

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE

By

MRS HELEN HAIGH

For

ONE SELF-BUILD CUSTOM DWELLING

On

**LAND AT WINDMILL FARM, BUSKER LANE
SKELMANTHORPE**

PLANNING STATEMENT

APRIL 2025

140 Denby Lane
Upper Denby
Huddersfield
HD8 8UN

T: 01484 860000
M: 07836 654108
www.alynnicholls.com
akn@alynnicholls.com

CONTENTS

	Page Number
INTRODUCTION	1
PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE	2
THE SELF-BUILD ACT	2
THE SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA	3
RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY	4
THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN	6
NATIONAL POLICY (“the NPPF”)	7
HOUSING LAND SUPPLY AND HOUSING DELIVERY	10
ASSESSMENT	11
CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY	14

PARTNERS:

ALYN NICHOLLS BA (HONS) MRTPI

ANN NICHOLLS – Partner Responsible For Business and Administration



INTRODUCTION

1. This Statement forms part of an application for Permission in Principle (***“PiP”***) for one self-build, custom dwelling on land at Windmill Farm, Busker Lane, Skelmanthorpe (***“The Site”***). The Site comprises an equestrian menage, It is previously developed land.
2. The Site falls within the Green Belt as defined within the Kirklees Local Plan. The history of the site includes a dismissed appeal for the development of a house in 2010 and a refused planning application in 2023. The main reason the appeal was dismissed and the application was refused was a failure to demonstrate very special circumstances to justify development inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
3. However, Kirklees Council does not have a 5 year supply of housing land. It is also failing the Housing Delivery Test. It is land which is previously developed and does not strongly contribute to any purposes of the Green Belt hen considered in the context of the plan area as a whole. In these circumstances, development involving the provision of housing in a sustainable location is not regarded as inappropriate development in the Green Belt¹. The consequence is the requirement to demonstrate very special circumstances to justify development in the Green Belt does not apply.
4. This Application comprises the following:
 - Completed application forms for PiP;
 - A Location, Site and Block Plan, Drawing No.HA25017 (PL) 001 Rev.A;
 - A Technical Note on Highways by SCP Transport Planning; and
 - This Planning Statement
5. The proposed dwelling will be a project under the Self-Build and Custom Housing Act 2015, (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016) (***“The Self-Build Act”***).
6. This Statement is set out as follows:
 - The requirements of PiP;
 - The provisions of the Self-Build Act.
 - A brief description of the site and surrounding area;

¹ National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024). paragraph 155 and footnote 56.

- A description of the relevant planning history of the site;
- Housing land supply and the Housing Delivery Test;
- The Development Plan and the most important policies for the determination this application;
- Relevant National Policy;
- An assessment of the merits of the Application
- Summary and conclusions.

PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE

7. The PiP route for obtaining planning permission for the proposed development, is available because:
 - The proposed development is housing;
 - The proposal is for a minor development (as opposed to a major development)²;
 - The development does not fall within the scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations;
 - The development is not a householder application.
 - It is not a habitats development.
 - The proposal is not otherwise excluded from a grant of PIP by Article 5B of the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) (Amendment) Order 2017.
8. The matters within the scope of a decision on whether to grant PIP are limited to location, land use and the amount of development.

THE SELF-BUILD ACT

9. The Self-Build and Custom House Building Act 2015 places a statutory duty on Councils to keep and publicise a register of people who want to self or custom build in their area and to have regard to the register when exercising planning, housing, land disposal and regeneration functions³.

² The Permission in Principle (amendment) Order 2017, Part 2a Section 5B(5) defines major development of being where the number of dwelling houses to be provided is 10 or more, or where the development is to be carried out on a site having an area of 1 hectare or more.

³ Section 2(1) The Housing and Planning Act 2016 places a duty on Councils to meet demand, the target number based on the register number, by granting development permissions for enough service plots to need demand on a rolling annual basis. There is therefore a statutory requirement to grant sufficient permissions to meet demand.

10. The Housing and Planning Act 2016 places a duty on Councils to meet demand (target number based on Register number) by granting 'development permissions' for enough serviced plots to meet demand on rolling annual basis⁴. (three years to deliver). "Development permissions" expressly includes PiP. It should be noted that the requirement to meet demand is contained in primary legislation as opposed to policy or guidance.
11. The proposal qualifies as a Self-Build and Custom Home because it will be commissioned by the Applicant for her occupation and designed to meet her specific requirements. The Applicant will be the first owner of the home and will have a primary input into its design and layout⁵.

THE SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA

12. The site comprises land laid out as an equestrian menage and is located between Windmill Farm and No. 7 Busker Lane, Skelmanthorpe. The Site has a frontage onto Busker Lane. The menage was created in the 1980s. The Site is rectangular in shape, about 0.09 hectares in area. The land has been engineered to create a flat, level service for the menage. Around the menage there are four lighting columns about 4 metres in height. Established hedges surround the Site. A stone wall is on the Busker Lane frontage
13. The Site is located to the east of the main built-up area of Skelmanthorpe. It comprises a gap in ribbon development on the northern side of Busker Lane. The frontage of the Site onto Busker Lane is about 20 metres in length. The Site is about 100 metres to the east of the settlement boundary for Skelmanthorpe identified in the Local Plan.
14. Adjoining to the west is the farmhouse at Windmill Farm, adjoining immediately to the east, beyond the boundary hedgerow, is a swimming pool building within the curtilage of No. 7 Busker Lane. On the opposite side of Busker Lane are the Windmill Public House and bowling green and large detached houses setting extensive mature gardens.
15. There are no street level views into and across the Site from Busker Lane because of the boundary wall and hedgerow. From the north, in views from Pilling Lane, the Site is indistinguishable within existing development on Busker Lane.

⁴ Self-Build Act 2015 Section 2A (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016)

⁵ See National Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph: 016 Reference ID: 57-016-20210208

16. Skelmanthorpe as a major settlement within rural Kirklees. The Local Plan anticipates the development of housing in the village as part of the strategy to secure a sustainable pattern of development. The centre of the village is defined as a district centre and it provides a range of shops, services and a health centre. There are also two primary schools and a high school within the village.
17. Busker Lane is a bus route. It is served by the D1 bus service from Denby Dale to Huddersfield and the X1 service between Holmfirth and Wakefield. Bus stops are located at Windmill Close about 100 metres to the west of the Site and on Busker Lane, about 200 metres to the east.
18. In summary, the Site comprises an equestrian menage. It is previously developed; it has development on either side and development on the opposite side of Busker Lane and it is visually enclosed by existing boundary treatment. The Site is 100 metres outside the boundary of Skelmanthorpe as defined in the Local Plan. The village is a sustainable location for development and a range of shops and services are available together with a health centre and schools. Busker Lane is also a bus route.
19. The Site is not within a Conservation Area and there are no listed buildings in the vicinity of the site.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

20. There have been three planning applications for the development of a dwelling on the Site. The first was in 1994. The second was in 2009 (*"the 2009 Proposal"*)⁶. It was refused and a subsequent appeal dismissed. The third was in 2022 and refused permission in March 2023 (*"the 2022 Proposal"*)⁷. The location of the Site within the Green Belt was the determining factor in each case.
21. There is no record of planning permission being granted for the creation of the equestrian menage and installation of the lighting columns. It was created at some point in the 1980s. Aerial images⁸ indicate it was in situ in December 2002. The presence of the menage is noted in the appeal decision letter for the 2009 Proposal⁹.

⁶ Kirklees Ref. 2009/93236; PINS Ref. APP/Z4718/A/10/2122627

⁷ Kirklees Ref. 2022/91564

⁸ Google Earth

⁹ Paragraph 7. The menage is an established use of the site.

22. The appeal decision for the 2009 Proposal addressed the following matters:
- Whether the proposed development would be an appropriate development in the Greenbelt;
 - The effect of the proposal on the openness of the Greenbelt;
 - Whether the proposal could make an effective use of land;
 - Whether harm by reason of inappropriateness is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
23. In respect of each of these matters:
- a. The Inspector concluded that the site would be an appropriate development in the Green Belt;
 - b. The Inspector considered that the menage use retained the openness of the Green Belt. A dwelling would erode the openness of this section of Busker Lane;
 - c. It was not demonstrated that the proposal would be an effective use of Brownfield land; and
 - d. The Inspector considered there were no considerations that weighed in favour of the development and clearly outweigh the harm to the openness of the Greenbelt.
24. The 2022 Proposal sought outline permission for a single dwelling¹⁰. Access and layout were matters for determination as part of this application. The proposed access arrangements were to share the existing access to Windmill Farm.
25. The 2022 Proposal was refused in March 2023. There are two reasons for refusal. In summary, the first is that the proposal was inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that no very special circumstances had been demonstrated to justify development. The second reason was that no independent speed survey had been undertaken to demonstrate satisfactory visibility at the access. Consequently, it was

¹⁰ LPA Reference: 2022/91564

asserted that the proposed development would be to the detriment of highway safety.

26. In summary, the location of the site within the Green Belt has been the main reason development has not been approved in the past. This issue is addressed later in this report. The revised National Planning Policy Framework issued in December 2024 has made a material change in policy for housing development in the Green Belt. The highway issue arising in the 2023 refusal of planning permission is addressed in the report of SCP Transport Planning's Technical Note.

THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

27. The Development Plan as far as relevant comprises the Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies and the Kirklees Local Plan Allocations and Designations, both adopted in February 2019. The site falls within the Green Belt as defined on the Local Plan Policies Map.
28. Bearing in mind the consideration of a PiP application is limited to location, land use and the amount of development, the following policies are the most important to the determination of the Application:

- Policy LP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, which reflects paragraph 11 of the National Planning policy Framework. In particular it notes that where policies relevant to the proposal are out of date the Council will grant permission unless material considerations indicate otherwise having regard to whether any adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or whether specific policies in that NPPF indicate that development should be restricted. Up until the revision of the NPPF in December 2024, policy for development in the Green Belt was a matter weighing against the grant of planning permission in circumstances when policies were otherwise out of date.
- Policy LP11: Housing Mix and Affordable Housing, which encourages proposals for self-build homes where consistent with other policies in the Local Plan.
- Policy LP59: Brownfield Sites in the Green Belt, which identifies when development will be acceptable. This includes infill development.

29. The Development Plan has not changed since the refusal of the 2022 Proposal. Policy LP59: Brownfield Sites in the Green Belt is identified in the first reason for refusal for that development.
30. The Officer Report relating to the determination of the 2022 Proposal took the position that in order to qualify as infill development under Policy LP59(a), a gap between development must be between buildings on a brownfield site on the same planning unit. It was asserted that brownfield land located in a gap between buildings did not qualify in circumstances a building on one side of the gap was on an adjacent neighbouring site. The report concluded that the proposal did not qualify under this clause of the policy.
31. It was also argued that the menage was overgrown and could not reasonably be reinstated without works to the Site. It was argued that the fact it was overgrown at that time resulted in the Site having blended into the landscape. As a consequence, the Site did not qualify as Previously Developed Land having regard to the definition within the NPPF.
32. It was argued that the introduction of a dwelling onto the site where there is presently no built development would harm the openness of the Green Belt and planning was refused.

NATIONAL POLICY (“the NPPF”)

33. The revised NPPF was published on the 12th December 2024. The cornerstone of National Policy is the achievement of a sustainable pattern of development through a plan led system. The NPPF provides a framework within which local plans and decisions can provide for sufficient housing in a sustainable manner¹¹. In achieving sustainable development, the planning system has three interdependent, overarching objectives. These are an economic objective to ensure the planning system can facilitate growth in the economy; a social objective to ensure sufficient homes are provided and through fostering well designed developments to support communities; and an environmental objective to protect and enhance the natural and built environment, including making the best use of land¹².
34. A presumption in favour of sustainable development is set out in NPPF paragraph 11. For decision making it states that proposals that accord with an up to date Plan

¹¹ NPPF, paragraph 1.

¹² *Ibid*, paragraph 8.

should be approved “without delay.” Paragraph 11 goes on to consider circumstances where there are no relevant development plan policies or where the most important policies for determining an application are out of date. Footnote 8 refers to circumstances when the development plan is out of date. This includes situations where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites or where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that the delivery of housing was substantially below the housing requirement over the previous five years. These circumstances arise in Kirklees and the development plan is consequently out of date.

35. Section 5 of the NPPF is concerned about delivering a sufficient supply of homes. At the outset it records the Government’s objective to “*significantly boost*” the supply of homes¹³. Whilst the wording to “*significantly boost*” is carried over from the NPPF (2023), it must be seen in the context of the Ministerial Written Statement “*Building the Homes We Need*” of the 30th July 2024 which sets out reforms to fix the foundations of the housing and planning system, to improve affordability, turbo charge growth and to build 1.5 million houses over the next five years. This is further emphasised in the Ministerial Statement of 12th December 2024 “*Building the Homes We Need*” which refers to the measures to restore and raise housing targets, the changes to the NPPF and support for the plan making process.
36. NPPF paragraphs 63 refers to meeting the need for various types of housing including specific reference to custom and self-build housing. Footnote 28 refers to the requirements of the Self-Build Act 2015 and the requirement to give sufficient permissions to meet the demand.
37. Paragraph 73 refers to small and medium sized sites and the contribution these can make to meeting housing needs in an area; that they are essential for smaller housebuilders and that they can often deliver new homes quickly. Paragraph 73(a) states that Council’s should support small sites to come for inter alia self-build and custom build housing. Paragraph 73(d) supports the development of windfall sites.
38. With regard to housing land supply, paragraph 78 requires Councils to maintain a minimum of five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against their local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old. Paragraph 79 states that local planning authorities should monitor the delivery of housing on sites which have permission.

¹³ NPPF paragraph 61.

Where the Housing Delivery Test indicates that delivery has fallen below the Council's housing requirement over the previous three years, policy consequences are identified. In the case of Kirklees, housing delivery has fallen below 75% of the requirement over the previous three years and as a consequence, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies, as set out in footnote 8 of the NPPF.

39. Housing in rural areas is considered by paragraphs 82 to 84. Paragraph 83 states that to promote sustainable development, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.
40. Chapter 13 is about protecting the Green Belt. The NPPF issued in December 2024 changes policy for the protection of the Green Belt. Most significantly in the context of this application is that it redefines what is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It also amends the approach to dealing with Previously Developed Land and it introduces the concept of Grey Belt.
41. Grey Belt is defined as is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land that, in either case, does not strongly contribute to the Green Belt purposes identified in paragraph 143 (a); (b) and (d) of the NPPF¹⁴.
42. Paragraphs 153 to 160 deals with proposals affecting the Green Belt. Paragraph 153 states that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. However, this is qualified by footnote 55 which indicates that requirement does not apply to development on previously developed land or Grey Belt land, where development is not inappropriate.
43. Paragraph 153 goes on to say that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. It states that 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations¹⁵.

¹⁴ The definition of Grey Belt is set out in Annex 2: Glossary to the NPPF. With regard to Green Belt purposes set out in paragraph 143, the definition only requires a site to address purposes (a), to check the sprawl of a large built up area; (b), to prevent the merger of neighbouring towns; and (d), to preserve the special character of historic towns.

¹⁵ This is reaffirmed by paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 64-014-20250225 of the Planning Practice Guidance issued in February 2025.

44. Paragraph 154 states that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the identified exceptions arise.
45. However, paragraph 155 refers to housing proposals in the Green Belt. It states that housing development should not be regarded as inappropriate development when development would utilise Grey Belt land and not undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan; there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed; that development is in a sustainable location; and where applicable development meets the “Golden Rules” requirement.
46. With regard to need, footnote 56 states means the lack of a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, or where the Housing Delivery Tests was below 75% of the housing requirement over the previous three years. In terms of sustainable locations, reference is made to paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF. These paragraphs refer to locating development where it would be sustainable through limiting demand for travel and where there is a choice of transport modes and a safe a suitable access is available for all users.
47. The “Golden Rules” apply to major development involving the provision of housing. These to not apply to this Application which is not a major development.

HOUSING LAND SUPPLY AND HOUSING DELIVERY

48. Kirklees cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land. The most recent published assessment of housing land supply reflects the position as at 1st April 2023. At that point, the housing land supply was 3.96 years. That was based on an annual requirement of 1,595 dwelling per annum. New housing requirement figures for each local authority area were issued by the Government in December 2024 alongside the publication of the NPPF. The annual requirement for Kirklees is increased to 1,840 dwellings per annum.
49. The Kirklees Annual Monitoring Report 2023-2024¹⁶ refers to the NPPF published in December 2024 and the amendments to the standard method calculation of housing need. It states that the Council will consider the implications of this before publishing an updated five year housing land supply position.

¹⁶ Published December 2024

50. The published information available to date is that the supply of housing land is 3.96 years¹⁷.
51. There has also been a substantial under delivery of housing in the context of the Housing Delivery Test. Based on the housing land requirements published in December 2024, as at 1st April 2023, Kirklees has delivered only 54% of the housing requirement¹⁸. The Annual Monitoring Report indicates that the net increase in the number of homes in the year 2023-2024 was 1,204¹⁹. This is substantially below the pre December 2024 housing need requirement and an even greater deficit compared to the current (new) annual requirement of 1,840 dwellings per annum. The position in Kirklees is that the delivery of homes is falling further behind the housing requirement.
52. The policy consequence is that the Development Plan is out of date; there is a presumption in favour of granting planning permission arising from NPPF paragraph 11; and NPPF paragraph 155 is engaged in respect of the Green Belt.

ASSESSMENT

53. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Site falls with land designated Green Belt. It is Previously Developed Land and Local Plan Policy LP59: Brownfield sites in the Green Belt would apply.
54. However, the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliver housing land and it is failing against the Housing Delivery Test. The Local Plan is out of date²⁰. In these circumstances NPPF paragraph 11 requires applications to be granted planning permission unless the application of policies within the NPPF provide a strong reason to refuse permission, or the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the NPPF considered as a whole.

¹⁷ A land supply position 3.96 years is being reported to the Council's Planning Committee for the purposes of dealing with applications. In particular, see the Officer Report for Planning Application 2023/93667 for the redevelopment of Storthes Hall Student Village on 10th April 2025.

¹⁸ Housing Delivery Test December 2023 (published December 2024)

¹⁹ See the Annual Monitoring Report Table 18.

²⁰ As per footnote 8 to NPPF paragraph 11.

55. The benefits of the proposal are the contribution to meeting housing need. It will support an SME builder and tradesmen who are important to maintain housebuilding skills and thereby contribute to avoiding too much reliance on volume housebuilders to meet housing need. It will asl make better use of a brownfield site. Importantly, It will also provide a self-build plot for which there is a demand. There is a statutory requirement arising from the Self-Build Act to grant planning permission in this context.
56. Having regard to the planning history of the Site, setting aside Green Belt policy, the only potential harm identified is highway safety. The reason for refusal for the 2022 Proposal was information had not been provided, rather than the scheme as proposed being unacceptable. The SCP Transport Note forming part of the Application addresses the suitability of the anticipated access point. It concludes that visibility is safe at the anticipated access point having regard to measurement of traffic speed and there are no highway capacity issues.
57. The only issue raised by this Application is therefore Green Belt policy.
58. Ordinarily, housing would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This, and the absence of very special circumstances to justify development is the reason the 2009 and 2022 proposals failed. However, National Policy has changed, the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land and is failing the Housing Delivery Test.
59. NPPF paragraph 155 sets out circumstances when housing development is not inappropriate development within the Green Belt. If a proposal meets the criteria of paragraph 155, the proposal is not inappropriate and there is no requirement to demonstrate very special circumstances in order to justify granting permission.
60. Paragraph 155(a) requires the Site to be Grey Belt. Reference has been made to the definition of Grey Belt. Grey Belt is defined as land in the Green Belt comprising previously developed land **and/or** any other land that does not strongly contribute to Green Belt purposes (a), (b) and (d). The Site is previously developed. It meets this criterion. In the Officer Report for the 2022 Proposal it was asserted that the Site was overgrown and had returned to nature, disqualifying it as previously developed land. It was also asserted that the site could not be reasonably reinstated without work. However, the only work undertaken since that decision is ground maintenance. Irrespective, the infrastructure comprising the lighting columns remains.

61. Irrespective, the Site would also qualify as Grey Belt because it does not strongly contribute to the relevant purposes of the Green Belt.
62. In terms of contribution to Green Belt purposes, the site is bordered by existing development on Busker Lane. Visually, the Site is enclosed. There are no views across the Site from Busker Lane to the open countryside to the north because of the boundary wall and boundary hedges. The Site does not serve to check the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area (Green Belt purpose (a)); it serves no purpose in separating towns (purpose (b)); it would not protect the setting of an historic town (purpose (d)); and it would not assist urban regeneration (purpose (e))²¹. The only potential role is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment (purpose(c)). The policy test in this respect is whether the development of the Site would “fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the Plan. Visually, the Site is enclosed relative to adjacent development, there are no street level views into and across the Site from Busker Lane because of the boundary wall and hedgerow, and in views from the north, the Site is indistinguishable within existing development on Busker Lane. The scale of the Site is wholly insignificant in the context of the plan area. The development of the Site would not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the Plan.
63. Paragraph 155(a) is satisfied: the Site qualifies as Grey Belt and it would not undermine the purposes of the Green Belt across the plan area.
64. Paragraph 155(b) requires there to be an unmet need for the development proposed. Reference has been made to footnote 56. In this case there is a demonstrable shortfall in housing land and housing delivery. Paragraph 55(b) is satisfied.
65. Paragraph 155(c) requires development to be in a sustainable location. Whilst the Site falls outside the defined settlement limits of Skelmanthorpe, it is only 100 metres from the defined boundary and there is continuous development along Busker Lane. The Site is closely related to the settlement as defined. Skelmanthorpe is settlement in Rural Kirklees which has a district centre with shops, services, education and health facilities. It is identified in the Local Plan as a settlement where some growth is to be directed. Further, Busker Lane is a bus route with bus stops at Windmill Crescent about 100 metres to the west of the Site and on Busker lane itself

²¹ Purpose (e) is not identified in the definition of Grey Belt. In any event, in that context it has to be borne in mind the Council cannot deliver sufficient housing to meet needs.

about 200 metres to the east. The Site is in a sustainable location. Paragraph 155(c) is satisfied.

66. As all of the requirements of paragraph 155 are met, the proposal is not inappropriate development within the Green Belt. There is therefore no requirement to demonstrate very special circumstances in order to justify allowing development²².

CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY

67. This Application is for PiP. The only matters relevant to the determination of this application are the location of the Site, land use and the amount of development. The Application satisfies the requirements of the regulations in terms of land use because it is a proposal for housing and the amount of development falls within the scope of a “minor development.” The location of the Site is suitable for housing and it is in a sustainable location.
68. Kirklees cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of housing land. It is also failing the Housing Delivery Test. Having regard to NPPF footnote 8, the Kirklees Local Plan is out of date. The policy consequence of the housing delivery performance of Kirklees is a presumption in favour development. NPPF paragraph 11(d) states that planning permission should be granted unless policy within the NPPF provide a strong reason for refusing the development or the adverse impacts arising from the proposal demonstrably outweigh the benefits. NPPF footnote 7 identifies Green Belt policy as a policy to protect areas in this context. Previous applications for development on the Site have been refused on the grounds that very special circumstances have not been demonstrated to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
69. However, the revised NPPF, issued in December 2024 places greater emphasis on the delivery of housing. It also changes the approach to housing in the Green Belt. Housing is not inappropriate development when the circumstances arising in paragraph 155 arise. These circumstances are that the land is Grey Belt; that there is a shortfall in housing land supply and the site is in a sustainable location. All of these apply to this Application. The proposal is not therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The requirement to demonstrate very special circumstances to justify development does not apply.

²² See PPG paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 64-014-20250225

70. There are no adverse impacts arising from the Application that would justify refusing development in terms of NPPF paragraph 11(d)(ii).
71. The benefits of the Proposal are the contribution to meeting housing need; it will support an SME builder and tradesmen; it will asl make better use of a brownfield site; and most significantly, it will provide a self-build plot for which there is a demand. There is a statutory requirement arising from the Self-Build Act to grant planning permission in these circumstances.
72. Overall, the Development Plan is out of date. There is a presumption in favour of and no reasonable basis to refuse the approval of Permission in Principle.