

Delves Cottage - The White House
Slaithwaite
Huddersfield
HD7 5FA

Kirklees Council
PO Box 1720
Huddersfield
West Yorkshire
HD1 9EL

19th March 2026

For the attention of Kerri Simpson, Case Officer, Planning & Development

**Planning application number 2026/59/90318/W - Application for Permission in Principle
Land adjacent to Delves Gate, Slaithwaite, HD7 5AD - objection**

I am writing with reference to the above planning application for Permission in Principle to formally lodge my objection following the planning notice displayed opposite the site.

There are a number of concerns I would like to raise, as follows;

1. Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt

The application site lies within the Green Belt as defined by the development plan. The proposal seeks to rely on the concept of "Grey Belt" to argue that the development constitutes appropriate development under Paragraph 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

However, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the site meets the definition of Grey Belt. The planning statement relies on broad assertions that the site makes a "weak or none" contribution to Green Belt purposes, but provides no robust, site-specific assessment to support this conclusion.

In particular:

- The site comprises undeveloped greenfield land and therefore contributes to openness

- The proposal would result in clear encroachment into the countryside, contrary to Green Belt purpose (c)
- The site's relationship to surrounding development has not been objectively assessed

Accordingly, the site should not be regarded as Grey Belt, and the proposal therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

2. Failure to Satisfy NPPF Paragraph 155

Even if the site were to be considered Grey Belt (which is disputed), the proposal fails to meet the criteria set out in Paragraph 155 of the NPPF.

a) Impact on Green Belt purposes

The development would result in encroachment into the countryside and harm to openness. The planning statement understates this impact and incorrectly suggests that such harm can be disregarded.

b) Demonstrable unmet need

The applicant incorrectly equates the absence of a five-year housing land supply with "demonstrable unmet need." This is a misinterpretation of national policy. The NPPF requires a more specific and evidenced need for the type and location of development proposed.

c) Sustainable location

The site is located over 1 mile from nearby settlements and would be heavily reliant on private car use. The limited public transport provision described does not constitute a genuinely sustainable location in policy terms.

The public transport provision is also incorrectly stated; there is not "an hourly bus service runs from Chain Road to Meltham and Holmfirth", but in fact the hourly bus service runs from the top of Varley Road (not Chain Road) to Meltham and Holmfirth but only between approximately 07:30 and 17:00 Monday to Friday, 08:40 to 16:00 on Saturday and no service on a Sunday.

Walking on Chain Road from Delves Gate to the top of Varley Road is not a safe stretch of road for pedestrians. There is no pavement, no street lights, several blind bends, and it has a derestricted speed limit.

3. Misapplication of the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

The Council's Housing Delivery Test position (54%) is acknowledged, and it is accepted that Paragraph 11 of the NPPF is engaged.

However, national policy is clear that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply where policies protecting areas such as the Green Belt provide a clear reason for refusal.

Given that the proposal conflicts with Green Belt policy, the tilted balance should not be applied in favour of the development.

4. Previous Refusal Not Addressed

A previous application for residential development on this site (or overlapping land) was refused. The current submission fails to meaningfully address the reasons for that refusal or demonstrate how the proposal overcomes those concerns.

5. Premature Use of Permission in Principle

The use of the Permission in Principle route in this case is inappropriate given the site's sensitive Green Belt location and appears to limit proper scrutiny of key issues such as access, highway safety, and environmental impacts. These matters are fundamental to the acceptability of the site and should not be deferred.

While it is acknowledged that detailed matters are reserved, the absence of sufficient information regarding access, highway safety, drainage, and environmental impacts, it has not been demonstrated that the site can be developed without harm. As such, the application is premature and should be refused at this stage.

6. Access

There is insufficient evidence that safe and suitable access can be achieved. The planning statement suggests that "visibility at the site entrance is good in both directions". However, the single-track road is narrow, has no footpaths, offers poor visibility on approach past the cottages at the former Whitehouse pub building and is regularly used by horseriders and dog walkers. Additional dwellings would intensify use of a substandard access.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposal:

- Constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt
- Fails to meet the requirements of Paragraph 155 of the NPPF
- Is not located in a sustainable location
- Conflicts with the development plan and national policy

The application should therefore be refused.

Yours faithfully,