
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 April 2026 by S Manson DipTP MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6007222

Butterley Leys Cottage, Spring Lane, Holmfirth HD9 7EH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Lomax against the decision of Kirklees Metropolitan Council.
 - The application Ref is 2026/90156.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The vehicle parking shown on the submitted plans is outside of the development area as defined as the appeal scheme. It is not referenced by the appellant as being part of the proposals, nor is it part of the description of development being applied for. With this and the Council's approach to the area in mind, I have not considered it any further.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are a) whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt; the effect of the proposal on b) the openness of the Green Belt; c) the character and appearance of the area; and d) if the scheme is inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, as to amount to very special circumstances required to justify it.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Inappropriate Development

5. In regard to Green Belt development, the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) sets out, amongst other things, that development is inappropriate, unless it falls within a given set of exceptions. One is the extension or alteration of a building provided it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Policy LP57 of the Kirklees Local Plan, 2019 (LP), makes an allowance for similar, providing the original building remains the

dominant element both in terms of size and overall appearance and for buildings already extended, proposals to extend should have regard to the scale and character of the original part of the building. Neither defines what disproportionate is or set any benchmark in terms of size. It is therefore a matter of judgement.

6. Paragraph 154 c) of the Framework is clear that extensions within the Green Belt must be assessed against the size of the original building, which is defined as the building as it existed on 1 July 1948 or, if constructed thereafter, as it was originally built. The appeal property is a stone-built dwelling attached to a former barn/agricultural outbuilding. The latter of which appears to have been converted to residential use. Together they form the “original building” for the purposes of Green Belt policy. I don’t have calculations of the amount of additional built form that has been added to the building in the past but understand that the appeal property has been extended at first floor level to the side and from my observations a substantial rear timber structure has been added to the neighbouring attached conversion.
7. The proposals would introduce further built development to the front of the dwelling, the dominant and most visually prominent elevation of the original building. By reason of its siting, massing and scale, the extension would unacceptably erode the visual primacy of the original building, such that it would no longer remain the dominant element in either size or appearance. Taking these matters together and in the context of what has gone before, the proposal would amount to disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. As such, it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This would conflict with both the identification of such by the Framework and the aims of Policy LP57 of the LP as set out above.

Openness

8. Openness is a fundamental attribute of the Green Belt and comprises both spatial and visual elements. Spatial openness is generally taken to refer to the absence of built form. The proposals effect on the visual aspect would be limited due to the site’s situation down a private road. Nevertheless, it would introduce a sizeable addition that would result in substantial built development where there is currently none. This would, unavoidably, reduce the spatial aspect of the Green Belt’s openness. This would be in further conflict with the position of the Framework and the aims of Policy LP57 as far as they align therewith.

Character and Appearance

9. The appeal property is of traditional appearance, with coursed natural stone elevations beneath a simple pitched roof. It is characterised by a simple and consistent fenestration pattern, with relatively small, evenly spaced window openings. Whilst modest in detailing, the fenestration is an important unifying feature of the building. The consistent proportions, regular spacing and alignment of the openings establish a clear repeating rhythm across the elevation, which contributes positively to its overall composition and appearance.
10. The proposed extension would introduce fenestration of a markedly different scale and proportion. The proposed ground-floor windows would be substantially wider and more horizontally emphasised than the existing openings, resulting in a misaligned relationship with the established pattern of fenestration. Rather than appearing as a subservient addition, the proposal would dilute the simplicity and

rhythm of the existing frontage, visually competing with the original elevation, undermining the dominance and architectural legibility of the original building.

11. Consequently, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, would conflict with Policy LP24 of the LP, and guidance contained in the Kirklees House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document, 2021. Together, and amongst other things, seek to ensure extensions are subservient to the original building, and in keeping in terms of scale, materials and details.
12. The Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan policy has not been provided. I however have sufficient elements of the development plan before me to be able to relate to my findings thereon.

Other Considerations

13. It is submitted that the appeal scheme would provide a larger sitting area and a more convenient entrance arrangement, including space for storage and removal of shoes, making a more practical living space. These changes would offer a degree of domestic convenience. However, no substantive evidence has been provided to demonstrate that such functional improvements could not be achieved by a more modest form of development which might better respect the scale, appearance and Green Belt policy constraints of the site. In light of my findings above, these matters attract very limited weight.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The appeal scheme would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It would also result in a reduction in openness. In accordance with the Framework, I give substantial weight to these harms. There would also be harm to the character and appearance of the area. Weight ascribed to the other considerations would be insufficient to clearly outweigh them. Accordingly, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposed development do not exist.
15. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan as I have set it out above and there are no other material considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, that indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR