

KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL INVESTMENT & REGENERATION SERVICE

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

DELEGATED DECISION TO DETERMINE APPLICATIONS FOR CONSENT, AGREEMENT OR APPROVAL REQUIRED BY CONDITION

Reference No:	2025/44/91909/W
Site Address:	72, Northgate, Huddersfield, HD1 6AE
Description:	Discharge of details reserved by condition 22 (landscaping) on previous permission 2024/92246 for redevelopment of existing site including demolition of existing car sales room (sui generis) and erection of new 2 storey police station (sui generis) with associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure
Recommending Officer:	William Simcock

DECISION – Discharge of Condition – Approve

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.

Nick Hirst

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 24-Feb-2026

Officer Report

Application: 2025/91909

Site: 72, Northgate, Huddersfield, HD1 6AE

Proposal: This application seeks discharge of details reserved by condition 22 (landscaping) on previous permission 2024/92246 for redevelopment of existing site including demolition of existing car sales room (sui generis) and erection of new 2-storey police station (sui generis) with associated car parking, landscaping and infrastructure.

Background

Approval of details reserved by condition 22 has already been sought and obtained under application 2025/91079. The current application however makes some changes to the approved boundary treatments as well as minor changes to the soft landscaping. Details of boundary treatments were supplied with the original application, on a plan reference BKDZ-BBA-30-22-D-L-1006 Revision 3.

No specific condition was applied regarding the erection or retention of boundary treatments. This was implicitly covered by Condition (2): "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". However, boundary treatments can fall within the definition of hard landscaping and it is considered that any proposed additional or replacement boundary treatments can be treated as being within the remit of Condition 22, provided that they do not also amount to a material change to the proposed development viewed as a whole (which would mean that a variation of condition would have to be applied for).

The current proposal for discharge of details reserved by condition (22) seeks to make changes to the scheme of boundary treatments and the soft landscaping.

Assessment

Condition 22 (landscaping)

22. Full details of all hard and soft landscaping works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before work on the superstructure of the proposed building commences. This shall include species mix and shall demonstrate that opportunities have been taken to enhance the biodiversity of the site. Any tree, hedge or shrub dying or becoming diseased within five years of its substantial completion shall be replaced by another of the same species and variety.

Reason: *In the interests of enhancing the ecological value of the site and visual amenity and to accord with Policies LP24 and LP30 of the*

Kirklees Local Plan, and Chapters 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The following details have been supplied.

1. Covering letter 05C400157
1. Proposed Landscape General Arrangement Plan, reference 6BKD2 BBA 30 ZZ D L 1003, Revision C06, submitted 19/12/2025.
2. Proposed Hard Landscaping Layout, reference 6BKD2-BBA-30-ZZ-D-L-1004, Revision C04, submitted 19/12/2025.
3. Proposed Soft Landscaping Layout, reference 6BKD2-BBA-30-ZZ-D-L-1005, Revision C03, submitted 19/12/2025.
4. Proposed Fencing Layout, reference 6BKD2-BBA-30-ZZ-D-L-1006, Revision C03, submitted 01/09/2025.
5. Soft works details (including sections), reference 6BKD2-BBA-30-ZZ-D-L 7002 Revision C01, submitted 10/07/2025.
6. Landscape Material Schedule, reference 6BKD2-BBA-30-ZZ-T-L-0010 Revision C01, submitted 10/07/2025.
7. Party Wall Details reference 6BKD2-BWB-XX-XX-D-S-6070 Revision P01, submitted 10/07/2025.
8. Two documents, both entitled “Award made under The Party Wall etc. Act 1996” dated 19/06/2025 and 23/06/2025 (by Lantern Building Consultancy).
9. Blaxter (stone) technical data sheet
10. Email from the developer (05/09/25) confirming that the undyed version of the stone would be used.
11. Additional statement by the developer’s agent setting out further justification for the change in soft landscaping.

Regarding boundary treatments, what is proposed that along a 12.5m stretch of the northern boundary, as shown on plan 6BKD2-BBA-30-ZZ-D-L-1006 Revision C03, a 3m high wall would be built on the boundary in place of the 3m high mesh fence shown on the original plans, and to the west of this a further 6.5m length of existing walling would be retained instead of being demolished as originally intended. The wall would have a double skin and would have an outer facing of natural sandstone on each face.

The same mesh fencing is to be used for all other parts of the northern site boundary, and for the eastern and southern boundaries, as originally approved.

Whilst this is not a statutory procedure, the occupier of the immediate neighbouring premises, the Ahmadiyya Centre, was notified by letter and given two weeks to make comments (period ended 05/08/2025). This was considered a reasonable precautionary measure since they might consider themselves to be affected by the proposed replacement boundary wall. No comments were received because of this publicity.

The stone, supplied by Blaxter, is a yellow-buff sandstone. Samples were inspected on site by the case officer on 29/08/2025. The stone is tumbled and had been dyed on one face, with the opposite face left in its natural colour. The

stone is not a perfect match for the local natural coursed stone used on buildings in the vicinity of the site (including the Ahmadiyya Centre) and the use of dying fails to achieve the intended natural aging effect. Nevertheless, considering the secluded nature of the walling, it is considered on balance an acceptable material for the erection of the proposed boundary wall. The developer has confirmed that the undyed version of the stone is to be used.

It is considered that the proposed new wall would not represent a material change to the scheme as originally approved, for the following reasons:

- i. The proposed change inconsequential in terms of its scale in relation to the original approval since it would only affect a short stretch of the boundary (19m out of a perimeter of approximately 300m). It would not be clearly visible from the public highway;
- i. The building it would partially replace is a red brick building. The new walling material would be a better match for the stonework in the vicinity of the site;
- ii. The new wall would be the same height as the boundary wall it would replace. Consent under the Party Wall Act was obtained, for which the neighbouring occupier would have had to be notified under statutory procedures, regardless of the need to seek consent from the Council acting as Local Planning Authority. The only representations made on the original application related to the principle of the development, in particular its location, and not detailed design or impact on amenity. As previously stated, the occupier of the adjacent property was notified of the application by letter during the course of this application. It is therefore considered that the interests of third parties, including (but not limited to) those who made representations on the original application, would not be prejudiced;
- iii. It is considered that the change would accord with all relevant LP Policies;
- iv. The proposed changes would not result in the development falling outside the description of the development as set out on the Decision Notice;
- v. The proposed change does not contravene any condition on the Decision Notice since the change is considered to fall within the remit of condition (2);
- vi. The proposed change would not require a further restriction to make it acceptable;
- vii. There are no reasons why it would not have been approved had it formed part of the original application.

The Proposed Landscape General Arrangement Plan 1003 reference C01 which formed part of the approved documents for the original application showed generic areas of soft landscaping including a wedge of land along the western frontage of the site of about 35sqm. The details approved under the first application to discharge condition (22) were in conformity with the approved indicative landscaping scheme in terms of the amount and distribution of soft landscaping, and showed a linear hedge fronted by a wedge of ornamental grass along the western frontage.

On the scheme now under consideration, the ornamental hedge would be laid out as before, but the grass would be replaced by paving. This change relates to roughly 21sqm. The applicant's agent has explained in a supporting statement that the opportunity to sow grass in this area would be limited due to the bollards being specified to be PAS 68 bollards, which have a long strip foundation, 700mm deep which leaves barely enough soil left for the grasses to grow.

There would be some additional bulb planting in the area north-east of the substation and north-east of the cycle store, although this would be partially replacing what was intended to be wildflower meadow.

Moreover, there would be some additional soft landscaping (circa 13sqm) at the northern extent, adjacent to Lower Fitzwilliam St. This would consist of *Carex oshimensis* and *Carex morrowii*.

Throughout the rest of the soft landscaping scheme, species mix is unchanged from that which was approved in the earlier discharge of condition application, 2025/91079. Hard landscaping treatments of surfaces (slab paving) is also unchanged.

It is considered on balance that the loss of a narrow strip of ornamental grass is justified for demonstrable practical reasons. With the additional ornamental shrub planting described above, it is considered that the overall quality of the landscaping scheme delivered would be acceptable, in that it would not result in the quality of the proposed scheme, as shown on the plans submitted for the original approval, 2024/92246, being diminished, nor would it be inferior to that previously approved as discharge of condition application 2025/91079.

Conclusion

It is considered that all aspects of the proposed scheme submitted with this application are acceptable for the purposes of condition (22) and are recommended for approval.

The condition has ongoing requirements, preventing a full discharge currently. A note stating those requirements is recommended to be included on the decision notice.

Recommendation: Approve details

Report Dated: 24/02/2026

Proposed Letter Text

Condition 22

You have submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 22:

1. Covering letter 05C400157;
1. Proposed Landscape General Arrangement Plan, reference 6BKD2 BBA 30 ZZ D L 1003, Revision C06;
2. Proposed Hard Landscaping Layout, reference 6BKD2-BBA-30-ZZ-D-L-1004, Revision C04;
3. Proposed Soft Landscaping Layout, reference 6BKD2-BBA-30-ZZ-D-L-1005, Revision C03;
4. Proposed Fencing Layout, reference 6BKD2-BBA-30-ZZ-D-L-1006, Revision C03;
5. Soft works details (including sections), reference 6BKD2-BBA-30-ZZ-D-L-7002 Revision C01;
6. Landscape Material Schedule, reference 6BKD2-BBA-30-ZZ-T-L-0010 Revision C01;
7. Party Wall Details reference 6BKD2-BWB-XX-XX-D-S-6070 Revision P01;
8. Two documents, both entitled "Award made under The Party Wall etc. Act 1996" dated 19/06/2025 and 23/06/2025 (Lantern Building Consultancy);
9. Blaxter (stone) technical data sheet.
10. Email from the developer (05/09/25) confirming that the undyed version of the stone would be used.
11. Additional statement setting out further justification for the change in soft landscaping.

The submitted details are acceptable for the initial requirements of condition 22 and are hereby approved.

However, you are reminded that condition 22 has the ongoing requirement that the hereby approved details are implemented and that:

'Any tree, hedge or shrub dying or becoming diseased within five years of its substantial completion shall be replaced by another of the same species and variety.'