will be liable to a formal technical approval (via submission of an AIP). The sectional detail will need to include the full width of the private access road and the exact location and width of the PROW that runs along it.

SC1 RESPONSE

- condition 5 (retaining wall). timescale: prior to commencement.
- Our structural engineer is currently in dialogue with the local authority highways dept and is preparing details for a technical approval submission.
- Once Technical Approval has been achieved the relevant detail will be updated and re-issued to planning.
- Ongoing.

Condition 6 (Phase II Report), **7** (Remediation Strategy), **9** (Remediation Validation Report): The submitted documents have previously been refused and objected to. See comments from K.C. Environmental Health at

KC Environmental Health (Pollution & Noise Control) - The reports include geo-technical information, which is outside the remit of Environmental Health, this consultation response therefore only relates to the land contamination aspects of the reports. Environmental Health have already reviewed this document as part of our comments for previous permission 2021/92062. We raised several points in our response dated 18th August 2021, that require clarification. We understand that works have commenced onsite. We require clarification on these points raised in our response dated 18th August 2021, and a statement that confirms the status of the site, before we can further consider the application to discharge Conditions 6, 7, and 9 on previous permission 2021/92062. For these reasons, Conditions 6, 7 and 9 must remain until further notice.

KC Environmental Health (Pollution & Noise Control) response letter dated 18th august 2021)

Having read the report, we have identified a few points requiring clarification:

1. In the updated Conceptual Site Model (Section 10), made ground is referred to in several parts of the table. However, in Section 5 of the report where the ground conditions are described there is no reference to made ground. This appears contradictory and does not correspond to the borehole logs presented in the Appendix. We require clarification as to whether made ground was present. If this is not the case, CSM should be updated appropriately.
2. In the updated Conceptual Site Model (Section 10), made ground soils on site containing hydrocarbons are referred to. The table refers to vapour intrusion. However, the report details in Section 8.3 that no exceedances in organic determinants were identified. It remains unclear why a risk from vapour intrusion is identified. Again, it is also unclear why made ground is referred to when these samples were reportedly from topsoil horizons. Clarification is necessary.
3. We acknowledge the ground gas data provided, however in Section 6 of the report it is detailed that groundwater was encountered in every monitoring round. However, no commentary has been provided in relation to the impact of water ingress in the response zones of the monitoring wells. As such, we consider the ground gas regime characterisation incomplete until further information is received.

We also note that no revised remediation strategy has been provided since our last consultation response dated 14th July 2021. It remains that we do not consider the report 'Land Remediation statement from Eco Control Solutions' to be a robust remediation strategy.

We consider a robust remediation strategy to be a report that indicates how the proposed remediation measures will be implemented and remove any unacceptable risks identified from the Phase 1 and Phase 2 investigation. The requirements for a robust remediation strategy are indicated in the Land Contamination Risk Management (LCRM) guidance. Additionally, the Yorkshire and Lincolnshire Pollution Advisory Group (YALPAG) have produced technical guidance for the development on contaminated land. Their document, Development on Land Affected by Contamination: Technical Guidance for Developers, Landowners and Consultants (dated June 2020, version 11.2) should also be consulted.

SC1 RESPONSE

- condition 6, 7 & 9. timescale: prior to commencement.
- Specialist input requested, information will be issued through to the planning department when SC1 are in receipt.
- Ongoing.

Condition 18 (Japanese Knotwood): May be discharged.

Kind Regards,

Richard Jones