

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:	2026/44/91411/W
Site Address:	Hinchliffe Mill, Water Street, Holmbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 2NX
Description:	Discharge of details reserved by conditions 4 (design and appearance), 5 (archaeological investigation), 6 (boundary treatments), 9d (flood proofing), 10 (drainage scheme), 15 (Remediation Strategy), 18 (electric vehicle charging), 20 (highway retaining walls, 22 (materials for retaining walls), 24 (Waste Management Plan) and 31 (LEDS) of previous permission 2026/90162 for variation of condition 2 (plans and specifications) of previous permission 2021/90800 for redevelopment and change of use of former mill site to form 19 residential units (within a conservation area)
Recommending Officer:	Victor Grayson

DECISION – Discharge of Condition – Split Decision

I hereby authorise the split decision 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: 19-Aug-2026

Officer Report

Application: 2026/44/91411/W

Site: Hinchliffe Mill, Water Street, Holmbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 2NX

Proposal: Discharge of details reserved by conditions 4 (design and appearance), 5 (archaeological investigation), 6 (boundary treatments), 9d (flood proofing), 10 (drainage scheme), 15 (Remediation Strategy), 18 (electric vehicle charging), 20 (highway retaining walls), 22 (materials for retaining walls), 24 (Waste Management Plan) and 31 (LEDS) of previous permission 2026/90162 for variation of condition 2 (plans and specifications) of previous permission 2021/90800 for redevelopment and change of use of former mill site to form 19 residential units

Planning history

2021/90800 – Full planning permission granted 20/08/2025 (subject to Section 106 agreement) for redevelopment and change of use of former mill site to form 19 residential units.

2025/93383 – Discharge of Condition application relating to 22 conditions. Split decision issued 09/04/2026.

2026/90162 – Section 73 application approved 20/04/2026.

2026/90676 – Discharge of Condition application (condition 34 – bat licence). Approval issued 16/03/2026.

2026/90999 – Discharge of Condition application (condition 35 (construction, specification and works for provision of PROW HOL/95/10) under consideration.

2026/91697 – Non-Material Amendment (to wordings of conditions 4, 9 and 20) approved 20/07/2026.

Consultation

The comments of KC Conservation and Design, KC Ecology, KC Environmental Health, KC Highway Structures, KC Waste Strategy, the Lead Local Flood Authority and the West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service are referred to in the assessments below, where relevant.

Holme Valley Parish Council – No response.

Condition 4 (design and appearance)

Condition 4, as amended by the NMA application approved on 20/07/2026 (2026/91697), reads as follows:

4) Prior to the commencement of the development (unless otherwise stated below), the following details relating to design and appearance shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- a) Samples of external masonry (walling stone and ashlar) in the form of a sample panel showing coursing and pointing to be inspected on-site;*
- b) External material samples (photographic imagery) for all dwellinghouses (mill conversion and new-build), including but not limited to the proposed roofing, soffits, fascias and drainage runs;*
- c) Window and external door (including loading doors) design schedule for the mill conversion in the form of annotated 1:20 elevations and 1:5 sections, to include details of locations of the window designs within the elevations, their material, colour, and fixed/opening configurations;*
- d) Design of roof lights including patent glazing and conservation styles, where applicable, in the form of annotated 1:20 elevations and 1:5 sections;*
- e) Heritage architect report setting out how internal and external heritage features (including but not limited to the cast iron structural pillars, pulley mechanisms, loading doors) are to be retained, exposed and restored alongside any internal floor plan alterations to enable such works; and*
- f) Design of solar panels, including details of their locations, profiles and appearance.*

Prior to the commencement of the superstructure of the new dwellings, a window (including projecting window features) and external door design schedule in the form of annotated 1:20 elevations and 1:5 sections, to include details of locations of the window designs within the elevations, their material, colour, and fixed/opening configurations, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance approved details.

Reason: *To ensure appropriate standards of design whilst maintaining the heritage significance of the mill and the wider Hinchliffe Mill Conservation Area in accordance with Policy 3 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan and Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan.*

This pre-commencement condition is necessary to ensure design details are prepared and approved at an appropriate stage of the development process.

A refusal was previously issued pursuant to condition 4 (prior to its rewording) under Discharge of Conditions application 2025/93383.

The applicant has submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 4:

- Materials Schedule (Heneghan Architecture, 2559, issue 06, 21/04/2026)

- Mill Conversion Working Drawing Elevations (drawing 2559-0504, rev P04, 20/05/2026)
- Window and Door Details (drawing 2559-0403, rev P03, 17/08/2026)
- Typical Window Elevations and Sections (drawing 2559-0407, rev P03, 14/08/2026)
- Typical Door Elevations and Sections (drawing 2559-0406, rev P03, 14/08/2026)
- Proposed Mill Conversion Floor Plans (drawing 2559-0302 rev P02, 20/05/2026)
- Report to accompany an Application to discharge Condition 4e) of Planning Application ref 2021/62/90800/W (Mark Hide Associates, rev B, 21/05/2026)

The external materials and other details proposed by the applicant include:

- 140mm split face tumbled walling stone from PG Stone, coursed at random lengths, with flush pointing (for the new dwellings and garages)
- Ashlar stone from PG Stone, sourced from Johnsons Wellfield Quarry, South Crosland (for heads and cills)
- 140mm split faced tumbled natural walling stone (for the retaining walls)
- Rustic brick (for feature panels to the new dwellings)
- Reclaimed stone (for repairs to the walls of the retained mill building)
- Reclaimed stone slates left over from Seventy Acre Farm development (for repairs to the retained mill building)
- Westland Graphite Brazilian slate 7-9mm thick (for roofs of the new dwellings)
- Metal standing seam cladding (for projections to new dwellings)
- Bitumen and cellulose fibre black corrugated panels (for garage roofs)
- Refurbished or new iron, painted black (for gutters and downpipes to the retained mill building)
- Black aluminium gutters and downpipes (for new dwellings)
- Powder coated aluminium, black grey RAL 7021 (for windows and doors to the retained mill building and new dwellings)
- Conservation roof lights (stainless steel frames, polyester powder coated black)
- Dual Glass All Black N-Type Mono solar panels (made by Jinko) set into a GSE in-roof integrated system
- Gritstone-filled galvanised steel mesh enclosures, timber doors painted black, galvanised / stainless steel ironmongery (for bin stores)

A sample panel of the proposed walling stone was viewed on site by officers on 23/07/2026. Samples of the proposed Brazilian slate and window frames were also viewed.

The listed requirements of condition 4 are considered as follows:

Samples of external masonry (walling stone and ashlar) in the form of a sample panel showing coursing and pointing to be inspected on-site

The proposed walling stone would achieve a good match with the stone of the retained mill building, and with other surrounding buildings. The proposed coursing and pointing (as seen in the sample panel) are considered appropriate. The applicant no longer proposes to use dyed stone, and although the proposed tumbling of the stone is not considered necessary by officers, its appearance (as seen in the sample panel) does not raise significant concerns.

The proposed ashlar stone would be suitably sourced from a local quarry.

The repairs to the retained mill building would be carried out with reclaimed stone. During previous site visits, officers noted that some of the stone from the site's demolished buildings had been retained on-site.

KC Conservation and Design are satisfied with the proposed materials.

External material samples (photographic imagery) for all dwellinghouses (mill conversion and new-build), including but not limited to the proposed roofing, soffits, fascias and drainage runs

The other external materials now proposed for the new dwellings and retained mill building are considered acceptable. PVC is no longer proposed for the windows, doors and rainwater goods. A largely consistent palette of materials is proposed across the site. According to the applicant, the proposed Westland Graphite Brazilian slate has already been used in another nearby development on Shaw Lane, and while a Welsh or Cumbrian slate would have been preferable in this location, the proposed slate raises no significant concerns in terms of its appearance (officers viewed a sample of the proposed slate on site on 23/07/2026, and additionally viewed the development at Shaw Lane). The limited use of corrugated panels (for the proposed garages) and of metal standing seam cladding (for the projections to the new dwellings) is considered acceptable, given their appearance and locations. The rustic brick panels for the new dwellings would be similar to those used at two sites on Manchester Road, and are considered acceptable.

The applicant has confirmed that no soffits or fascias are proposed.

The proposed materials for the bin stores are considered acceptable.

KC Conservation and Design are satisfied with the proposed materials.

Window and external door (including loading doors) design schedule for the mill conversion in the form of annotated 1:20 elevations and 1:5 sections, to include details of locations of the window designs within the elevations, their material, colour, and fixed/opening configurations

For the retained mill building, acceptable window and door designs are now proposed. While these do not follow the advice provided by officers on 14/05/2026 (officers suggested a single wide pane over four square panes, to replicate the building's existing windows), the applicant has noted a six-pane window design at Yew Tree Mills on Woodhead Road, which officers accept is

appropriate in its appearance. There is also some evidence of a six-panel window design being previously proposed (in documents received in October 2011, under the previous parent application 2010/91518) and of KC Conservation and Design supporting this approach, although there is no evidence of a formal approval subsequently being issued. The simplified six-pane window design now proposed for most of the windows of the retained mill building would be reflected in the proposed doors (including the French doors and loading doors), giving the elevations a consistent appearance.

The submitted Window and Door Details (drawing 2559-0403, rev P03, 17/08/2026) includes 1:20 elevations and 1:5 sections of the proposed windows and doors, as required by condition 4. Adequate reveals are illustrated.

Regarding materials and colours, the applicant proposes powder coated aluminium in black grey RAL 7021. Although there is a concern that this colour was not historically used in the windows of the mill building, and that it may appear dated in the near future as the trend for dark grey comes to an end, this is not considered to justify withholding an approval.

The submitted Mill Conversion Working Drawing Elevations (drawing 2559-0504, rev P04, 20/05/2026) and Window and Door Details (drawing 2559-0403, rev P03, 17/08/2026) confirm the proposed fixed/opening configurations of the windows and doors proposed for the retained mill building. Openable windows would be side- or top-hung. This is considered acceptable.

Design of roof lights including patent glazing and conservation styles, where applicable, in the form of annotated 1:20 elevations and 1:5 sections

Conservation-style rooflights are now proposed. The submitted Window and Door Details (drawing 2559-0403, rev P03, 17/08/2026) includes a 1:500 plan indicating where the rooflights would be installed. All would be within the roof valley of the retained mill building, which would mean they would not be visible in some views, however the retained mill building's existing roofslopes are highly visible from higher land along public footpath HOL/95/10 to the south. The same drawing also includes two 1:10 sections of the proposed rooflights, confirming they would not project out beyond the surface of the roofslope in which they are to be installed.

The submitted Window and Door Details (drawing 2559-0403, rev P03, 17/08/2026) confirms that the rooflights would have a stainless steel frame with a polyester powder coat. On 17/08/2026 the applicant confirmed that the polyester powder coat would be black. This is considered acceptable.

KC Conservation and Design are satisfied with the proposed rooflights.

Although the annotated 1:20 elevations and 1:5 sections of the rooflights specified by condition 4 have not been submitted, it is considered that sufficient detail has been provided to inform the above assessment.

Heritage architect report setting out how internal and external heritage features (including but not limited to the cast iron structural pillars, pulley mechanisms, loading doors) are to be retained, exposed and restored alongside any internal floor plan alterations to enable such works.

The applicant's proposals to retain and expose internal and external heritage features of the retained mill (as set out in the submitted report by Mark Hide Associates, rev B, dated 21/05/2026) are generally welcomed. Ambiguous wording has been deleted from the document.

KC Conservation and Design are satisfied with the proposed approach to (and extent of) retaining heritage features.

Officers previously advised that the inclusion of historic photographs of the mill building would also assist an assessment of the proposals. In response, the applicant has referred to an Archaeological Building Report (Andrew Swann, 003, June 2011) previously submitted under application 2021/90800. This is noted, however it was historic photographs (rather than a 2011 photographic survey) that officers had in mind.

Nevertheless, it is considered that enough information has been submitted pursuant to this part of condition 4, and the submitted details are considered acceptable.

Design of solar panels, including details of their locations, profiles and appearance

This requirement was added to condition 4 under the Section 73 application 2026/90162.

The applicant proposes Dual Glass All Black N-Type Mono solar panels (made by Jinko) set into a GSE in-roof integrated system. The terms "dual glass", "n-type" and "mono" refer to the materials and construction of the panels (and their related efficiency), which has implications for their appearance, however the applicant's submission confirms that the panels would appear black. The term "GSE in-roof integrated system" confirms that the panels would form an integral part of the roofslope, and would not be proud of the roofslope or fixed on top of the proposed slates.

The submitted Window and Door Details (drawing 2559-0403, rev P03, 17/08/2026) confirms that ten solar panels are proposed for each new dwelling. No solar panels are shown to the roof of the retained mill building.

The proposed details confirm that the solar panels would have an unobtrusive appearance, and would be appropriately located.

KC Conservation and Design are satisfied with the proposed solar panels.

A window (including projecting window features) and external door design schedule in the form of annotated 1:20 elevations and 1:5 sections, to include

details of locations of the window designs within the elevations, their material, colour, and fixed/opening configurations

This requirement relates to details of the new dwellings that need to be submitted prior to the commencement of the superstructure of the new dwellings.

The submitted Typical Window Elevations and Sections (drawing 2559-0407, rev P03, 14/08/2026) and Typical Door Elevations and Sections (drawing 2559-0406, rev P03, 14/08/2026) illustrate acceptable details for the windows and doors of the new dwellings. These would be powder coated aluminium (in accordance with officer advice), coloured black grey RAL 7021. With aluminium (rather than PVC) proposed, an appropriate slenderness to the frames and glazing bars can be achieved. The proposed numbers and divisions of panes for the doors and windows would be suitably reflective of what is proposed for the retained mill building, as would the arrangement of openable and fixed panes (and the method of opening). Adequate reveals are illustrated. Reconstituted stone cills are no longer referred to in the submission. A sample of the windows was viewed on site by officers on 23/07/2026.

KC Conservation and Design are satisfied with the proposed doors and windows for the new dwellings.

Although the annotated 1:5 sections of the doors and windows specified by condition 4 have not been submitted (1:10 elevations and sections have been submitted instead), it is considered that sufficient detail has been provided to inform the above assessment.

Given the above assessment, it is recommended that an approval be issued pursuant to condition 4, subject to the applicant being reminded of the further requirement of the condition, which states:

The development shall be implemented in accordance [with the] approved details.

Condition 5 (archaeological investigation)

Condition 5 reads as follows:

5) The development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with the Archaeological Watching Brief (OSA, November 2025) approved by the Local Planning Authority on 09/04/2026 (under Discharge of Condition application 2025/93383) and recording shall be carried out by an appropriately qualified and experienced archaeological organisation / consultant.

Reason: *In the interests of recording the historic environment of the local area in accordance with Policy 3 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan and Policy LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan.*

Of note, condition 5 was reworded under Section 73 application 2026/90162 to reflect the fact that an approval had been issued under Discharge of Condition application 2025/93383. The condition (when imposed under permission 2021/90800) previously required the submission and approval of a programme of archaeological investigation and recording of the area within the northern section of mill building.

Under this current Discharge of Conditions application, the applicant has stated that the design of the development has been modified so that no groundworks are required below the existing concrete floor slab within the northern section of the mill, and that this means that any archaeological remains that may be present will be undisturbed by the development and will remain preserved in-situ. An accompanying letter (On-Site Archaeology, 24/04/2026) states the same, and appends a section illustrating the retention of the concrete slab.

In two responses (dated 01/06/2026 and 16/06/2026) the West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service (WYAAS) accepted the applicant's updated information. In the more recent response, WYAAS advised:

"...a condition was originally placed on this application for an archaeological watching brief (condition 5) the design of the proposed works has since been changed and the concrete slab under the north side of the mill will no longer be removed. The developers agent has sent a letter to confirm this. Based on this the archaeological watching brief required by condition 5 is no longer required and the condition can be discharged as completed, from an archaeological point of view".

Strictly speaking, an amending application would be needed to vary condition 5 (which is a compliance condition that specifically refers to a previously-approved watching brief). However, under this Discharge of Conditions application, the council – while not issuing an approval – can acknowledge the applicant's revised information, and can concur with the conclusions of WYAAS. Accordingly, it is recommended that appropriate commentary be included in the council's decision letter.

Condition 6 (boundary treatments)

Condition 6 reads as follows:

6) Prior to commencement of superstructure works, the following boundary treatment details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

- a) An updated boundary treatment strategy;*
- b) Boundary treatment elevations and plans;*
- c) Detailed material(s) schedule and hedge species; and*
- d) Height(s) of boundary treatments.*

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved boundary treatment details.

Reason: *To ensure boundary treatments are appropriate to their setting and serve to sufficiently enclose and secure spaces in accordance with*

Policy 2 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan and Policies LP24 and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan.

A refusal was previously issued pursuant to condition 6 under Discharge of Conditions application 2025/93383.

The applicant has submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 6:

- Boundary Treatments Strategy (drawing M3320-PA-04-V16)
- Retaining wall plan (drawing 2559-0405 rev P03)
- Retaining dry stone wall detail (drawing M3320-PA-W1-V1)
- Retaining dry stone wall detail (drawing M3320-PA-W1-V1)
- Boundary wall detail (drawing M3320-PA-W3-V1)
- 1.2m Metal Estate Railing (drawing M3320-PA-R1-V1)
- Site sections (drawing 2559-0404 rev P04)
- Schedule of Hard Landscaping Materials (Holroyd Homes, April 2026)
- Materials Schedule (Heneghan Architecture, 2559, issue 06, 21/04/2026)

There are numbering / title errors in some of the above-listed documents. The Boundary Treatments Strategy refers to V15 and V16 on the same drawing. There are two drawings titled “Retaining dry stone wall detail” and numbered M3320-PA-W1-V1 – one illustrates a “W1” wall for locations with level differences, the other illustrates a “W2” wall for level ground.

The submitted documents detail the following proposed boundary treatments:

- 1.2m high metal estate railing, painted black (along the River Holme, around most of the mill pond, and along the site’s eastern boundary)
- Stone-faced retaining walls of varying heights (1.2m above ground level, plus additional height depending on level difference) at the centre of the site
- 1.2m stone-faced masonry walls (to garden curtilages)
- Existing dry stone walls, various heights (along the River Holme, mill pond and Dam Head)
- Hedges (separating gardens, and to garden curtilages)

Details of the proposed hedges are not included in the above-listed documents, but are shown in drawings submitted pursuant to condition 31, and are considered acceptable. Beech hedges are proposed.

The proposed 1.2m high metal estate railing, painted black, is considered acceptable for this site.

The retention of the site’s existing dry stone walls is considered appropriate. These are likely to be historic features, and they contribute positively to the Hinchliffe Mill Conservation Area and the settings of adjacent listed buildings.

The proposed stone-faced walls are considered acceptable. They would be faced with the same appropriate material (140mm split faced tumbled natural walling stone) that is proposed for the new dwellings and garages. Appropriate stone copings are also proposed.

The proposed masonry walls are also considered acceptable. Appropriate justification for such boundary treatments (instead of dry stone walls) is set out in the submitted Materials Schedule (Heneghan Architecture, 2559, issue 06, 21/04/2026), and it is accepted that masonry walls (with mortar and pointing to match those of the new dwellings) would be more appropriate at the centre of the site, which has more of an industrial (rather than rural) character. Masonry walls would also assist with the treatment of level differences, where concrete blocks are to be used (these would be screened by the proposed stone facing). Although the height of every section of masonry wall has not been confirmed, the applicant has confirmed that the walls would rise to 1.2m above ground level, except where retention is necessary. Here, the walls would rise to 1.2m on the side with a higher ground level, and would have additional height on the other side, with the total height dependent upon the level difference. Given what is known regarding level differences across the site, and given the appropriate facing material proposed, it is considered that the walls would not appear unduly over dominant or obtrusive.

Timber fences are no longer proposed. This is welcomed.

The proposed boundary treatments would be suitably respectful of the history and appearance of the site and the Hinchliffe Mill Conservation Area.

It is noted that hedgehogs would be able to move through some of the proposed boundary treatments.

The proposed boundary treatments would help to define and separate public and private spaces, which would help in terms of legibility and avoiding the creation of leftover space that is vulnerable to anti-social behaviour. While most of the proposed boundary treatments are of heights that could be climbed relatively easily by perpetrators of crime, it is noted that natural surveillance across the application site would generally be good, and there are therefore no significant concerns regarding crime risk in relation to the boundary treatments.

Given the above assessment, it is recommended that an approval be issued pursuant to condition 6, subject to the applicant being reminded of the further requirement of the condition, which states:

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved boundary treatment details.

Condition 9d (flood proofing)

Condition 9, as amended by the NMA application approved on 20/07/2026 (2026/91697), reads as follows:

9) *The development shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (KRS Environmental Ltd, ref: KRS.0646.001.R.001.A, dated September 2022) and in compliance with the following mitigation measures detailed within the approved FRA:*

- a) All new build development shall be located wholly within Flood Zone 1;*
- b) The finished floor level of the lower ground floor of units 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 shall be no lower than 166.50 metres Above Ordnance Datum (AOD);*
- c) There shall be no residential living space on the lower ground floor of units 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9;*
- d) A scheme of flood proofing for units 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented no lower than the 1% AEP plus 23% climate change level with a suitable allowance for freeboard.*

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation of any dwellings of the development hereby approved. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Reason: *To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants in accordance with the requirements of Policy LP27 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.*

Of note, only requirement d of condition 9 requires the submission and approval of details. Condition 9 (including requirements a, b and c) is otherwise a compliance condition.

A refusal was previously issued pursuant to condition 9 (prior to its rewording) under Discharge of Conditions application 2025/93383.

The applicant has submitted a Drainage Conditions document (EWE Associates, 2025/3388, rev F, 22/04/2026) and a Flood Proofing Scheme (16/04/2026) pursuant to condition 9d.

In comments dated 12/10/2022, made in relation to application 2021/90800, the Environment Agency recommended a version of the above condition, and it was duly imposed by the council when issuing the planning permission. In those comments, the Environment Agency did not ask to be consulted at conditions stage (the recommended condition had “shall be agreed with the LPA” wording). The Environment Agency were therefore not consulted on this Discharge of Conditions application.

The Environment Agency were, however, consulted recently regarding the wording of the condition, and – as a consequence, and given units 3 and 4 do not have any lower ground floor accommodation (and, therefore, flood proofing measures are not needed for those two units) – the condition’s wording was amended under NMA application 2026/91697.

The Lead Local Flood Authority have previously advised that they would not comment on details submitted pursuant to a condition that they did not recommend.

In comments dated 12/06/2026, KC Highways Structures advised that condition 9 cannot be discharged pending the satisfactory conclusion of the technical approval of the design of oversize manholes located in the highway, however this comment relates to a matter not being considered under part d of condition 9.

As under the previous Discharge of Conditions application 2025/93383, at page 7 of the submitted Drainage Conditions document, under a “Flood Resilience Measures” heading, the author states “Consideration should be given to flood proofing non habitable ground floor level to units 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 to reduce the residual damages if a critical event was to occur”. On the following page the author sets out a list of recommended flood proofing measures “which can be incorporated within the design of buildings”.

The details submitted pursuant to condition 9d are brief, and the ambiguous wording (“Consideration should be given”, “recommendations” and “can be incorporated”) means the document does not make it clear whether any flood resilience measures are to be implemented. It is therefore recommended that the Drainage Conditions document be disregarded in relation to condition 9d.

The submitted Flood Proofing Scheme (16/04/2026) is of more use. It proposes no residential living accommodation within the lower ground floors of plots 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9, it sets out sealing and drainage measures, and recommends water resistant materials, one-way valves, raised electrical installations, information dissemination and other measures. Residents will also be advised to sign up to the Environment Agency’s flood alert service. These measures are considered acceptable and proportionate to the scale and nature of development, and to the level of flood risk affecting plots 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9.

Given the above assessment, it is recommended that an approval be issued pursuant to condition 9d, subject to the applicant being reminded of the further requirements of the condition, which state:

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation of any dwellings of the development hereby approved. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Condition 10 (drainage scheme)

Condition 10 reads as follows:

10) Development shall not commence until a design scheme detailing foul, surface water and land drainage has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include discharge rates (agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority) indirectly or

directly to watercourse, attenuation for the critical 1 in 100 + 30% climate change rainfall event, attenuation construction details / design, plans and longitudinal sections, hydraulic calculations, and details of phasing of drainage provision. The scheme shall include a risk assessment and method statement, in accordance with CDM Regulations 2015, for access to and into the attenuation structure, and an itinerary of maintenance tasks with schedules. No part of the development shall be occupied until the approved drainage scheme has been provided on the site to serve the development, and the approved scheme shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: *To ensure the provision of adequate and sustainable systems of drainage are employed, in the interests of amenity and environmental wellbeing, and to accord with Policies LP27 and LP28 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.*

This pre-commencement condition is necessary to ensure appropriate measures are designed and agreed prior to any potentially damaging flooding occurring that could harm the existing and approved dwellinghouses.

A refusal was previously issued pursuant to condition 10 under Discharge of Conditions application 2025/93383.

The applicant has submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 10:

- Drainage Conditions (EWE Associates, 2025/3388, rev F, 22/04/2026)
- Surface Water and Foul Water Layout (drawing EWE/3388/01 rev F)
- Surface Water and Foul Water Drainage Details (drawing EWE/3388/02 rev E)
- Impermeable Area Plan (drawing EWE/3388/04 rev A)

Surface water is to discharge (following attenuation) into the adjacent River Holme. Foul water is to discharge to the existing public combined sewer to the north of the application site.

The applicant's covering letter of 22/05/2026 explains how the earlier concerns of the Lead Local Flood Authority have been addressed, through amendments and corrections to the submission documents, and by explaining a previously-highlighted difference in the applicant's impermeable areas figure.

Referring back to their earlier concerns (raised in comments dated 09/01/2026 and 24/02/2026, in relation to the previous Discharge of Conditions application 2025/93383 and regarding several matters relevant to drainage and flood risk), the Lead Local Flood Authority (in comments dated 18/06/2026) have advised that those previous concerns have now been addressed.

Yorkshire Water confirmed they have no objection to the discharge of condition 10.

Given the above assessment, it is recommended that an approval be issued pursuant to condition 10, subject to the applicant being reminded of the further requirements of the condition, which state:

No part of the development shall be occupied until the approved drainage scheme has been provided on the site to serve the development, and the approved scheme shall be retained thereafter.

Condition 15 (Remediation Strategy)

Condition 15 reads as follows:

15) Where site remediation is recommended in the Phase II Intrusive Site Investigation Report approved pursuant to condition 14, no further groundworks / material operations in the affected areas of the site shall commence until a Remediation Strategy by a suitably competent person has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Remediation Strategy shall include a timetable for the implementation and completion of the approved remediation measures.

Reason: *To ensure the safe occupation of the site in accordance with Policy LP53 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.*

The applicant has submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 15:

- Phase 3 Remediation Strategy Report (RGS, C5334/25/E/8828, 05/02/2026)
- Hinchliffe Mill – Development Timeline

The Development Timeline is referred to by the applicant as “rev A”, however no revision number is included on the document.

KC Environmental Health had already seen the submitted Phase 3 Remediation Strategy Report, as it had been submitted pursuant to condition 14 under Discharge of Conditions application 2025/93383. In comments dated 19/02/2026, KC Environmental Health noted:

The remediation strategy sets out the following mitigation: garden areas to be ‘remediated’ by providing a clean cover system consisting of a capping layer of 500mm of inert material over a 100mm thick capillary break. Site operatives are to use safe systems of work to protect themselves during construction and construction best practice operate to prevent release of contaminants/cross contamination on site. The strategy goes on to clarify suitability of clean cover and imported materials and mentions methods for removal and destination of contaminated materials

The applicant did not apply to discharge condition 15 under that earlier application.

In comments dated 07/07/2026 and related to this current Discharge of Conditions application, KC Environmental Health have referred back to their comments of 19/02/2026, and have advised that they have no objection to the discharge of condition 15.

Of note, the submitted Development Timeline does not explicitly refer to remediation works, however “External landscaping” is referred to, and this would include the proposed provision of clean cover referred to in the submitted Phase 3 Remediation Strategy Report.

Given the above assessment, it is recommended that an approval be issued pursuant to condition 15. By issuing an approval that refers to the two submitted documents (which includes information that meets the condition’s requirement for “a timetable for the implementation and completion of the approved remediation measures”), the council will be able to ensure that the remediation is indeed carried out. In addition, condition 16 of permission 2026/90162 states:

Remediation of the site shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the Remediation Strategy approved pursuant to condition 15.

It is recommended that the applicant be reminded of the above.

Condition 18 (electric vehicle charging)

Condition 18 reads as follows:

18) In respect of electric vehicle charging only, the development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with the EV Charging Point and Bin Store Layout (drawing 2559-0402 rev P04) approved by the Local Planning Authority on 09/04/2026 (under Discharge of Condition application 2025/93383). The approved dedicated facilities for charging electric vehicles shall be installed and made operational prior to the occupation of the residential units they serve, and shall be maintained and retained thereafter. The approved dedicated facilities for charging the electric vehicles of visitors shall be installed and made operational prior to the visitor parking spaces being brought into first use, and shall be maintained and retained thereafter.

Reason: *In the interests of supporting and encouraging the use of low emission vehicles, in the interests of air quality enhancement, to comply with the aims and objectives of Policy 12 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan, Policies LP20, LP24 and LP47 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Chapters 2, 9 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the West Yorkshire Low Emission Strategy (WYLES).*

Of note, condition 18 was reworded under Section 73 application 2026/90162 to reflect the fact that an approval had been issued under Discharge of Condition application 2025/93383. Notwithstanding that previous approval, the applicant now seeks a further approval pursuant to condition 18, as the relevant drawing has been updated.

The applicant has now submitted an EV Charging Point and Bin Store Layout (drawing 2559-0402 rev P06) pursuant to condition 18.

The submitted drawing still shows one charging point for each of the 19 dwellings, and one charging point for the visitor parking spaces to the south of the retained mill building. In terms of numbers, this provision is considered adequate. The same drawing also confirms “Charging points to be Apex-7.3 Fast AC Single Outlet 7.3kW Tethered & Untethered Chargers”, which meets the supply requirements that were specified in the original wording of condition 18.

Strictly speaking, an amending application would be needed to vary condition 18 (which is a compliance condition that specifically refers to a previously-approved drawing). However, under this Discharge of Conditions application, the council – while not issuing an approval – can acknowledge the applicant’s revised information, and can note that it still adequately addresses the requirements of the original wording of condition 18. Accordingly, it is recommended that appropriate commentary be included in the council’s decision letter.

Condition 20 (highway retaining walls)

Condition 20, as amended by the NMA application approved on 20/07/2026 (2026/91697), reads as follows:

20) No excavation works or other development shall occur within 10 metres of the boundary between Plot 16 and the re-aligned public footpath until a scheme detailing locations and including cross-sectional information together with the proposed design and construction details of all new retaining walls / building retaining walls adjacent to existing and proposed highways including any modifications to the existing retaining walls on Dobb Lane / Spring Lane / Dam Head has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to superstructure works of any dwellinghouse hereby approved and thereafter retained throughout the life of the development.

Reason: *To ensure that any new retaining structure or modifications to existing retaining structures do not compromise the stability of the highway in accordance with the requirements of Policy 11 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan and Policy LP21 of the Kirklees Local Plan.*

This pre-commencement condition is necessary to ensure that load-bearing highway structures are designed and agreed to a satisfactory standard prior to their use by vehicular traffic.

A refusal was previously issued pursuant to condition 20 (prior to its rewording) under Discharge of Conditions application 2025/93383.

Under this current Discharge of Conditions application, the applicant has submitted a covering letter dated 22/05/2026, stating:

In connection with recent work on the PROW diversion and re-instatement, it came to light that a retaining structure is likely to be

required adjacent to the part of the new public footpath (see enclosed retaining wall plan by Heneghan Architecture). As such, the details below are submitted to address this (and which includes the requested plan showing the location of other retaining walls bounded by private roads / land).

The applicant has therefore submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 20:

- Site sections (drawing 2559-0404 rev P04)
- Retaining wall plan (drawing 2559-0405 rev P03)
- Approval in Principle for Design document (draft, rev 1, 12/05/2026)

The public footpath referred to in condition 20 is HOL/95/10, which runs along the eastern edge of the application site.

In comments dated 12/06/2026, KC Highways Structures advised that the condition could not be discharged pending the technical approval of the proposed retaining walls via submission of AIPs. Of note, on 03/08/2026, KC Highways Structures clarified that this comment related to condition 20.

There has since been extensive dialogue between the applicant team and KC Highways Structures regarding the retaining structure adjacent to the public footpath.

Notwithstanding this ongoing engagement with KC Highways Structures, it is noted that condition 20 was reworded under NMA application 2026/91697, to allow works to continue across the majority of the application site (only excavation works and other development within 10 metres of the boundary between Plot 16 and the re-aligned public footpath are restricted by condition 20). Therefore, the absence of an approval pursuant to condition 20 at this stage may not significantly delay progress at the application site.

Nevertheless, given the ongoing engagement with KC Highways Structures and the submissions made to that team to date, and given that planning conditions should not duplicate controls imposed by separate regulatory regimes, it is considered appropriate to issue an approval pursuant to condition 20. It is recommended that this approval should refer to the submitted Site sections (drawing 2559-0404 rev P04) and Retaining wall plan (drawing 2559-0405 rev P03), should note the ongoing engagement with KC Highways Structures, and should advise the applicant that a further Discharge of Conditions application or an amending application may need to be submitted if what is ultimately approved by KC Highways Structures (via the AIP process) materially differs to what is illustrated in those two drawings or other drawings approved under previous planning applications. The council's decision letter should also remind the applicant of the further requirements of condition 20, which state:

The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to superstructure works of any dwellinghouse hereby approved and thereafter retained throughout the life of the development.

Condition 22 (materials for retaining walls)

Condition 22 reads as follows:

22) Details of the facing materials for the retaining walls within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before works to construct the retaining walls commence. The retaining walls shall be faced in the approved materials and thereafter maintained as such.

Reason: *In the interests of visual amenity and to accord with Policies 1 and 2 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan, Policies LP24 and LP35 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapters 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework.*

A refusal was previously issued pursuant to condition 22 under Discharge of Conditions application 2025/93383. This related to the then-proposed use of tumbled and “lightly aged” walling stone.

The applicant has now submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 22:

- Materials Schedule (Heneghan Architecture, 2559, issue 06, 21/04/2026)
- Site sections (drawing 2559-0404 rev P04)
- Retaining wall plan (drawing 2559-0405 rev P03)

The applicant still proposes the use of tumbled stone, but no longer intends to dye it. As noted earlier in this report (in relation to condition 4), the proposed 140mm split faced tumbled natural walling stone is considered acceptable for the retaining walls within the application site.

KC Highways Structures, in comments dated 12/06/2026, raised concerns regarding condition 22, but later (on 03/08/2026) clarified that these comments actually related to condition 20, In addition, KC Highways Structures noted that, as the proposed wall would be a private structure, from an aesthetic standpoint they would have no specific requirement for the facing material.

Given the above assessment, it is recommended that an approval be issued pursuant to condition 22, subject to the applicant being reminded of the further requirements of the condition, which state:

The retaining walls shall be faced in the approved materials and thereafter maintained as such.

Condition 24 (Waste Management Plan)

Condition 24 reads as follows:

24) Prior to the commencement of superstructure works, a Waste Management Plan shall be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Waste Management Plan shall:

- a) Identify the location of sufficiently sized bin stores, either internal or external, for all dwellinghouses; and*
- b) Set out the construction and detailing of all external bin collection point screening (with a preference for grit stone gabion fencing) and door detailing.*

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Waste Management Plan.

Reason: *To ensure satisfactory arrangements are implemented in relation to waste during the construction phase, in the interests of visual and residential amenity and highway safety, and to assist in achieving sustainable development, in accordance with Policies 5 and 11 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Plan and Policies LP21 and LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan.*

A refusal was previously issued pursuant to condition 24 under Discharge of Conditions application 2025/93383.

The applicant has now submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 24:

- Permanent Waste Management Plan (Heneghan Architecture, 2559, issue 02, 28/04/2026)
- EV Charging Point and Bin Store Layout (drawing 2559-0402 rev P06)
- Materials Schedule (Heneghan Architecture, 2559, issue 06, 21/04/2026)

In comments dated 03/06/2026, KC Waste Strategy confirmed that the Waste Collection Authority can agree to the discharge of condition 24.

Section 8 of the Permanent Waste Management Plan states “An annotated EV Charging and Waste Storage & Collection Plan accompanies this report”, however no drawing with that title has been submitted, and it is assumed that the author is referring to the EV Charging Point and Bin Store Layout (drawing 2559-0402 rev P06).

That drawing shows bin store and bin collection point locations, and confirms that the bin stores would be enclosed by gritstone-filled galvanised steel mesh enclosures. The submitted Materials Schedule adds that the enclosures would have timber doors painted black, and galvanised / stainless steel ironmongery. As noted earlier in this report (in relation to condition 4), the materials proposed for the bin stores are considered acceptable. The proposed gritstone-filled steel mesh structures meet the preference (expressed in the wording of condition 24) for “grit stone gabion fencing”.

The numbers, sizes and locations of the bin stores and bin collection points are considered acceptable.

Given the above assessment, it is recommended that an approval be issued pursuant to condition 24, subject to the applicant being reminded of the further requirement of the condition, which states:

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Waste Management Plan.

Condition 31 (Landscape Ecological Design Strategy)

Condition 31 reads as follows:

31) Development shall not commence until a Landscape Ecological Design Strategy (LEDS) is submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEDS shall:

- a) Detail how 8.64 habitat units (as per the Biodiversity Metric dated 31/10/2022) are to be achieved post-development;*
- b) Set out on-site provision for roosting bats and nesting bird as detailed in the Ecological Impact Assessment (Quants, 1504c rev 2, 24/08/2022); and*
- c) Hard and soft landscaping design.*

The proposed works of the LEDS shall also include the following details:

- d) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed works;*
- e) Review of site potential and constraints;*
- f) Detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) to achieve stated objectives;*
- g) Extent and location / area of proposed works on appropriate scale maps and plans;*
- h) Type and source of materials to be used where appropriate, e.g. stone setts and/or native species of local provenance;*
- i) Specifications of tree pits or root barriers for trees within drainage easements;*
- j) A timetable for implementation demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of development;*
- k) Persons responsible for implementing the works;*
- l) Details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance;*
- m) Details for monitoring and (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEDS are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action shall be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers a measurable biodiversity net gain;*
- n) Details for disposal of any wastes arising from works; and*
- o) A Landscape Management Plan to include details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance for minimum of five years. This shall also include any existing trees and vegetation retained on site, plus management of the mill pond.*

The LEDS shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure the development provides adequate visual amenity, ecological enhancement and creation measures sufficient to provide no net loss to biodiversity in accordance with Policies LP24, LP30, LP32, LP33, LP47 and LP63 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

This pre-commencement condition is necessary to ensure details relating to the required no net loss to biodiversity are devised and agreed at an appropriate stage of the development process.

A refusal was previously issued pursuant to condition 31 under Discharge of Conditions application 2025/93383.

In response to that earlier refusal and to the comments (made under this current Discharge of Conditions application) of KC Ecology dated 05/06/2026, the applicant submitted amended and additional information pursuant to condition 31, with the latest submission made on 12/06/2026. The applicant's submission now comprises:

- Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy (drawing M3320-PA-05-V7)
- Landscape Layout (drawing M3320-PA-01-V20)
- Hardscape Strategy (drawing M3320-PA-03-V17)
- Soft Landscape Strategy (drawing M3320-PA-02-V18)
- Public Open Space Landscape Layout (drawing M3320-PA-06-V2)
- Tree Pit Detail (drawing M3320-PA-TP1-V1)
- Untitled, unreferenced drawing detailing bat boxes, bird boxes, sparrow terraces and swift bricks
- Landscape Maintenance Schedules (Barnes Walker, M3320-PA-V2-Maintenance Schedules, June 2026)
- Landscape Management Plan (Barnes Walker, M3320-PA-V2-Management Plan, June 2026)
- Mill Pond Management Plan (Holroyd Homes, rev A, June 2026)
- Schedule of Hard Landscaping Materials (Holroyd Homes, April 2026)
- Landscape Ecological Design Strategy (LEDS) (Quants Environmental, 1507f, rev 1, November 2025)
- Hinchliffe Mill – Development Timeline

The Development Timeline is referred to by the applicant as “rev A”, however no revision number is included on the document.

The listed requirements of condition 31 are considered as follows:

Detail how 8.64 habitat units (as per the Biodiversity Metric dated 31/10/2022) are to be achieved post-development

At section 3 of the submitted Landscape Ecological Design Strategy, the applicant confirms describes the proposed the creation of other neutral grassland in moderate condition, mixed scrub in good condition, bioswales in moderate condition, and vegetated gardens. The management methods included in the Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy have been designed

in line with the BNG Condition Assessment Sheets, to demonstrate how the habitats onsite will achieve the proposed condition. The site's existing pond and mixed scrub would be retained and enhanced, and would deliver 7.66 habitat units. In addition, new habitats would deliver a further 0.98 habitat units. These provisions total 8.64 units, in accordance with the Biodiversity Metric dated 31/10/2022 and considered under the original application (2021/90800).

During the life of the application, in response to the comments of KC Ecology, other submission documents have been corrected to correspond with what is set out in the Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy.

Set out on-site provision for roosting bats and nesting bird as detailed in the Ecological Impact Assessment (Quants, 1504c rev 2, 24/08/2022)

An untitled, unreferenced drawing provides appropriate details of bat boxes, bird boxes, sparrow terraces and Swift bricks, as does the Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy (drawing M3320-PA-05-V7). Section 4 of the submitted Landscape Ecological Design Strategy describes these measures. The numbers and locations of the boxes, terraces and bricks are considered appropriate.

Hard and soft landscaping design

The submitted Hardscape Strategy (drawing M3320-PA-03-V17) is relevant to this requirement. It details the following hard surfacing materials:

- Tarmac (for the development's roads)
- Plasmor Sorrento block paving, "Sarsen Stone" colour (for driveways, parking spaces, paths and service margins)
- Marshalls Indian sandstone paving, "Raj Green" colour (within private gardens)
- Moonstone loose gravel (for an area south of the mill pond)
- KBI Flexipave porous surfacing with timber edging (for the public footpath along the eastern edge of the site)
- Marshalls conservation kerb, "charcoal" colour (for edging the vehicular access from Spring Lane)
- Plasmor Plaspave cobblestones, "Granite Stone" colour (for edging the northern vehicular access and car turning area)

Although the use of locally-quarried natural stone paving materials throughout the site would be preferable (given the site's context, and its location within the Hinchliffe Mill Conservation Area), artificial products can be considered acceptable here, if of a high quality and if they suitably respond to the materials of the retained mill building, the new dwellings, and the existing buildings surrounding the site. To inform an assessment of the suitability of the proposed paving materials, photographs of most of the above-listed materials have been provided in the submitted Schedule of Hard Landscaping Materials (Holroyd Homes, April 2026), and officers viewed samples of a Marshalls Indian sandstone paving on site on 23/07/2026.

The proposed paving materials are considered acceptable. They would respond well to the materials of the retained mill building, the new dwellings, and the existing buildings surrounding the site, in a relatively consistent Pennine valley context where locally-quarried natural stone predominates. The Indian sandstone paving (which is now proposed in “Raj Green” colour, whereas “Multi Brown” was previously proposed under application 2025/93383) is considered acceptable, given its limited proposed use within private gardens.

The submitted Soft Landscape Strategy (drawing M3320-PA-02-V18) is also relevant to this requirement. This illustrates planting throughout the site, which is considered acceptable (several native species are proposed, as are species attractive to pollinators). Supplementary planting is detailed in the submitted Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy, and this includes a night-scented flowering plant (Honeysuckle) which attract insects which, in turn, bats feed on. A previously-proposed potentially invasive species (*Euphorbia amygdaloides robbiae*) has been deleted from the proposals. At the request of KC Ecology, a non-native Elm has also been deleted. For the proposed scrub and bioswale planting, changes have been made to the proposed species, to address the comments of KC Ecology.

Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed works

This requirement is satisfactorily addressed at section 3 of the submitted Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy.

Review of site potential and constraints

This requirement is satisfactorily addressed at section 2 of the submitted Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy.

Detailed design(s) and/or working method(s) to achieve stated objectives

Detailed designs of the proposed landscaping are set out in the various drawings and documents listed above. The submitted Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy provides acceptable details of working methods.

Extent and location / area of proposed works on appropriate scale maps and plans

This requirement is addressed via the details set out in the various drawings and documents listed above.

Type and source of materials to be used where appropriate, e.g. stone setts and/or native species of local provenance

This matter is assessed above in relation to the proposed hard and soft landscaping.

Specifications of tree pits or root barriers for trees within drainage easements

The submitted Tree Pit Detail (drawing M3320-PA-TP1-V1) addresses this requirement.

A timetable for implementation demonstrating that works are aligned with the proposed phasing of development

The timetable for implementation at section 7 of the submitted Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy, and the submitted document titled “Hinchliffe Mill – Development Timeline”, provide sufficient and acceptable detail in relation to this requirement.

Persons responsible for implementing the works

Paragraph 6.3.1.1 of the submitted Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy states that “Holroyd Homes (The Studio, Rear Of 14 Park Drive, Huddersfield, HD1 4EB) will be responsible for implementing the works detailed in this LEDS”. While more specific information would have been preferable, this – together with the details of responsibilities set out in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP: Biodiversity) previously submitted and approved pursuant to condition 30 – is considered adequate.

Details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance

Section 7 of the submitted Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy is relevant to this requirement, however more detail is set out in the Landscape Maintenance Schedules (Barnes Walker, M3320-PA-V2-Maintenance Schedules, June 2026) and the Landscape Management Plan (Barnes Walker, M3320-PA-V2-Management Plan, June 2026). The proposed initial aftercare and long-term maintenance arrangements are considered acceptable.

Details for monitoring and (where the results from monitoring show that conservation aims and objectives of the LEDS are not being met) how contingencies and/or remedial action shall be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers a measurable biodiversity net gain

Paragraphs 6.1.1.3 and 6.2.1.1 of the submitted Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy state:

After each of the monitoring stages (Years 3, 5, 10, 20 and 30) and before the end of the relevant calendar year, an Ecological Monitoring Report will be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Each Ecological Monitoring Report will include a review of all habitats against the Target Conditions and will identify any Remedial Measures required in order to meet the Target Conditions listed in this LEDS.

Where the results from the monitoring show that the Target Conditions are not being met or not likely to be met by 30 years, Remedial Measures will be detailed in the Ecological Monitoring Report and the remedial action

will be implemented so that the development meets the Target Conditions and delivers the required Habitat Units and Hedgerow Units.

These arrangements are considered acceptable (although the reference to hedgerow units is understood to be an error, as condition 31 does not refer to these), and would help ensure the development would still deliver the biodiversity net gain.

Details for disposal of any wastes arising from works

Paragraphs 6.4.1.1 and 6.4.1.2 of the submitted Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy set out appropriate arrangements for the disposal of waste, including the re-use of logs / brush on-site.

A Landscape Management Plan to include details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance for minimum of five years. This shall also include any existing trees and vegetation retained on site, plus management of the mill pond

The submitted Landscape Management Plan (Barnes Walker, M3320-PA-V2-Management Plan, June 2026) set out acceptable landscape management arrangements, and now includes the removal of all invasive non-native species. Management of the site's mill pond is addressed separately (and adequately) in the submitted Mill Pond Management Plan (Holroyd Homes, rev A, June 2026).

In comments dated 17/06/2026, KC Ecology advised that the revised information was satisfactory, and that condition 31 could be discharged. KC Ecology noted, however, the text at paragraph 6.1.1.3 of the submitted Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy, which states:

After each of the monitoring stages (Years 3, 5, 10, 20 and 30) and before the end of the relevant calendar year, an Ecological Monitoring Report will be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Each Ecological Monitoring Report will include a review of all habitats against the Target Conditions and will identify any Remedial Measures required in order to meet the Target Conditions listed in this LEDS.

Given the above assessment, it is recommended that an approval be issued pursuant to condition 31, subject to the applicant being reminded of the commitments set out at paragraph 6.1.1.3 of the submitted Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy, and of the further requirements of the condition, which state:

The LEDS shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

Recommendation

Split decision:

- Approve details pursuant to conditions 4 (design and appearance), 6 (boundary treatments), 9d (flood proofing), 10 (drainage scheme), 15 (Remediation Strategy), 20 (highway retaining walls), 22 (materials for retaining walls), 24 (Waste Management Plan) and 31 (LEDS), subject to advice.
- Advise applicant that no approvals are issued pursuant to conditions 5 (archaeological investigation) and 18 (electric vehicle charging), but that the submissions are noted and are considered acceptable.

Decision Notice Text

Condition 4 (design and appearance) – You have submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 4:

- Materials Schedule (Heneghan Architecture, 2559, issue 06, 21/04/2026)
- Mill Conversion Working Drawing Elevations (drawing 2559-0504, rev P04, 20/05/2026)
- Window and Door Details (drawing 2559-0403, rev P03, 17/08/2026)
- Typical Window Elevations and Sections (drawing 2559-0407, rev P03, 14/08/2026)
- Typical Door Elevations and Sections (drawing 2559-0406, rev P03, 14/08/2026)
- Proposed Mill Conversion Floor Plans (drawing 2559-0302 rev P02, 20/05/2026)
- Report to accompany an Application to discharge Condition 4e) of Planning Application ref 2021/62/90800/W (Mark Hide Associates, rev B, 21/05/2026)

The external materials and other details you have proposed include:

- 140mm split face tumbled walling stone from PG Stone, coursed at random lengths, with flush pointing (for the new dwellings and garages)
- Ashlar stone from PG Stone, sourced from Johnsons Wellfield Quarry, South Crosland (for heads and cills)
- 140mm split faced tumbled natural walling stone (for the retaining walls)
- Rustic brick (for feature panels to the new dwellings)
- Reclaimed stone (for repairs to the walls of the retained mill building)
- Reclaimed stone slates left over from Seventy Acre Farm development (for repairs to the retained mill building)
- Westland Graphite Brazilian slate 7-9mm thick (for roofs of the new dwellings)
- Metal standing seam cladding (for projections to new dwellings)
- Bitumen and cellulose fibre black corrugated panels (for garage roofs)
- Refurbished or new iron, painted black (for gutters and downpipes to the retained mill building)
- Black aluminium gutters and downpipes (for new dwellings)
- Powder coated aluminium, black grey RAL 7021 (for windows and doors to the retained mill building and new dwellings)

- Conservation roof lights (stainless steel frames, polyester powder coated black)
- Dual Glass All Black N-Type Mono solar panels (made by Jinko) set into a GSE in-roof integrated system
- Gritstone-filled galvanised steel mesh enclosures, timber doors painted black, galvanised / stainless steel ironmongery (for bin stores)

A sample panel of the proposed walling stone was viewed on site by officers on 23/07/2026. Samples of the proposed Brazilian slate and window frames were also viewed.

The submitted details are considered acceptable for the purpose of condition 4, and are hereby approved. Please be reminded of the further requirement of the condition, which states:

The development shall be implemented in accordance [with the] approved details.

Condition 5 (archaeological investigation) – You have stated that the design of the development has been modified so that no groundworks are required below the existing concrete floor slab within the northern section of the mill, and that this means that any archaeological remains that may be present will be undisturbed by the development and will remain preserved in-situ. An accompanying letter (On-Site Archaeology, 24/04/2026) states the same, and appends a section illustrating the retention of the concrete slab.

In two responses (dated 01/06/2026 and 16/06/2026) the West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service (WYAAS) accepted your updated information. In the more recent response, WYAAS advised:

“...a condition was originally placed on this application for an archaeological watching brief (condition 5) the design of the proposed works has since been changed and the concrete slab under the north side of the mill will no longer be removed. The developers agent has sent a letter to confirm this. Based on this the archaeological watching brief required by condition 5 is no longer required and the condition can be discharged as completed, from an archaeological point of view”.

Strictly speaking, an amending application would be needed to vary condition 5 (which is a compliance condition that specifically refers to a previously-approved watching brief). However, although no approval is hereby issued under this Discharge of Conditions application, your revised information is acknowledged, and the council concurs with the above-quoted conclusions of WYAAS.

Condition 6 (boundary treatments) – You have submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 6:

- Boundary Treatments Strategy (drawing M3320-PA-04-V16)
- Retaining wall plan (drawing 2559-0405 rev P03)

- Retaining dry stone wall detail (drawing M3320-PA-W1-V1)
- Retaining dry stone wall detail (drawing M3320-PA-W1-V1)
- Boundary wall detail (drawing M3320-PA-W3-V1)
- 1.2m Metal Estate Railing (drawing M3320-PA-R1-V1)
- Site sections (drawing 2559-0404 rev P04)
- Schedule of Hard Landscaping Materials (Holroyd Homes, April 2026)
- Materials Schedule (Heneghan Architecture, 2559, issue 06, 21/04/2026)

There are numbering / title errors in some of the above-listed documents. The Boundary Treatments Strategy refers to V15 and V16 on the same drawing. There are two drawings titled “Retaining dry stone wall detail” and numbered M3320-PA-W1-V1 – one illustrates a “W1” wall for locations with level differences, the other illustrates a “W2” wall for level ground.

The submitted documents detail the following proposed boundary treatments:

- 1.2m high metal estate railing, painted black (along the River Holme, around most of the mill pond, and along the site’s eastern boundary)
- Stone-faced retaining walls of varying heights (1.2m above ground level, plus additional height depending on level difference) at the centre of the site
- 1.2m stone-faced masonry walls (to garden curtilages)
- Existing dry stone walls, various heights (along the River Holme, mill pond and Dam Head)
- Hedges (separating gardens, and to garden curtilages)

The submitted details are considered acceptable for the purpose of condition 6, and are hereby approved. Please be reminded of the further requirement of the condition, which states:

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved boundary treatment details.

Condition 9d (flood proofing) – You have submitted a Flood Proofing Scheme (16/04/2026) pursuant to condition 9d. You have also submitted a Drainage Conditions document (EWE Associates, 2025/3388, rev F, 22/04/2026), however this has been disregarded due to its brevity and ambiguous wording in relation to flood proofing and condition 9d.

The details set out in the submitted Flood Proofing Scheme (16/04/2026) are considered acceptable for the purpose of condition 9d, and are hereby approved. Please be reminded of the further requirements of the condition, which state:

These mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation of any dwellings of the development hereby approved. The measures detailed above shall be retained and maintained thereafter throughout the lifetime of the development.

Condition 10 (drainage scheme) – You have submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 10:

- Drainage Conditions (EWE Associates, 2025/3388, rev F, 22/04/2026)
- Surface Water and Foul Water Layout (drawing EWE/3388/01 rev F)
- Surface Water and Foul Water Drainage Details (drawing EWE/3388/02 rev E)
- Impermeable Area Plan (drawing EWE/3388/04 rev A)

The submitted details are considered acceptable for the purpose of condition 10, and are hereby approved. Please be reminded of the further requirements of the condition, which state:

No part of the development shall be occupied until the approved drainage scheme has been provided on the site to serve the development, and the approved scheme shall be retained thereafter.

Condition 15 (Remediation Strategy) – You have submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 15:

- Phase 3 Remediation Strategy Report (RGS, C5334/25/E/8828, 05/02/2026)
- Hinchliffe Mill – Development Timeline

The Development Timeline is referred to in your submission as “rev A”, however no revision number is included on the document.

The submitted details are considered acceptable for the purpose of condition 15, and are hereby approved. This approval is based on the two above-listed documents (which include information that meets the condition’s requirement for “a timetable for the implementation and completion of the approved remediation measures”), and you are therefore required to carry out the remediation. In addition, please be reminded that the related condition 16 of permission 2026/90162 states:

Remediation of the site shall be carried out and completed in accordance with the Remediation Strategy approved pursuant to condition 15.

Condition 18 (electric vehicle charging) – You have submitted an EV Charging Point and Bin Store Layout (drawing 2559-0402 rev P06) pursuant to condition 18.

Although an approval pursuant to condition 18 had previously been issued under Discharge of Condition application 2025/93383, you now seek a further approval pursuant to condition 18, as the relevant drawing has been updated.

Strictly speaking, an amending application would be needed to vary condition 18 (which is a compliance condition that specifically refers to a previously-approved drawing). However, although no approval is hereby issued under this

Discharge of Conditions application, your revised information is acknowledged, and you are advised that the details included in the submitted drawing (2559-0402 rev P06) are considered acceptable for the purpose of condition 18.

Condition 20 (highway retaining walls) – You have submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 20:

- Site sections (drawing 2559-0404 rev P04)
- Retaining wall plan (drawing 2559-0405 rev P03)

Having regard to your ongoing engagement with KC Highways Structures regarding the AIP process and public footpath HOL/95/10, the details submitted pursuant to condition 20 are considered acceptable and are hereby approved. Please be reminded of the further requirements of condition 20, which state:

The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to superstructure works of any dwellinghouse hereby approved and thereafter retained throughout the life of the development.

You are also advised that a further Discharge of Conditions application or an amending application may need to be submitted if what is ultimately approved by KC Highways Structures (via the AIP process) materially differs to what is illustrated in the two drawings listed above or other drawings approved under previous planning applications.

Condition 22 (materials for retaining walls) – You have submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 22:

- Materials Schedule (Heneghan Architecture, 2559, issue 06, 21/04/2026)
- Site sections (drawing 2559-0404 rev P04)
- Retaining wall plan (drawing 2559-0405 rev P03)

The submitted details are considered acceptable for the purpose of condition 22, and are hereby approved. Please be reminded of the further requirements of the condition, which state:

The retaining walls shall be faced in the approved materials and thereafter maintained as such.

Condition 24 (Waste Management Plan) – You have submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 24:

- Permanent Waste Management Plan (Heneghan Architecture, 2559, issue 02, 28/04/2026)
- EV Charging Point and Bin Store Layout (drawing 2559-0402 rev P06)
- Materials Schedule (Heneghan Architecture, 2559, issue 06, 21/04/2026)

The submitted details are considered acceptable for the purpose of condition 24, and are hereby approved. Please be reminded of the further requirement of the condition, which states:

The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved Waste Management Plan.

Condition 31 (Landscape Ecological Design Strategy) – You have submitted the following documents pursuant to condition 31:

- Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy (drawing M3320-PA-05-V7)
- Landscape Layout (drawing M3320-PA-01-V20)
- Hardscape Strategy (drawing M3320-PA-03-V17)
- Soft Landscape Strategy (drawing M3320-PA-02-V18)
- Public Open Space Landscape Layout (drawing M3320-PA-06-V2)
- Tree Pit Detail (drawing M3320-PA-TP1-V1)
- Untitled, unreferenced drawing detailing bat boxes, bird boxes, sparrow terraces and swift bricks
- Landscape Maintenance Schedules (Barnes Walker, M3320-PA-V2-Maintenance Schedules, June 2026)
- Landscape Management Plan (Barnes Walker, M3320-PA-V2-Management Plan, June 2026)
- Mill Pond Management Plan (Holroyd Homes, rev A, June 2026)
- Schedule of Hard Landscaping Materials (Holroyd Homes, April 2026)
- Landscape Ecological Design Strategy (LEDS) (Quants Environmental, 1507f, rev 1, November 2025)
- Hinchliffe Mill – Development Timeline

The Development Timeline is referred to in your submission as “rev A”, however no revision number is included on the document.

The submitted details are considered acceptable for the purpose of condition 31, and are hereby approved. Please be reminded of the further requirements of the condition, which state:

The LEDS shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and all features shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

Please also be reminded of the commitments set out at paragraph 6.1.1.3 of the submitted Landscape and Ecological Design Strategy, which states:

After each of the monitoring stages (Years 3, 5, 10, 20 and 30) and before the end of the relevant calendar year, an Ecological Monitoring Report will be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Each Ecological Monitoring Report will include a review of all habitats against the Target Conditions and will identify any Remedial Measures required in order to meet the Target Conditions listed in this LEDS.