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:	**2024/62/92902/W**
Site Address:	Spring Hall Mount, Binn Lane, Marsden, Huddersfield, HD7 6NW
Description:	Erection of boundary fence and driveway gates and installation of replacement guttering (Listed Building)
Recommending Officer:	Nicole Helliwell

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.

Sarah Longbottom

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 27-Feb-2025

Officer Report

Reference No. 2024/62/92902/E

Site Address: Spring Hall Mount, Binn Lane, Marsden, Huddersfield, HD7 6NW

Proposal: Erection of boundary fence and driveway gates (Listed Building)

Site Description

The application relates to Spring Hall Mount, a two-storey detached property located in Marsden, Huddersfield. The dwelling was constructed late 18th Century and is Grade II listed. The property is faced in hammer dressed stone and incorporates a dual-pitched roof finished in stone slate. The dwelling is also situated within the Green Belt and within a bat alert area. The site is not within a conservation area, nor are there any Public Rights of Way (PROW) within close proximity to the site.

Description of Proposal

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for the erection of a boundary fence and driveway gates. The proposed post and rail fence would measure approximately 1.3m to 1.8m in height. The fence would be set back approx. 1m from the highway and would be treated but left unpainted. The gate proposed would be a traditional 'Stocksmoor' Design by Job Earnshaw and would have an overall height of approximately 1.1m.

History of negotiations / amendments received

Amendments were sought during the course of the application. KC Conservation and Design were consulted on the proposal and did confirm that the retrospective fence does impact the immediate setting of Spring Hall Mount. A request was made to partly reduce the height of the fence along the south-eastern boundary of the site. Revised drawings were received which were considered acceptable in this regard.

Relevant Planning History

- **2024/92903:** Listed Building Consent for erection of boundary fence and driveway gates and installation of replacement guttering. Planning application details | Kirklees Council – Pending Consideration
- **2022/93114:** Listed Building Consent for Installation of solar panels on annex. Planning application details | Kirklees Council – Consent Granted
- **2022/93113:** Installation of solar panels on annex. Planning application details | Kirklees Council – Conditional Full Permission
- **2021/90629:** Erection of detached summer house (Listed Building). Planning application details | Kirklees Council – Conditional Full Permission
- **2015/90495:** Erection of detached building to create dwelling forming annex accommodation associated with Spring Hall Mount, Binn Lane, Marsden, Huddersfield, HD7 6NW (within the curtilage of a Listed Building). Planning application details | Kirklees Council - Conditional Full Permission
- **2013/92880:** Discharge of conditions 4 (material samples) and 10 (garage door details) on previous application no. 2010/90653 for erection of split level building to provide ancillary living accommodation and garage (within the curtilage of a listed building). Planning application details | Kirklees Council – Discharge of Conditions Approved
- **2011/90039:** Listed Building Consent for internal alterations, retrospective mullion reinstatement, replacement windows and alteration of existing window opening to form a door opening. Planning application details | Kirklees Council – Consent Granted
- **2010/90654:** Listed Building Consent for erection of split level building and garage. Planning application details | Kirklees Council - Withdrawn
- **2010/90653:** Erection of split level building to provide ancillary living accommodation and garage (within the curtilage of a listed building). Planning application details | Kirklees Council - Conditional Full Permission
- **2006/95117:** Erection of split level building to provide ancillary living accommodation and garage (within curtilage of a listed building). Planning application details | Kirklees Council – Conditional Full Permission

Representations

The application was publicised by site notice, press advertisement and neighbour notification letters, which expired on 29th November 2024. As a result of the above publicity, 20 representations have been received. The comments made have been summarised below:

Objections (3 Representations)

- Why are the applicants applying for permission for their fence to remain?
- If listed properties on Binn Lane are supposed to have wooden gutters, why should Spring Hall Mount be exempt?
- Why could Spring Hall Mount attach their patio fence permanently to their wall without having listed building consent?

- I consider therefore the wooden fence in its current position, except for my area of land, should be replaced with a dry stone wall.
- Wooden gutters are a feature of these listed buildings, and to request an alternative when other people in the area have continued with heritage guttering is not consistent.
- I have issues with the design statement as it has been written from the viewpoint of the applicants whilst leaving out significant and relevant details of the narrative and the current situation.
- The applicants are relying I believe on Ordinance Survey information which does not correlate with topographical information, as the 1928 deed plan does, and OS was never designed to characterise a border.
- There is a border dispute concerning the second part of the fence that goes into what I term my triangle of land, appropriated by the applicants.
- My drive contractor and I realised in view of border issues that there would be difficulties that I cited in my planning application for my new drive. Therefore, for safety in the event of legal action left the current border structures in place, however the existing fence, gate and gateposts are mine. Planning was complied with, there was no breach. My drive was built to plan but behind rather than on the border of my fence. Enforcement had no objection to the above, after in depth discussion. the current fence in a straight line following the border rather than zigzag in and out, it would serve the same purpose for them.
- I consider planning enforcement made the correct decision and the pallets and other items they mention are a matter of aesthetic sensitivity and those on my wall were never a permanent feature but were serving a very useful purpose.
- It was not a barricade. It is my choice how I use my land. Case law re Town and Country planning reinforces my viewpoint.

<u>Supporting Comments (17 Representations)</u>

- Fence looks brilliant, offering shelter and privacy. The design and materials used are in keeping with the natural surroundings and environment.
- I see no problems for this fence being erected, it is in keeping with the surroundings being made of wood.

  The planning of the fence is a fabulous idea for privacy and safety. Especially the way it’s been erected and matches in with the surrounding area.
- The timber design is excellent, better than concrete and in keeping with the area.
- The property will no longer be overlooked, which gives excellent privacy for both parties. Overall, a great move forward.
- The new fence and guttering is totally in keeping with the property and its surroundings.

- The work has been carried to a high standard and enhances the other improvements made to the property by its current owners.
- The fence provides a tasteful addition to the security and privacy of the property and is aesthetically pleasing.
  We think the addition of the fence and gate greatly add to the privacy and security of Spring Hall Mount and are certainly in keeping with the surroundings. Spring Hall Mount has been tastefully and sympathetically improved over the last 14 years and is a credit to the owners of the property. The boundary fencing is appropriate and in keeping with the area.
- The shelter has allowed the area to flourish with wild plants, and the benefits to the biodiversity are not to be underestimated.
- I regularly walk past this property and the fencing and gate is of high quality, aesthetically pleasing and is in keeping with the local rural setting.
- I pass this property regularly on my walks and have really enjoyed seeing the progress of the developments over the years. The work is sympathetic and also in keeping with the area and surrounding buildings.
- The recent addition of a fence and gates really complements the work that has gone on previously and creates a little more privacy and security without being out of character.
- I believe the addition of this fence adds quality to the building and fits within the natural beauty of Binn moor.
- It enhances safety for animals and young children at this residence as the property is located next to a road with a national speed limit so the fence will stop animals and children running onto the road.
- This fence also adds much needed privacy from the neighbouring property.
- The owners of this house have every right to place a secure and safe boundary fence on their property which is also attractive and well maintained.
- They also have dogs which keep them safe.
- Please support this application which enhances these beautiful surroundings.
- As a regular walker in the area, I think the fence looks great. Not only does it add to the natural aesthetic, it creates privacy and a clear divide of both properties.
- I don't have any objection to this fencing which is of good design and quality and made of natural materials. I don't think it interferes with the character of the area. I haven't noticed the guttering.
- As a regular walker in the area, this fence has much improved the location when compared to the piled up pallets, tubs and other waste building material that has been used as a boundary between the properties previously.
- This fence and gate enhance the property while also providing privacy to the owners. It all looks very tasteful and professional and presumably came at great financial cost to the owners.

- The fence benefits both neighbouring parties. Allowing privacy. The fence is well made and great appearance.
- There is a considerable amount of poorly maintained boundaries in the upper edges of the village and this fence looks attractive and improves the general appearance of the area.

Consultation Responses

KC Conservation & Design – Whilst the fence does impact the immediate setting of Spring Hall Mount, Officers have confirmed that the fence can remain providing that it is partly reduced in height.

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 located within the designated Green Belt on the Kirklees Local Plan Proposals Map. The site is also sited within the Strategic Green Infrastructure Network as indicated within the Kirklees Local Plan. The most relevant policies for consideration in this case are:

Kirklees Local Plan Policies

- **LP 1** - Achieving Sustainable Development
  LP 2 - Place Shaping
- **LP 21** - Highways and Access
- **LP 22** - Parking
- **LP 24** - Design
- **LP 35** - Historic Environment
- **LP 31** - Strategic Green Infrastructure Network
- **LP 52** - Protection and Improvement of Environmental Quality
- **LP 57** - Extension, Alterations or Replacement within Green Belt

Kirklees Council adopted supplementary planning guidance on house extensions on 29th June 2021 which now carries full weight in decision making. This guidance indicates how the Council will usually interpret its policies regarding such built development, although the general thrust of the advice is aligned with both the Kirklees Local Plan (KLP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), requiring development to be considerate in terms of the character of the host property and the wider street scene. As such, it is anticipated that this SPD will assist with ensuring enhanced consistency in both approach and outcomes relating to house extensions.

In this case, the following SPDs are applicable:

- Highways Design Guide SPD (adopted 4th November 2019)
- House Extensions and Alterations SPD (adopted 29th June 2021)
- Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Advice Note (adopted 29th June 2021)

National Policies and Guidance:
National planning policy and guidance is set out in National Policy Statements, primarily the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published December 2024, 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 12** - Achieving Well-Designed Places
- **Chapter 13** - Protecting Green Belt Land
- **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

<u>Assessment</u>

1. Principle of development

<u>Impact on Green Belt</u>

The application site is located on land allocated as Green Belt on the Kirklees Local Plan (KLP). As such, the proposal will be assessed having regard to KLP Policy LP57 and Chapter 13 of the NPPF. The National Planning Policy Framework and the Kirklees Local Plan both support limited extensions to buildings within the Green Belt. For extensions within the Green Belt to be considered acceptable, it is essential that they should not impact on the open character of the Green Belt nor be discordant in themselves or in relation to the host property.

Paragraph 2.12 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD states that when considering any application, substantial weight will be given to any harm to the Green Belt and applications may be refused if it is considered that the development would result in the encroachment of urban character into a countryside setting.

Paragraphs 153 and 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that certain forms of development are exceptions to ‘inappropriate development’. One of these is the extension or alteration of a building, provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

The host property is a residential dwelling located off Binn Lane. In respect of the openness of the Green Belt, openness has been established to have both a visual and spatial aspect. The proposal would introduce additional built development within the Green Belt which would have some effect on the character and openness. The submitted plans confirm that a gate and a post and rail fence would be erected to enclose the occupant's private outdoor amenity space. However, given that this area of land has already been landscaped, the proposed development is not considered to impact openness. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development would preserve openness and would constitute appropriate development in the Green Belt in accordance with Policy LP57 of the Kirklees Local Plan and the guidance contained within Chapter 13 of the NPPF.

2. Impact on Visual Amenity and Historic Environment

Key Design Principle 1 of the House Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) does state that extensions and alterations to residential properties should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and local character of the area and the street scene. Furthermore, Key Design Principle 2 of the SPD goes onto state that extensions should not dominate or be larger than the original house and should be in keeping with the existing building in terms of scale, materials and details.

Paragraph 135(c) of the NPPF sets out that development should be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting. Furthermore, LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan requires development proposals affecting a designated heritage asset to preserve or enhance the significance of the asset, retaining those elements of the historic environment which contribute to the distinct identity of the Kirklees area and ensuring that proposals maintain and reinforce local distinctiveness.

Paragraph 210 of the NPPF is also of relevance and states that in determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

The application relates to a Grade II Listed building located in Marsden, Huddersfield. As such, KC Conservation and Design were formally consulted on the proposed scheme. The proposed post and rail fence would measure approximately 1.3m to 1.8m in height. The fence would be set back approx. 1m from the highway and would be treated but left unpainted. The gate proposed

would be a traditional ‘Stocksmoor’ Design by Job Earnshaw and would have an overall height of approximately 1.1m. The proposed development would be visually acceptable with regard to their materials, siting and design. For these reasons, the proposed development is not considered to have any significant visual impact on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area and therefore would be acceptable in this regard.

Summary

Having taken the above into account, the proposed development would not cause any significant harm to the visual amenity of either the host dwelling or the wider street scene, complying with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local, KDP 1 & 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document and the aims of Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Furthermore, the proposal would not cause any detrimental harm to the significance of the Listed Building and would comply with Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Chapter 16 of the NPPF and the requirements of Section 66 the Town & Country Planning (Listed Buildings & Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

3. Impact on Residential Amenity

Consideration in relation to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants shall now be set out, taking into account Policy LP24 c), which sets out that proposals should promote good design by, amongst other things, extensions minimising impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers. The SPD goes into further detail with respect to Key Design Principle 3 on privacy, Key Design Principle 5 on overshadowing/loss of light, Key Design Principle 6 on preventing overbearing impact and Key Principle 7 for outdoor space.

Due to its siting, the proposed boundary treatment and gate would not cause any additional overlooking, overbearing or overshadowing harm to the residential amenity of the adjacent neighbouring occupants, over and above the existing arrangements on site.

Summary

Having considered the above factors, the proposals are not considered to result in any adverse impact upon the residential amenity of any surrounding neighbouring occupants, complying with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan (b) in terms of the amenities of neighbouring properties, Key Design Principles 3, 5, 6 & 7 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and Paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. Impact on Highway Safety

Local Plan Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan are relevant and seek to ensure that proposals do not have a detrimental impact on highway safety and provide sufficient parking. Furthermore, Paragraph 116 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.

The proposed development would not materially intensify the use or affect the existing highway access and parking arrangements on site. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not cause detrimental harm to the safe and efficient operation of the highway network, in accordance with Policies LP21 and LP22 of the KLP, Chapter 9 of the NPPF, Principles 15 and 16 of the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations SPD and the Highways Design Guide SPD.

5. Other Matters

Carbon Budget

The proposal is a small-scale domestic development to an existing dwelling. As such, no special measures were required in terms of the planning application with regards to carbon emissions. However, there are controls in terms of Building Regulations which will need to be adhered to as part of the construction process which will require compliance with national standards.

Ecology

The application site is located within the bat alert layer on the Council's GIS mapping system. An advisory note will be attached to the decision notice. If signs of bats are found, work should immediately cease and the advice of a suitable professional sought.

There are no other matters relevant to the determination of this application.

6. Representations

20 representations were received following the statutory publicity. The comments made have been summarised and addressed below:

Objections (3 Representations)

- Why are the applicants applying for permission for their fence to remain?
  Response: *The proposed development requires planning permission.*

- If listed properties on Binn Lane are supposed to have wooden gutters, why should Spring Hall Mount be exempt?
- ***Response:*** *This alteration has been omitted from the planning application and is no longer under consideration.*

- Why could Spring Hall Mount attach their patio fence permanently to their wall without having listed building consent?
  Response: *Any construction works undertaken prior to determination are at the Applicant's own risk and may be subject to enforcement action.*

- I consider therefore the wooden fence in its current position, except for my area of land, should be replaced with a dry stone wall.
  Response: *The proposals potential impact on the appearance and character of the street scene has been assessed within the 'visual amenity' section of the report.*

- Wooden gutters are a feature of these listed buildings, and to request an alternative when other people in the area have continued with heritage guttering is not consistent.
  Response: *This alteration has been omitted from the planning application and is no longer under consideration.*

- I have issues with the design statement as it has been written from the viewpoint of the applicants whilst leaving out significant and relevant details of the narrative and the current situation.
- ***Response:*** *This would be a private matter and would not constitute a material planning consideration.*

- The applicants are relying I believe on Ordinance Survey information which does not correlate with topographical information, as the 1928 deed plan does, and OS was never designed to characterise a border.
  Response: *This would be a private matter and would not constitute a material planning consideration.*

- There is a border dispute concerning the second part of the fence that goes into what I term my triangle of land, appropriated by the applicants.
- ***Response:*** *This would be a private matter and would not constitute a material planning consideration.*
-
- My drive contractor and I realised in view of border issues that there would be difficulties that I cited in my planning application for my new drive. Therefore, for safety in the event of legal action left the current border structures in place, however the existing fence, gate and gateposts are mine. Planning was complied with, there was no breach. My drive was built to plan but behind rather than on the border of my fence. Enforcement had no objection to the above, after in depth discussion. the current fence in a straight line following the border rather than zigzag in and out, it would serve the same purpose for them.

Response: *This matter is not related to the current application and would not constitute a material planning consideration.*

- I consider planning enforcement made the correct decision and the pallets and other items they mention are a matter of aesthetic sensitivity and those on my wall were never a permanent feature but were serving a very useful purpose.
  Response: *This matter is not related to the current application and would not constitute a material planning consideration.*

- It was not a barricade. It is my choice how I use my land. Case law re Town and Country planning reinforces my viewpoint.
  Response: *This matter is not related to the current application and would not constitute a material planning consideration.*

<u>Supporting Comments (17 Representations)</u>

- Fence looks brilliant, offering shelter and privacy. The design and materials used are in keeping with the natural surroundings and environment.
- I see no problems for this fence being erected, it is in keeping with the surroundings being made of wood.
  The planning of the fence is a fabulous idea for privacy and safety. Especially the way it's been erected and matches in with the surrounding area.
- The timber design is excellent, better than concrete and in keeping with the area.
- The property will no longer be overlooked, which gives excellent privacy for both parties. Overall, a great move forward.
- The new fence and guttering is totally in keeping with the property and its surroundings.
- The work has been carried to a high standard and enhances the other improvements made to the property by its current owners.
- The fence provides a tasteful addition to the security and privacy of the property and is aesthetically pleasing.
  We think the addition of the fence and gate greatly add to the privacy and security of Spring Hall Mount and are certainly in keeping with the surroundings. Spring Hall Mount has been tastefully and sympathetically improved over the last 14 years and is a credit to the owners of the property. The boundary fencing is appropriate and in keeping with the area.
- The shelter has allowed the area to flourish with wild plants, and the benefits to the biodiversity are not to be underestimated.
- I regularly walk past this property and the fencing and gate is of high quality, aesthetically pleasing and is in keeping with the local rural setting.

- I pass this property regularly on my walks and have really enjoyed seeing the progress of the developments over the years. The work is sympathetic and also in keeping with the area and surrounding buildings.
- The recent addition of a fence and gates really complements the work that has gone on previously and creates a little more privacy and security without being out of character.
- I believe the addition of this fence adds quality to the building and fits within the natural beauty of Binn moor.
- It enhances safety for animals and young children at this residence as the property is located next to a road with a national speed limit so the fence will stop animals and children running onto the road.
- This fence also adds much needed privacy from the neighbouring property.
- The owners of this house have every right to place a secure and safe boundary fence on their property which is also attractive and well maintained.
- They also have dogs which keep them safe.
- Please support this application which enhances these beautiful surroundings.
- As a regular walker in the area, I think the fence looks great. Not only does it add to the natural aesthetic, it creates privacy and a clear divide of both properties.
- I don't have any objection to this fencing which is of good design and quality and made of natural materials. I don't think it interferes with the character of the area. I haven't noticed the guttering.
- As a regular walker in the area, this fence has much improved the location when compared to the piled up pallets, tubs and other waste building material that has been used as a boundary between the properties previously.
- This fence and gate enhance the property while also providing privacy to the owners. It all looks very tasteful and professional and presumably came at great financial cost to the owners.
- The fence benefits both neighbouring parties. Allowing privacy. The fence is well made and great appearance.
- There is a considerable amount of poorly maintained boundaries in the upper edges of the village and this fence looks attractive and improves the general appearance of the area.

7. Conclusion

This application for the erection of boundary fence and driveway gates at Spring Hall Mount has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan as listed in the policy section of the report, the House Extensions and Alterations SPD, the National Planning Policy Framework and other material considerations. Given the acceptable design and lack of harm in terms of visual

and residential amenity, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable.

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 development would constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation: Approve

Decision Authorisation - Delegated Powers
Application Number: 2024/92902
Officer Recommendation: Approve
Conditions and Reasons

1. 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 to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development on completion, and to accord with Policies LP1, LP2, LP21, LP22, LP24, LP35, LP31, LP52 and LP57 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Key Design Principles 1 & 2 of the House Extensions and Alterations SPD and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Within 3 months of the decision, the post and rail fence hereby approved shall be lowered in accordance with the 'Revised Plan for Fence' (dated 10th December 2024) and thereafter retained.
Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to comply with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

NOTE: The granting of planning permission does not override any private legal rights or consents that may be required. It is the responsibility of the applicant / developer to ensure that all appropriate consents are in place prior to any development commencing; during the period of construction existing access for neighbouring properties is maintained; and no damage is caused to the access driveway or surrounding properties.

NOTE: Due to its location, a bat roost may be present on site. Bats are a European protected species under regulation 41 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. It is an offence for anyone intentionally to kill, injure or handle a bat, disturb a roosting bat, or sell or offer a bat for sale without a licence. It is also an offence to damage, destroy or obstruct access to any place used by bats for shelter, whether they are present or not. If bats are discovered on site development shall cease and the applicant is advised to contact Natural England for advice.

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 the works may be carried out.

Plans and specifications schedule:

Plan Type	**Reference**	**Revision**	**Date Received**
Location Plan	TQRQM21018124532250	-	10/10/2024
Block Plan	-	-	10/10/2024
Spring Hall Mount – Rear Fence/Gate	-	-	10/10/2024
Revised Plan for Fence	-	-	19/12/2024
Design Statement 2	-	-	19/12/2024

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 Planning Authority have, where possible, made a pre-application advice service available, complied with the Kirklees Development Management Charter 2024 and otherwise actively engaged with the applicant in dealing with the application. Amendments were received during the course of the application, following comments from KC Conservation and Design. Revised drawings were provided which were considered acceptable.

Report Dated: 25/02/2025