

**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:	2025/62/90527/E
Site Address:	Land adj, 67, Elm Tree Close, Norristhorpe, Liversedge, WF15 7BU
Description:	Change of use of land to domestic garden, formation of access and hard surfacing and erection of 2.0m high fencing, greenhouse and gazebo
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: 09 September 2025

Officer Report

Reference no. 2025/62/90527/E

Site Address: Land adj, 67, Elm Tree Close, Norristhorpe, Liversedge, WF15 7BU

Proposal: Change of use of land to domestic garden, formation of access and hard surfacing and erection of 2.0m high fencing, greenhouse and gazebo

Site Description

The application relates to a parcel of land located to the south of 67 Elm Tree Close, a two-storey terraced property situated in Norristhorpe, Liversedge. The surrounding area comprises residential properties of similar materials and architectural styles. The site is not within a conservation area, nor are there any listed buildings nearby. However, public right of way SPE/141/40 is located to the south and public right of way SPE/145/20 is located to the east of the application site.

Description of Proposal

The applicant is seeking retrospective planning permission for the change of use of land to domestic garden, formation of access and hard surfacing and erection of 2.0m high fencing, greenhouse and gazebo. The details of the proposal are summarised below:

- The timber fence would span the perimeter of the site and would have an overall height of 2m.
- The timber gates would be installed along the southern boundary of the site and would have an overall height of 2m.
- Gazebo (width approx. 2m, depth approx. 2.3m and an overall height of approx. 2.5m)
- Greenhouse (width approx. 1.5m, depth approx. 1.5m and an overall height of approx. 2.4m)
- Formation of access and hard surfacing

History of negotiations/amendments received

Amendments were sought during the course of the application. KC Highways Development Management did raise concerns regarding visibility and pedestrian/vehicle intervisibility. However, a revised site plan (reference no. 200 rev B) was submitted showing the fence set back to 1m from the carriageway edge of Lodge Lane, which was considered acceptable with regard to highway safety.

Relevant Planning History

2004/93390: Outline application for residential development (2 dwellings).
Planning application details | Kirklees Council – Withdrawn

Representations

The application was advertised by site notice, which expired on 8th May 2024. As a result of the above publicity, 21 representations have been received. The comments made have been summarised below:

General Comments (1 Representation)

Good use has been made of land, and fence stops any fly tipping taking place

Supporting Comments (8 Representations)

- I use the footpath what goes down the side of the land and behind the houses, the people who have bought the land has cleared the footpath that runs behind the fence, this has made the access better when taking the bins in & out.
- I don't see for any objections to what they have already done, the fence is not as high as the wall next door, you can see through the fence and the bit of land looks tidy so I do not have any objection.
- I have lived on the close for many years, I live opposite the land and have no objections to the fence, the hight of the fence or the change of use of the land .
- We have dog walked past the plot 2or 3 times a day over the last 10 years, passing an unsightly, dog toilet, overgrown dumping ground. But not now, the new owners deserve a real thankyou from local residents, the area as never looked as pleasant and tidy.
- Since it was bought from the original developers a year or so ago, the new owners have tidied up the area to make an enclosed garden with much needed planting of various trees, shrubs and flowers. It therefore looks a considerable improvement on its previous derelict state.
- The plan is a positive step for the environment, and the surrounding area.
- It will now be used for assisting nature and protecting wildlife, insects and bees, as all the planting has been thoughtfully considered for each season.
- The surrounding wooden fence is in keeping with nature and in no way obstructs views.
- Repurposing the site has eliminated my worries.
- I haven't heard or seen any anti-social behaviour since the enclosure of the plot; but some other residents are closer to the site.
- For me the biggest impact is visual. The fence is not strictly out of keeping with the open-plan nature of the surroundings. Perhaps its uncompromising appearance might be improved with a colour wash.

- People may be objecting to the fence blocking their view, I have a photo taken by myself which shows the little amount of fence you can see because of all the cars & vans parked in front of the fence when people are home from work.
- I have no objection to either the fence or garden as I think it is an improvement.
- Before the work done, this was a bit of an eye sore with overgrown grass and weeds and litter. Now it looks extremely neat and tidy and I notice lots of plants have been planted in which looks lovely.
- I can't see any negatives in general or for the residents nearby.

Objections (12 Representations)

- The fence has already been erected and the land tarmacked. This was done in 2024, since doing this they have had parties on the land resulting in my property being covered in fireworks and ash.
- It is also ruining the views.
- Not sure why the fence has been already put up when planning permission was not yet passed.
- It is unsightly to look at what once was a beautiful view from my windows now is a wooden 6 foot fence.
- We did not have the opportunity to object before it was put up.
- This area should be left open and unspoilt as it now ruins the area and street scene.
- I think that the fence is too high, not in keeping with the surroundings.
- It has barbed wire around the top on the inside of the fence which is dangerous to wildlife and neighbouring cats.
- Trees have been planted which could over grow the height of the fence and in time block sunlight from neighbouring properties.
- I'm not opposed to the fence but believe it's too high.
- It's worth noting also that Highways Dept need to be informed that an entrance gate has been formed on a safe vehicle passing area on lodge lane! Another reason why this area should remain an ElmTree Close area, and not Lodge Lanes.
- Please all look at your title deeds as this is public open space and absolutely ruins the cul de sac.
- I cannot upload the original look off Google maps, but stress strongly that it looked better before with grass and sitting bench left open and peaceful.
- I would invite you to look on Google Maps as this area was very tidy and grass regularly cut by local residents and has never ever been a dumping ground.
- People of ElmTree Close used this for their families. Now it's blocked off with a big ugly fence with consideration at all for us residents and totally spoils the street scene!!

- This area has now been decimated by this high fence and spoils the street scene and should be taken down and left open and grassed as it was before and not used as someone's dumping ground.
- I wish to object to the above application on the basis of impact on residential amenity and impact on the street scene.
- If the land is designated as Greenbelt, then I object as this is inappropriate development.
- The planning application has been raised retrospectively as the work has already been completed.
- It appears to be used for social events causing increased noise level.
- Bonfire night the remains of fireworks were left in the road and cars were covered in soot.
- The fence has spoiled the views of many residents. It appears the owners have no consideration for the residents of Elm Tree Close.
- The land to my knowledge is supposed to be open land and was originally designated to be a children's play area.
- I've been a resident on ETC since 1987 and I've enjoyed looking out and enjoyed the view I vigorously oppose to this land being fenced off with a 2 meter fence and with trees planted.
- This area is a designated P.O.S. Requirement approved with the original application for the residents of ElmTree Close and as such should be covenanted so.
- How has this applicant got hold of this area belonging to Kirklees for public use, or are they trying to claim it by putting a fence round it?
- This applicant has also cunningly put that it's adjacent No.67 Elm Tree trying to pass it off that they're applying for additional garden when they live on Lodge Lane nothing to do with ElmTree Close.
- Do not approve this as garden because then he will apply for a dwelling and it's ElmTree Close land and should remain so.
- We residents could desperately use this for parking as an option and not segregated from the Cul de Sac.

Parish/Town Council Comments

Not Applicable.

Local Ward Members

Not Applicable.

Consultation Responses

The following is a brief summary of Consultee advice (more details are contained in the 'Assessment' section of the report, where appropriate):

The Mining Remediation Authority – No objection

KC Environmental Health – No comments

KC Highways Development Management – No objection

Planning Policy Background

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 on the Kirklees Local Plan Proposals Map. The most relevant policies for consideration in this case are:

- **LP 1** - Achieving Sustainable Development
- **LP 2** - Place Shaping
- **LP 21** - Highway Safety and Access
- **LP 22** - Parking
- **LP 24** - Design
- **LP 30** - Biodiversity & Geodiversity
- **LP 52** - Protection and Improvement of Environmental Quality

In this case, the following SPDs are applicable:

- Highways Design Guide SPD (adopted 4th November 2019)
- 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) updated 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. Most specifically in this instance, the below chapters are of most relevance:

- **Chapter 2** - Achieving Sustainable Development
- **Chapter 4** - Decision-Making
- **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

Assessment

1. Principle of Development

The site is without notation on the Kirklees Local Plan (KLP). Policy LP1 of the KLP states that when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the NPPF. In terms of extending and making alterations to a property, Policy LP24 of the KLP is relevant and Chapter 12 of the NPPF, regarding design.

In this case, the principle of development on the application site is considered acceptable, and shall be assessed against other material planning considerations, including visual and residential amenity, as well as highway safety.

1. Impact on Visual Amenity

Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan states that proposals should promote good design by ensuring the form, scale, layout, and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape.

The NPPF also offers guidance relating to design in Chapter 12 (achieving well designed places) whereby Paragraph 131 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.”

As the land did not previously have a designated purpose, it is considered that any harm caused by changing the use would be neutral. The submitted plans confirm that the proposed boundary treatment would comprise a fence which would span the perimeter of the site. The fence would be constructed from timber and would have an overall height of 2m. In addition, a timber gate would be installed along the southern boundary of the site and would have an overall height of 2m. Although the boundary treatment would have visibility from public vantage points, given that the proposed works would be of a domestic scale, they are not considered to have any significant visual impact on the character and appearance of the host property.

Having taken into account the above, it is considered that the proposed development would be acceptable from a visual amenity perspective, in accordance with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 12 of the NPPF.

2. Impact on Residential Amenity

Consideration in relation to the impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupants shall now be outlined, 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.

Due to its siting, the proposed development 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. Therefore, having considered the above factors, the proposal is 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 and Paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. 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.

This application seeks approval for the change of use of land to domestic garden, formation of access and hard surfacing and erection of 2.0m high fencing, greenhouse and gazebo at Land adjacent to 67 Elm Tree Close, Norristhorpe, Liversedge. The site is located at the south-eastern end of Elm Tree Close, to the eastern side of the turning-head at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Access to the site is via Lodge Lane, which runs perpendicular to Elm Tree Close, and comprises a single-track road (and footpath SPE/141/40), with a passing place to the front of the site. To the eastern side of the site, adjacent to the boundary, is a footpath (SPE/145/20) which leads to Norristhorpe Lane to the north.

Whilst Highways Development Management had generally no objection to the use of the site for parking, officers did raise concerns regarding visibility and pedestrian/vehicle intervisibility. A revised site plan (reference no. 200 rev B) was submitted which shows the fence set back to 1m from the carriageway edge of Lodge Lane. Based on the revised drawing, KC Highways Development Management have no further objection to this proposal.

In view of the above, 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 Kirklees Local Plan, guidance within the Council's Highways Design Guide SPD, and Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. 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.

In this case, due to the nature of the proposal is not considered reasonable to require the applicant to put forward any specific resilience measures.

Biodiversity

The application form states that the development is retrospective and as such, would be exempt from providing Biodiversity Net Gain. At this stage, Officers are only able to assess this on the basis of submitted information. Should the proposal be considered not exempt by reason of not being this or other relevant categories for the scale of the development then an appropriate condition, supported by a BNG metric submitted for the approval of the LPA, would be required to ensure on-site BNGs would last for at least 30 years to meet the requirements of this legislation.

Public Right of Way

Public right of way SPE/141/40 is located to the south and public right of way SPE/145/20 is located to the east of the application site. However, it is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the amenity of the footpath or its users. As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy LP23 of the Kirklees Local Plan.

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

5. Representations

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

General Comments (1 Representation)

Good use has been made of land, and fence stops any fly tipping taking place

Supporting Comments (8 Representations)

- I use the footpath what goes down the side of the land and behind the houses, the people who have bought the land has cleared the footpath that runs behind the fence, this has made the access better when taking the bins in & out.
- I don't see for any objections to what they have already done, the fence is not as high as the wall next door, you can see through the fence and the bit of land looks tidy so I do not have any objection.
- I have lived on the close for many years, I live opposite the land and have no objections to the fence, the height of the fence or the change of use of the land .
- We have dog walked past the plot 2 or 3 times a day over the last 10 years, passing an unsightly, dog toilet, overgrown dumping ground. But not now, the new owners deserve a real thank you from local residents, the area as never looked as pleasant and tidy.
- Since it was bought from the original developers a year or so ago, the new owners have tidied up the area to make an enclosed garden with much needed planting of various trees, shrubs and flowers. It therefore looks a considerable improvement on its previous derelict state.
- The plan is a positive step for the environment, and the surrounding area.
- It will now be used for assisting nature and protecting wildlife, insects and bees, as all the planting has been thoughtfully considered for each season.
- The surrounding wooden fence is in keeping with nature and in no way obstructs views.
- Repurposing the site has eliminated my worries.
- I haven't heard or seen any anti-social behaviour since the enclosure of the plot; but some other residents are closer to the site.
- For me the biggest impact is visual. The fence is not strictly out of keeping with the open-plan nature of the surroundings. Perhaps its uncompromising appearance might be improved with a colour wash.
- People may be objecting to the fence blocking their view, I have a photo taken by myself which shows the little amount of fence you can see because of all the cars & vans parked in front of the fence when people are home from work.
- I have no objection to either the fence or garden as I think it is an improvement.

- Before the work done, this was a bit of an eye sore with overgrown grass and weeds and litter. Now it looks extremely neat and tidy and I notice lots of plants have been planted in which looks lovely.
- I can't see any negatives in general or for the residents nearby.

Objections (12 Representations)

- The fence has already been erected and the land tarmacked. This was done in 2024, since doing this they have had parties on the land resulting in my property being covered in fireworks and ash.

Response: Any construction works undertaken prior to determination are at the Applicant's own risk and may be subject to enforcement action.

- It is also ruining the views.

Response: Loss of view would not constitute a material planning consideration.

- Not sure why the fence has been already put up when planning permission was not yet passed.

Response: Any construction works undertaken prior to determination are at the Applicant's own risk and may be subject to enforcement action.

- It is unsightly to look at what once was a beautiful view from my windows now is a wooden 6 foot fence.

Response: Loss of view would not constitute a material planning consideration.

- We did not have the opportunity to object before it was put up.

Response: Any construction works undertaken prior to determination are at the Applicant's own risk and may be subject to enforcement action.

- This area should be left open and unspoilt as it now ruins the area and street scene.

Response: The proposal's impact on the character and appearance of the street scene has been assessed within the 'Visual Amenity' section of the report.

- I think that the fence is too high, not in keeping with the surroundings.

Response: The proposal's impact on the character and appearance of the street scene has been assessed within the 'Visual Amenity' section of the report.

- It has barbed wire around the top on the inside of the fence which is dangerous to wildlife and neighbouring cats.

Response: *This matter would not constitute a material planning consideration.*

- Trees have been planted which could over grow the height of the fence and in time block sunlight from neighbouring properties.

Response: *This matter would not constitute a material planning consideration.*

- I'm not opposed to the fence but believe it's too high.

Response: *The proposal's potential impact on the appearance and character of the street scene has been assessed within the 'Visual Amenity' section of the report. Furthermore, the proposals potential impact to the neighbouring properties has been assessed within the 'Residential Amenity' section of the report.*

-

- Do not approve this as garden because then he will apply for a dwelling and it's ElmTree Close land and should remain so.

Response: *This application is for the change of use land to domestic garden, formation of access and hard surfacing and erection of 2.0m high fencing, greenhouse and gazebo and is assessed on this basis. Should an application be submitted for a new dwelling, the merits of such a proposal would be assessed at that time.*

- I would invite you to look on Google Maps as this area was very tidy and grass regularly cut by local residents and has never ever been a dumping ground.

Response: *This matter would not constitute a material planning consideration.*

- People of ElmTree Close used this for their families. Now it's blocked off with a big ugly fence with consideration at all for us residents and totally spoils the street scene!!

Response: *The proposal's impact on the character and appearance of the street scene has been assessed within the 'Visual Amenity' section of the report.*

- This area has now been decimated by this high fence and spoils the street scene and should be taken down and left open and grassed as it was before and not used as someone's dumping ground.

Response: *The proposal's impact on the character and appearance of the street scene has been assessed within the 'Visual Amenity' section of the report.*

- Please all look at your title deeds as this is public open space and absolutely ruins the cul de sac.

Response: *The proposal's impact on the character and appearance of the street scene has been assessed within the 'Visual Amenity' section of the report.*

- I wish to object to the above application on the basis of impact on residential amenity and impact on the street scene.

Response: *The proposal's potential impact on the appearance and character of the street scene has been assessed within the 'Visual Amenity' section of the report. Furthermore, the proposals potential impact to the neighbouring properties has been assessed within the 'Residential Amenity' section of the report.*

- If the land is designated as Greenbelt, then I object as this is inappropriate development.

Response: *The site is unallocated on the Kirklees Local Plan Proposals Map.*

- The planning application has been raised retrospectively as the work has already been completed.

Response: *Any construction works undertaken prior to determination are at the Applicant's own risk and may be subject to enforcement action.*

- It appears to be used for social events causing increased noise level.

Response: *The proposal is of a domestic scale and would not significantly impact residential amenity with regard to noise.*

- Bonfire night the remains of fireworks were left in the road and cars were covered in soot.

Response: *This matter would not constitute a material planning consideration.*

- The fence has spoilt the views of many residents. It appears the owners have no consideration for the residents of Elm Tree Close.

Response: *Loss of view would not constitute a material planning consideration.*

- This area is a designated P.O.S. Requirement approved with the original application for the residents of ElmTree Close and as such should be covenanted so.

Response: *This is a private matter and would not constitute a material planning consideration.*

- How has this applicant got hold of this area belonging to Kirklees for public use, or are they trying to claim it by putting a fence round it?
Response: *The applicant has confirmed that they own the land and therefore, the site is not available for public use.*

- This applicant has also cunningly put that it's adjacent No.67 Elm Tree trying to pass it off that they're applying for additional garden when they live on Lodge Lane nothing to do with Elm Tree Close.
Response: *This application is for the change of use land to domestic garden, formation of access and hard surfacing and erection of 2.0m high fencing, greenhouse and gazebo and is assessed on this basis.*

- The land to my knowledge is supposed to be open land and was originally designated to be a children's play area.
Response: *The site is unallocated on the Kirklees Local Plan Proposals Map. Officers cannot locate any evidence that the land was ever designated as P.O.S to serve the adjacent residential development.*

- It's worth noting also that Highways Dept need to be informed that an entrance gate has been formed on a safe vehicle passing area on Lodge Lane! Another reason why this area should remain an Elm Tree Close area, and not Lodge Lanes.
Response: *The proposal's potential impact on the highway network has been assessed within the 'Highway Safety' section of the report.*

- I've been a resident on ETC since 1987 and I've enjoyed looking out and enjoyed the view I vigorously oppose to this land being fenced off with a 2 meter fence and with trees planted.
Response: *Loss of view would not constitute a material planning consideration.*

- I cannot upload the original look off Google maps, but stress strongly that it looked better before with grass and sitting bench left open and peaceful.
Response: *The proposals impact on the character and appearance of the street scene has been assessed within the 'Visual Amenity' section of the report.*

- We residents could desperately use this for parking as an option and not segregated from the Cul de Sac.
Response: *The proposal's potential impact on the highway network has been assessed within the 'Highway Safety' section of the report.*

6. Conclusion

This application for the change of use of land to domestic garden, formation of access and hard surfacing and erection of 2.0m high fencing, greenhouse and gazebo at Land at 67 Elm Tree Close has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan as listed in the policy section of the report, 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 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: 2025/90527

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 so as to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development on completion, and to accord with Policies LP1, LP2, LP21, LP22, LP24, LP30, and LP52 of the Kirklees Local Plan, the guidance within the Council's Highways Design Guide SPD and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Within 3 months of the decision, the timber fence hereby approved shall be set back 1m from the carriageway edge of Lodge Lane in accordance with the 'As Proposed' drawing (reference no. 200 rev B) and thereafter retained.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and highway safety in accordance with Policies LP21 and 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: Public footpaths SPE/141/40 and SPE/145/20 are located adjacent to the development site and must not be interfered with or obstructed, prior to, during or after development works. The Council's Public Rights of Way unit may be contacted by telephone on 01484 221000. Public Rights of Way is based at PO Box 1720, Huddersfield HD1 9EL and the email address is publicrightsofway@kirklees.gov.uk.

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
Site Location Plan	SLP	-	28/03/2025
As Existing	100	-	25/02/2025
As Proposed	200	B	31/07/2025
Covering Letter	-	-	25/02/2025

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. Additional information was sought during the course of the application following the consultation response from KC Highways. Additional information was provided which was considered acceptable with regard to highway safety.

Report Dated: 22/08/2025

