

## Search application details

Application number: 2024/44/92519/W	
What is the application for?:	Discharge of details reserved by conditions 3 (Construction (Environmental) Mana
Address of the site or building:	Victoria Tower, Lumb Lane, Castle Hill, Almondbury, Huddersfield, HD4 6TA
Postcode:	

## User comments

Type of comment: An objection	
Do you wish your comments to be published on the website anonymously?	Yes
<p>I have gone through the documents on the Kirklees Planning Applications site viz. Castle Hill, Almondbury, 2024.</p> <p>The most pertinent was Planning application No. 2024/44/92519/W (id. 1061445) from Historic England.</p> <p>Written 4 October 2024, and recorded by Kirklees 8 October 2024.</p> <p>To quote:</p> <p>"We consider that there are limitations to the information submitted in respect of the Discharge Conditions. Your authority should reflect on the issues that we had raised in our several responses to the scheme and the conditions imposed as a consequence of those concerns.</p> <p>We are therefore recommending that the information does not in our view address the points we raised and does not appear to be sufficient to discharge the condition(s). We would remind your authority that Scheduled Monument Consent will be required in advance of any works on site".</p> <p>In response to the latest documents/submission relating to Castle Hill requesting an extension.</p> <p>HDAS as a committee is aware that the requirements in Section 104 from Historic England have not been fully met, even though Kirklees granted planning consent in February 2022.</p> <p>It remains our opinion that the plan is misguided in its conception, and that when planning consent was eventually granted it over-rid the concerns documented by the the various agencies consulted at the time.</p> <p>In view of the continued objections raised by Historic England (Planning Application No: 2024/44/92519/W; id. 1061445, dated 04/10/2024) and our own objections submitted prior to the Strategic Planning Committee's decision in 2022, we therefore object to Kirklees continuing with this proposal.</p>	