

RE: Lidl, Birstall - list of draft conditions

Lucy Sime <lucy.sime@lichfields.uk>
To: William Simcock; Gary Rafferty
Cc: Katie Jones; Christopher Darley

Reply Reply All Forward [Share] [More]

Mon 12/05/2025 17:59

Official
7404-SMR-00-ZZ-DR-A-3003-S3-C10 - PROPOSED SITE PLAN(33563225.1).pdf 1 MB
7404-SMR-00-ZZ-DR-A-2003-S3-PROPOSED SITE PLAN-C13(33563224.1).pdf 1 MB

I take note of your comments about the Travel Plans, which I shall add to the list of approved documents. [Thank you](#)

Condition 6 – you have asked for this to be changed to a compliance condition. I noticed in the plans table that the six documents referred to in your note (Kerbing and white lining etc) are in the plans table. I can find no record of Kirklees Highways Development Management having viewed, commented on or approved them. I do however have email correspondence on file from 16-Sep-2024 from the Highway Design (S278) team to your highway consultant which states confirmation that your attached drawings 23-435-S184-100-001 [General Arrangement Levels and Drainage](#), S184-200-001 [Site Clearance and Statutory Undertakers](#), S184-700-001 [Pavements](#), S184-1100-001 [Kerbing and White Lining](#) together with 23-435-S106-100-001 RevA [General Arrangement and Visibility Splays](#) and S106-100-002 [Section 106 Construction Details](#) are approved for construction. If these are the same references then it can be changed to a compliance condition. [Thanks William, these are the same documents I referenced – I’ve added the titles in to the list for ease.](#)

With condition (15), it is noted that a BEMP has been submitted. The Council Ecologist did not comment in detail on the submitted BEMP but did not raise any specific concerns with its scope or level of detail, and I would therefore surmise that it is acceptable given the scale of the development. So I am happy for this to be made a compliance condition referring to the BEMP [Thank you](#)

I’m sorry if I was under a misapprehension about the above two conditions, these things aren’t always completely clear and straightforward when one planning officer takes over from another mid-way through the process, as was the case here. [I appreciate this, thanks for addressing this now.](#)

I will update my report and conditions accordingly and send it to you. [Thank you](#) Unfortunately I do not think it likely that we will be able to issue a decision much before Tuesday next week, if you can agree to Monday 19-May as the new target date I will aim to meet it. [I’m just running this past Lidl and will come back to you.](#)

One other relatively minor thing I am still unclear about. In the list of approved plans your colleague sent me, the following both appear:

Proposed Site Plan	7404 - SMR - 00 - ZZ - DR - A - 3003 - C10	1:200
	S4 - C10	
Proposed Site/Surfacing Plan - Planning	7404 - SMR - 00 - ZZ - DR - A - 2003 - A3 - C13	1:500

You have asked for the references to be updated to refer to the site / surfacing plan, reference ending C13. Does this mean that the “Proposed Site Plan” is no longer relevant? [Sorry for the confusion – the first one ‘Proposed site Plan 7404 - SMR - 00 - ZZ - DR - A - 3003 - S4 - C10’ demonstrates the indicative fire hydrant location on Bankwood Way and 100m radius which was to aid the discussions with Yorkshire Water and for information. The ‘Proposed Site/Surfacing Plan – Planning 7404 - SMR - 00 - ZZ - DR - A - 2003 - A3 - C13’ plan should be the approved site plan listed.](#)

Thanks

Lucy

Kind regards

William Simcock