

KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL INVESTMENT & REGENERATION SERVICE

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

**Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England)
Order 2015 - Schedule 2, Part 18, Class A1**

DELEGATED DECISION FOR DISCHARGE OF CONDITION A1 - NOTIFICATION OF A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT UNDER LOCAL OR PRIVATE ACTS OR ORDER

Reference no. 2026/CL/90696/W

Site Address	Bridge MVL3/71, Britannia Road, Milnsbridge, Huddersfield, HD3 4QF
---------------------	---

Description	Prior approval for alterations to bridge MVL3/71
--------------------	---

Recommending Officer	Liz Chippendale
-----------------------------	-----------------

DECISION – Prior Notification – Approve

I hereby authorise the approval/refusal* (delete as appropriate) 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: 03-Jul-2026

Application: 2026/90696

Site: Bridge MVL3/71, Britannia Road, Milnsbridge, Huddersfield, HD3 4QF

Proposal: Prior approval for alterations to bridge MVL3/71

Application Site

Bridge MVL3/44 carries Britannia Road over the railway between Golcar to the north and Milnsbridge to the east. The existing bridge comprises of two spans. The southern span crosses the lineside access track and consists of a half- through deck with wrought iron main girders and is propped up by two trestle structures. The northern span crossed the railway lines and consists of a concrete deck with steel half-through girders.

The bridge is located on the boundary of the Golcar Conservation Area. Golcar Viaduct, a Grade II listed structure, is set to the south west of the bridge.

Proposal

The proposed works are focused on the southern span and are required to accommodate a third track and electrification under the bridge.

The works comprise the reconstruction of the span with a concrete filler beam deck and reinforced concrete parapet L-units topped with pre-cast concrete coper units. The existing southern abutment and pier are to be mostly maintained, with the tops cut down for the implementation of new reinforced concrete cill beams.

Consultee response

KC Conservation and Design provided the following response on 20.03.2026. Although the comments were not received for this application, the requirement for a condition was considered to be relevant for all applications relating to the alteration and replacement of the parapet:

No objection to the proposed works subject to conditions:

- *The pre-cast concrete L-units shall be a finished with natural stone cladding design pattern to match the natural coursed stones below. The concrete shall match the existing natural stones by colour, texture and coursing.*
- *The GRP handrail shall be finished in a black or green colour*

The applicant was unable to agree to the use of natural stone at this stage and requested a meeting to discuss. The meeting was held between the applicant, Conservation and Design Officer and Planning case officer. At the meeting it was advised that the use of an alternative material to natural stone could be acceptable, however, details of the material, colour and patterning would need to be agreed. The applicant agreed to provide options.

Following the meeting the applicant provided the following:

In relation to the question of cladding for some of the bridges, we have considered different design options but, given that we are not at the detailed design stage and the different context of each bridge, we are currently unable to provide the clarity being sought for the external finish for each concrete parapet. Therefore, our preference is that a condition be attached to each prior approval application (that involves a concrete parapet) requiring a sample of the finish be provided for LPA approval. This would allow a more thorough investigation of different finishes at the detailed design stage.

Conservation and Design officers agreed that the use of condition to secure details is acceptable. Therefore, the conditions would be as follows:

- The submission of material finish/detail to be agreed by the LPA

Background

Network Rail are due to submit an Order Application under the Transport & Works Act for improvements to the railway between Standedge Tunnel (Mardsen) to Gledholt Tunnel (Paddock). This proposes three tracking and full electrification of the line. In anticipation of the grant of the Order and to meet the deadline of the introduction of services to the Government's timetable, Network Rail propose to carry out a series of advance works on a number of structures, to permit speedy implementation of the wider proposals should the Secretary of State grant consent for the Order.

Procedural Matters

The applicant has submitted prior notification of the works under Part 18 (A) of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development Order) (England) 2015 (GPDO).

Part 18 of the GPDO (Miscellaneous development) states:

Permitted development

A. Development authorised by—

- (a) a local or private Act of Parliament,*
- (b) an order approved by both Houses of Parliament, or*
- (c) an order under section 14 or 16 of the Harbours Act 1964 (orders for securing harbour efficiency etc, and orders conferring powers for improvement, construction etc of harbours)(1),*

which designates specifically the nature of the development authorised and the land upon which it may be carried out.

Conditions

A.1 Development is not permitted by Class A if it consists of or includes—

- (a) the erection, construction, alteration or extension of any building, bridge, aqueduct, pier or dam; or*
- (b) the formation, laying out or alteration of a means of access to any highway used by vehicular traffic,*

unless the prior approval of the appropriate authority to the detailed plans and specifications is first obtained.

A.2 *The prior approval referred to in paragraph A.1 is not to be refused by the appropriate authority nor are conditions to be imposed unless they are satisfied that—*

- (a) the development (other than the provision of or works carried out to a dam) ought to be and could reasonably be carried out elsewhere on the land; or*
- (b) the design or external appearance of any building, bridge, aqueduct, pier or dam would injure the amenity of the neighbourhood and is reasonably capable of modification to avoid such injury.*

Such development is permitted subject to it benefiting from a local or private act or order and prior approval being granted by the appropriate authority.

In this case the enabling Act in the Huddersfield & Manchester Railway & Canal Act 1845, which incorporates clause 16 of the 1845 Railway Clauses Consolidation Act. The original Act specifying this stretch of railway states that the railway undertaker can, from time to time, alter, repair, or discontinue the before mentioned works or any of them and substitute others in their stead, and do all other acts necessary for making, maintaining altering, repairing or using the railway.

In light of this, it is therefore considered that the proposed works would benefit from permitted development rights under the aforementioned part of the GPDO.

Assessment

Part 18 A.2 of the aforementioned Order states:

“The prior approval referred to in paragraph A.1 is not to be refused by the appropriate authority nor are conditions to be imposed unless they are satisfied that—

- (a) the development (other than the provision of works carried out to a dam) ought to be and could reasonably be carried out elsewhere on the land; or*
- (b) the design or external appearance of any building, bridge, aqueduct, pier or dam would injure the amenity of the neighbourhood and is reasonably capable of modification to avoid such injury.*

In respect of part (a) the railway bridge is already in situ, with the addition of a third track proposed in this location is necessary to complete works on the TransPennine Route Upgrade, and cannot therefore be reasonably be located elsewhere.

In respect of part (b), the bridge has undergone significant alterations to its decks and abutments, and as such retains limited architectural interest. The bridge sits just south of the Golcar Conservation Area.

The proposed works would minimally alter the overall architectural appearance of the bridge beyond its current appearance as a significantly altered bridge 19th century bridge. As such, there would be negligible change to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and to the setting of nearby listed building.

Due to the isolated location of the bridge and the previous restoration works, removing the original stone, resulting in a more modern architectural appearance, the proposed works would not impact on the amenity of the surrounding area. The proposed works would retain, where possible, the original features of the bridge.

As such, there is no objection to the proposed works, subject to the application of suitably worded conditions for the submission of material and finish details.

The red line boundary is located within the bat alert layer. Ecological impacts are not a specific matter for consideration as part of this notification, although the council / LPA does hold a general Biodiversity Duty (per the Environment Act 2021). In this case, given the nature of the works (extending the parapet height), there is considered limited feasible harm to local biodiversity. Furthermore, the wider ecological impacts for the Transpennine Route Upgrade would be considered as part of the proposed Transport and Works Act Order.

The granting of prior approval under Part 18 of the GPDO would not grant consent to undertake these works without other necessary consents being sought and in place (e.g., temporary closure of public right of way).

Recommendation: Grant Approval

Report Dated: 26.06.2026

Decision Notice Text

The Council considers that the works detailed in the above application are permitted development under Part 18(A) of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 and that Prior approval for the development is hereby granted subject to the following conditions:

1. Notwithstanding the submitted plans, a sample of the parapet finish[es] shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, prior to their installation. The external treatment of the parapet finish[es] shall reflect the retained stonework of the bridge in terms of colour, texture, finish and coursing.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and the conservation of the Historic Environment and to accord with Policies LP24 and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan.

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date received
-----------	-----------	---------	---------------

Existing and proposed elevations and section	167037-TGP-54-MVL3-DRG-T-LP-164401	P02	26/02/2026
Existing and proposed plan	167037-TGP-54-MVL3-DRG-T-LP-167102	P03	26/02/2026
Network Rail cover letter dated 25/02/2026	TP/LNE/2026-023 167103	-	26/02/2026