

Wednesday, 29 October 2025

F.A.O. Victor Grayson
Development Management Masterplanner
Majors and Minerals Team
Huddersfield
HD1 9EL

Application Number: 2025/61/92242/W

RE: Hermitage Park, Lepton

Dear Victor,

This covering letter is intended to address the consultee responses provided on the reserved matters application for land off Hermitage Park, Lepton (2025/61/92242/W) submitted on Friday 8th August 2025. For ease, I have included the consultee responses in bold italic text, with our response or action listed below.

Highways

'The forward visibility splays around some of the bends is insufficient and will need to be a minimum of 23 metres for a shared surface carriageway as set out in Table 1 of our Design Guide. I understand this principle has been established in previous planning relating to this site. A S38 application has been received relating to this application where more detailed drawings have been provided which set this out more clearly and has hence been rejected as it did not meet our minimum adoption standards. Please ask the applicant to comply with this point and add dimensions of visibility splays to the drawing and establish them in the drawing Key as the visibility splays vary in length on this drawing.'

No road amendments have been made from the approved S73 outline layout, excluding the visitor parking bays as requested below. Should further clarification be provided regarding the above comment, we will undertake a review accordingly.

'Please add junction visibility splays to the turning heads.'

Please see the attached '1223-135-B General Arrangement' for visibility splays.

'Only visitor parking laybys parallel to the carriageway will be adopted. These must be a minimum of 2.4m x 6m. Any other bays (echelon or perpendicular) or private bays will not be considered for adoption. Parallel parking bays adjacent Public Open Space, walls/ boundaries or shared surface carriageway must be surrounded by a minimum 1-metre-wide hardstanding to enable safe entry and exit of the occupants. It would appear that this is of insufficient width on the drawing and is consistent with the minimum 600mm width for a shared surface margin throughout the development.'

Visitor parking spaces have now amended where next to a boundary to reflect the above comment.

'In addition, the service road leading to the sub/pumping station will want kerbing across the front, as its not to be adopted, so there should be a dropped crossing and private drive arrangement.'

No amendments have been made, as this section of the road is proposed for adoption.

'Provide a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit in accordance with GG119 (5.46.1). This will be required in advance of planning permission being granted as the findings may result in the red line boundary having to change due to road safety remedial measures being required.'

The updated Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was confirmed as complete by Ryan Kinder via email on 4 April 2025. The documents '250328-MH-Land off Hermitage Park RSA Stage 1' and '250328 Items Outside the Scope of RSAv1' are attached for reference.

Landscape

'Regarding street trees, the block comprising plots 58 to 70 looks sparse. Could more trees be added here?'

One additional tree has been added to plot 70. There are no other locations available with sufficient distance from highway and dwellings.

'Could more detail regarding each open space be provided, to enable us to confirm its purported typology (e.g., we don't have full details of the playspace ground materials or equipment, so I won't yet be able to confirm that the 2,417sqm space for children and young people could be accepted as such).'

Please find attached the latest play area design (REV A- Miller Homes Yorkshire - Hermitage Park, Lepton LEAP - CAS-360041-Z9T4G0-HBA1). This version already includes comments and recommendations from Emma Mills, with changes made to reflect the feedback. This is now shown on Landscape and Site Layout drawings.

'Regarding the native, species-rich, thorny hedgerows, could you confirm when these would be planted (ideally, long before any dwellings are occupied), and whether any accompanying measures to discourage access are proposed while the hedgerows become established?'

All elements of the POS landscaping are to be installed prior to 75% occupation, as per Clause 7.19 of the S106 agreement.

'Street trees – The submitted Landscape Management Plan only covers 14 of the proposed street trees for replacement if they were to fail. The frontline trees proposed in residents' gardens are not covered by the LMP. The LMP includes nothing re: replacement in the first five years (which would help ensure establishment of tree and shrub planting).'

The landscape management plan is intended to cover public realm only, with private gardens maintained by homeowners. A paragraph has been added in the 'Design Aims' section to explain that all trees and plants will be replaced for a period of 5 years from planting. The maintenance schedules have also been amended to state that plant replacement is for a period of 5 years. In addition to the LMP, a note has also been added to the detailed Landscape Proposals plans to cover this.

'Community orchard – Can this have an inclusive accessible path so that those with less mobility can enjoy it, and to ensure it is more accessible other than at fruit collection time (such as when visitors might want to walk through or close to it to enjoy the blossom)? Seats with arm rests and backs would be a great welcome addition too, to increase dwell time in this proposed public open space. '

Due to the existing site topography, no further improvements can be made beyond those already proposed. Additional benches will be provided however, we intend to address all street furniture matters through the condition discharge process.

‘Species – A lot of the species proposed for the evergreen hedgerows are ranked as critical on the Natural England list of species which could potentially be invasive. Where these are proposed within the development this is less of a risk, however they should not be proposed close to the ancient woodland and the eastern boundary. Invasive non-native species pose a significant threat to biodiversity in Britain. When submitting detailed landscape proposals, the preference is for species which are native, fruit bearing species, where appropriate. Potentially invasive species are not favourable, and details from the list published by Natural England [can be found here](#).’

We take note of this comment and appreciate the need to avoid the use of invasive species generally and in particular in sensitive areas. The detailed Landscape Proposals have been carefully considered and show only native species within the open space alongside woodland and extending to the closest garden boundaries. Evergreen, non-native species are used in some gardens further away from the woodland for their ornamental qualities.

‘Native, thorny hedgerows along the ancient woodland boundary – Temporary protective fencing/chestpale fencing would aid establishment.’

A 1m post and wire protective fence has been added alongside the hedge to the woodland boundary, to prevent disturbance and aid establishment. No additional fencing has been shown to the boardwalk hedge as there is already a post and rail fence shown here.

‘On-site open space – KC Landscape saw a detailed play areas plan (from Victoria Wilkinson of Kompan) back in March. This should be included in the submission (along with details of litter bins etc), and referred to in the LMP (which should also cover bin emptying etc). NB – the submitted public open space typologies plan incorrectly suggest that there is currently to council requirement re: outdoor sports.’

As noted above, the latest detailed play area design has now been submitted and incorporated into the Landscape Management Plan (REV A- Miller Homes Yorkshire - Hermitage Park, Lepton LEAP - CAS-360041-Z9T4G0-HBA1). With regard to outdoor sports typology provision, a contribution of £72,724 has been included within the Section 106 agreement, as the outdoor sports provision cannot be accommodated on site. This was confirmed within the pre-app response.

Landscape Management Plan – The submitted LMP appears to cover most matters, however it doesn’t confirm the replacement of planting for a minimum of five years for the entire scheme. We would usually expect it to explicitly state this, and should also cover/commit to:

- ***Maintenance of the approved landscaping scheme for five years after completion. Include:***
 - ***Seasonal maintenance for SuDS features, retained vegetation, slopes, woodlands.***
 - ***Management of play/educational spaces and RoSPA safety inspections where relevant.***
- ***Implement monitoring and remedial measures, including:***
 - ***Replacement of failed or diseased trees, shrubs, hedgerows, planting, equipment, surfacing, and site furniture within five years.***
- ***Any tree, shrub, or hedge that dies or is removed must be replaced with similar size and species unless approved by the Local Planning Authority for five years after completion.***
- ***Ensure compliance with planning conditions and Section 106 obligations for public open space and contributions.***

- **Ensure litter bins are shown on the plans and are included in the schedule for emptying for the lifetime of the scheme.**

The LMP has been amended to include all of the above points.

LLFA

Condition 6 does have a drainage element but is for PROW to answer. A land drainage pipe is located near the PROW which could provide an outfall if one is needed. Run off to landscaping either side would be encouraged.

For the Landscaping Condition, number 8, we are not sure if it is relevant, but an overflow swale was to be incorporated into the landscape to protect new properties. This was abandoned due to clash with root systems for existing trees. It is now a piped system the opposite side of the public right of way with an inlet at the north end of the site and an outlet toward the south. It is important that the land at the north end is shaped so any flow from a watercourse to the rear of existing properties is channelled toward the inlet. Landscaped drawings need clarification as it appears to suggest this may not be the case. This is important as problems with the existing watercourse resulted in residents diverting flows into the site in previous years which is not acceptable but remains a risk that needs to be mitigated.

For clarity, '1223-139-D Eastern Boundary Land Drain and Boardwalk Detail' was updated to show additional spot levels and fall arrows to show how the landscaping will be formed so that any flow from a watercourse to the rear of existing properties is channelled toward the inlet. The LLFA have since confirmed they are content with the changes shown.

WYP

Knee-high railings – For safety and maintenance reasons, these should not be collapsible. Could they simply be deleted or replaced with hedgerows at the identified plots? Plot 53 – Could the fence be moved closer to the hedge (mirroring what's proposed at plot 52)?

The latest layout now shows hedgerows in place of knee rails where possible.

Lighting – Given KC Ecology's comments, and assuming the proposed street lighting accord with advice obtained from Section 38 colleagues, no amendments are necessary.

No action required.

House types – Assuming the Greyford, Denford, Cherrystone and Denstone house types have already been built at other Miller sites, please share Miller's information re: crime occurrences for those house types.

'External Lighting - Woodsome View, Lepton' has been submitted to address the security concern in the entrance recess for the house types listed above. The document explains where sufficient lighting will be provided.

PROW

No action required.

Conservation and Design

No action required.

Waste Strategy

'The locations of bin collection points for plots 14/15 and 48/49 have not been addressed in the latest drawings.'

The above bin collection points are now shown adjacent to the highway on the updated layout.

Coal Authority

No action required.

Yorkshire Water

No action required.

Arboricultural

No comments received.

Regards,

On behalf of Miller Homes