



Infinite Renewables Ltd
1000B Central Park
Western Avenue
Bridgend
CF313RT
United Kingdom
T: +44 (0)1656 644 477
www.infiniterenewables.com

FAO Farzana Tabasum
Kirklees Council,
Planning and Development Service,
PO Box 1720,
Huddersfield,
HD1 9EL.

23rd October 2025

Dear Farzana Tabasum,

Section 73 Planning Application for the Variation of Condition 13 of Planning Application 2023/62/90668/E to reflect an amendment to the Wind Turbine at Grange Moor Coachworks, Barnsley Road, Grange Moor, Wakefield, WF4 4DR.

We are pleased to submit a S73 planning application to vary Condition 2 and Condition 13 of Planning Permission 2023/62/90668/E to reflect an amendment to the wind turbine at the above site.

This planning submission is supported by the following plans and documents:

- Planning Application Form;
- Site Location Plan (Drawing No. GMC001, Rev A);
- Site Layout Plan (Drawing No. GMC002, Rev A);
- Elevation Plan (Drawing No. WTGMC_002);
- Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) of the existing wind turbine Evoco 10kW; and
- Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) of the proposed BW80 wind turbine.

A fee of £2,085 (inc. VAT) will be paid to Kirklees Council under separate cover.

Planning History

The site has an existing operational wind turbine, which was allowed on appeal in 2011 (LPA Ref: 2010/62/90687/E2). The existing wind turbine is an EVOCO 10kW, with a hub height of 15m, rotor diameter 9.6m and blade tip height of 20.35m.

Planning permission was then sought for a replacement wind turbine (as part of a wider development scheme) and was approved on 4th October 2024 (LPA Ref:2023/62/90668/E). The application sought a wind turbine of the same scale, but a more efficient model. The planning consent is subject to 41 conditions. Condition 2

(plans and specifications schedule list) and Condition 13 (replacement wind turbine) are relevant to this S73 application.

Proposed Amendment

We are proposing to amend Conditions 2 and 13 of planning consent 2023/62/90668/E to allow a minor increase in height to the existing wind turbine. The proposed candidate wind turbine is the Bestwatt BW80 with a 15m hub height, rotor diameter of 15.85m and blade tip height of 22.9m – the turbine would have an annual yield of approximately 150,000 kWh.

Condition 2 states:

The development hereby approved shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications schedule listed in this decision notice, except as may be specified in the conditions attached to this permission, which shall in all cases take precedence.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is being permitted and in the interests of visual amenity, residential amenity and other matters relevant to planning and to accord with the Kirklees Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

It is proposed to amend Condition 2 by submitting a Wind Turbine Elevation (Drawing No. WTGMC_002) such that the following plans and documents set out in the scheduled list attached to the Decision Notice are amended/updated by the enclosed plan:

- Planning Statement, Job 2753, Date Received 13/11/2023
- Planning Statement, Reference P2753-ACU-XX-RP-T-002-P01
- Design and Access Statement, Reference P2753-ACU-XX-RP-T-001-P01, Date Received 01/03/2023
- Wind and Solar Desk Top Summary, Reference P1948, Date Received 01/03/2023
- Proposed Masterplan, Reference P2753-ACU-XX-DR-A-102-04
- Proposed boundary treatment Plan, Reference P2753-ACU-XX-DR-A-103-05

Condition 13 states:

13. The replacement wind turbine shall be no higher in height and scale than the wind turbine approved pursuant to planning permission 2010/90687 and shall be sited in the same location. In the event the wind turbine ceases to operate for a continuous period of six months, a scheme for the decommissioning and removal of the wind turbine and any other ancillary equipment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within three months of the end of the cessation period. The scheme shall include details for the restoration of the site. The scheme shall be implemented within three months of the date of its approval by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure appropriate restoration of this Green Belt site and to protect the visual amenity and openness of the Green Belt and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework.

It is proposed to amend Condition 13 through the submission of the Wind Turbine Elevation plan (Drawing No. WTGMC_002). The amended condition would therefore read as follows (with the superseded text struck through and amended or additional text in red):

13. The replacement wind turbine ~~shall be no higher in height and scale than the wind turbine approved pursuant to planning permission 2010/90687~~ shall be no higher than 22.9m in accordance with the Wind Turbine Elevation plan (Drawing No. WTGMC_002) and shall be sited in the same location. In the event the wind turbine ceases to operate for a continuous period of six months, a scheme for the decommissioning and removal of the wind turbine and any other ancillary equipment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within three months of the end of

the cessation period. The scheme shall include details for the restoration of the site. The scheme shall be implemented within three months of the date of its approval by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: *To ensure appropriate restoration of this Green Belt site and to protect the visual amenity and openness of the Green Belt and to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework.*

Assessment

The proposed amendment seeks to vary the existing planning consent for the replacement wind turbine to allow for a modest increase in overall tip height of 2.55m.

The main issues for assessment in this context are therefore:

- Impact on the Green Belt – including whether the modest height increase would result in any additional effect on the openness or visual character of the Green Belt, and whether the proposal continues to demonstrate very special circumstances in accordance with paragraph 160 of the NPPF; and
- Impact on Residential Amenity – including whether the change in height would give rise to any additional impacts in terms of visual appearance, noise, or shadow flicker beyond those already assessed and deemed acceptable in the previous approval.

Impact on the Green Belt

The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence (para. 142, NPPF).

In their recent pre-application response (Ref: 2025/20563), Kirklees Council confirmed that the site lies within the ‘grey belt’ in Green Belt policy terms. This refers to previously developed and/or poor-quality, underutilised areas within the Green Belt that make a limited contribution to its core purpose of preventing urban sprawl.

The existing operational wind turbine is located in the grey belt, and consent has previously been granted for a replacement wind turbine of the equivalent scale. The current proposal seeks only to increase the height of the consented replacement turbine by 2.55m. Accordingly, this assessment considered whether the proposed increase in height would materially affect the grey belt’s openness.

The existing wind turbine was approved on appeal (APP/Z4718/A/10/2139927/NWF). The Inspector at that time concluded:

“As a structure, the proposed turbine would have an effect on the openness of the Green Belt. However, given the small scale of the proposal and its slender appearance any harm would be slight. In this case, the wider environmental benefits in terms of the increased production of energy from renewable resources and the contribution to the reduction in green house gases attract significant weight and as such clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness and the slight harm to the openness of the Green Belt. As such very special circumstances exist to justify this development.”

A comparative Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) assessment demonstrates that the visibility of the proposed Bestwatt 80 turbine remains largely consistent with that of the existing Evoco 10kW model. The modest height increase produces only a negligible extension to the visual envelope, introducing no significant new receptors or adverse visual effects.

Importantly, the Bestwatt 80 turbine offers substantially greater efficiency and renewable energy generation capacity, delivering enhanced sustainability benefits that align directly with the Government’s commitment to supporting renewable energy projects, as expressed in paragraph 160 of the NPPF.

The proposed variation represents a minor, proportionate amendment to an already consented form of development within the grey belt. The change does not materially alter the scale or appearance of the turbine, nor does it increase harm to openness or conflict with the five purposes of Green Belt designation identified in paragraph 143 of the NPPF.

In line with paragraphs 153 and 160 of the NPPF, the proposal continues to demonstrate very special circumstances, as the environmental and renewable energy benefits clearly outweigh any limited harm by reason of inappropriateness.

It is therefore considered that the proposed increase in turbine height is fully compliant with national Green Belt policy and remains consistent with the original appeal decision and the objectives of sustainable development.

Impact on residential amenity

Wind turbines have the potential to impact residential amenity through factors such as noise, shadow flicker, and their relationship to surrounding properties. The proposed development seeks to amend the existing planning consent for the replacement turbine to allow for a modest increase in height of 2.55 metres, while ensuring that these considerations continue to be fully addressed.

The existing wind turbine was granted on appeal and at the time the Inspector noted that:

“The gap to the nearest dwelling is some 175m and views to the south and south-west are partly screened by a dense hedge some 3m high. This appeared to be a well maintained mature evergreen hedge and there is no evidence to suggest that it would not be retained and maintained. Parts of the turbine would be visible in the view to the south. However, no one has a right to a view per-se. Given the limited height and slender appearance of the proposed turbine, the significant degree of separation and the screening effect of the existing hedge, it would not appear dominant or overbearing when viewed from the gardens of habitable rooms of nearby houses. Similarly given the substantial separation and small scale nature of the proposal there would be no material risk from shadow flicker or noise. Accordingly the proposal would not unacceptably affect the outlook of nearby residents...”

These conclusions remain directly relevant. The siting, design, and separation distances of the proposed replacement turbine are unchanged from those previously assessed and found acceptable by the Inspector. The only alteration is the increase in overall height of 2.55 metres, which represents a minor proportional change to the already consented turbine.

There have been no new residential properties introduced in the vicinity since the appeal decision. The established mature boundary hedge referred to by the Inspector remains in place, continuing to provide effective visual screening from nearby dwellings. As such, the contextual relationship between the turbine and surrounding properties remains the same.

Given the slender profile of the turbine and the minor height increase, the proposal would not appear unduly dominant or overbearing in views from surrounding residential properties. The turbine would continue to be read as a vertical, functional element within an open rural landscape, consistent with the character of the existing development.

Similarly, the minor change in height would not alter the conclusions previously reached in relation to shadow flicker, noise, or residential amenity, as the operational characteristics of the turbine remain unchanged. Accordingly, it is considered that the 2.55 metre increase in height would not result in any additional visual, landscape, or amenity harm compared with the consented scheme. The Inspector’s earlier conclusions remain valid, and the proposal continues to comply with local and national planning policy, including the provisions of the NPPF relating to renewable energy development within the Green Belt.

Conclusion

The proposed increase in turbine height of 2.55 metres is considered a minor material amendment for the following reasons:

1. Proportional Increase – The additional 2.55 m represents a small proportion of the overall turbine height and would not materially alter the character, scale, or visual impact of the approved development. The turbine would retain its slender profile and remain visually consistent with the surrounding landscape, ensuring that its appearance remains compatible with the local context.
2. Consistency with Policy – The proposed height remains fully within the scale and context considered acceptable under the original appeal decision (Ref: APP/Z4718/A/10/2139927/NWF). The minor increase does not result in any material changes to Green Belt openness, landscape character, or residential amenity, and continues to align with the principles of national and local planning policy regarding renewable energy development within grey belt land.
3. No Additional Adverse Impacts – The slight increase in height would not give rise to any new or materially different impacts in terms of visual amenity, shadow flicker, or noise. Separation distances to nearby dwellings remain unchanged, and existing screening, such as the mature boundary hedges identified in the appeal, continues to mitigate any potential effects. There are no new sensitive receptors in the vicinity since the original consent was granted.
4. Sustainability and Environmental Benefits – The modest increase in height allows the turbine to operate with greater efficiency and renewable energy output, enhancing the wider environmental benefits without generating additional harm. This aligns with the principle set out in paragraph 160 of the NPPF, where renewable energy benefits can constitute very special circumstances justifying development within the Green Belt.

Overall, the proposed increase in height is minor in both absolute and relative terms, and does not materially alter the extent, character, or impact of the approved development. On this basis, the amendment is appropriately classified as a “minor material amendment” under Section 73, and does not trigger the need for a full new planning application. The proposal remains consistent with the original Inspector’s conclusions and relevant national and local planning policy.

We trust the submitted information is acceptable to progress the application to a positive determination, but should you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,

L Tomos-Harry

Laura Tomos-Harry
Head of Planning and New Projects