

KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL INVESTMENT & REGENERATION SERVICE

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) – SECTION 70

DELEGATED DECISION TO DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Reference No:	2026/62/91480/W
Site Address:	Moss Edge Farm, Moss Edge Road, Holmbridge, Holmfirth, HD9 2SD
Description:	Erection of garage extension and change of use of land from agricultural to residential
Recommending Officer:	Joanna Rednall

DECISION - REFUSED

I hereby authorise the refusal of this application for the reasons set out in the officer's report and recommendation annexed below in respect of the above matter.

Kerri Simpson

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date: 29th July 2026

Error! Filename not specified.

The Site

The application site refers to Moss Edge Farm, a two storey detached property located in the area of Holmbridge.

The dwelling is constructed from natural coursed stone. The property is located in a secluded location accessed via Moss Edge Road, a narrow private road, which joins on to the adopted highway known as Hollin Brigg Lane. The property was once part of a farmstead and is the original farmhouse. The surrounding development off this private access road consists of former agricultural buildings (which were once associated with the farmhouse) which were granted permission under application numbers 2024/91893 and 2024/91893 to be converted into 2 dwellings.

The site is located within the Green Belt on the Kirklees Local Plan.

The Proposal

The applicant is seeking planning permission for erection of garage extension and change of use of land from agricultural to residential.

The garage is proposed to the south / side facing elevation and would have the following measurements:

- 6.2m in depth
- 6m width
- 2.3m eave height
- 4m ridge height

The garage is constructed from natural stone with a pitched natural stone slate roof incorporated above. Two black composite garage doors are proposed to the front elevation.

The proposal includes the change of use of an approximately 7m by 7.5m section of the existing field to the south of the dwelling to residential curtilage in order to facilitate the proposed development.

History of Negotiations

No amendments have been sought in the processing of this application as it was considered significant amendments would be required beyond the scope of the application to overcome the harm identified.

Planning History

Relevant planning history for this site is summarised as follows:-

2025/90942: Certificate of lawfulness for proposed erection of two storey rear extension to dwelling, single storey side extension to garage and porch to the rear – Refused –

“The proposed two-storey and single-storey rear enlargement and single storey side enlargement do not benefit from general planning permission under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). The proposed single and two storey rear enlargement exceeds the limitations in sub-paragraph A.1 (h) of Class A and projects in part beyond the curtilage of the dwellinghouse. The proposed side enlargement is not considered to be within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse and therefore does not benefit from permitted any general planning permission granted by Article 3(1) of the Order.”

2025/91851: Erection of two storey rear extension – Conditional full permission

Publicity & Representations

The Council are currently undertaking the legal statutory publicity requirements, as set out at Table 1 in the Kirklees Development Management Charter. As such, this application has been publicised via a site notice.

Final publicity date expired: 2 July 2026

No representations were received as a result of the publicity.

Parish/ Town Council Comments

Holme Valley Parish Council: No objections

Consultations

No statutory consultations were requested for this application.

Allocation & Policies

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The statutory Development Plan for Kirklees is the Local Plan (adopted 27th February 2019) and the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan (adopted 8th December 2021).

Local guidance and policy is provided by the Kirklees Local Plan (adopted February 2019) as such the following policy, guidance and legislation is considered relevant to the determination of this application:-

Kirklees Local Plan (LP)

- LP1 Achieving Sustainable Development
- LP2 Place Shaping
- LP21 Highway Safety
- LP22 Parking Provision
- LP24 Design
- LP30 Biodiversity
- LP57 The extension, alteration or replacement of existing buildings
- LP58 Garden Extensions

Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan

The following policies of this plan are considered most relevant:

- Policy 1 – Protecting and Enhancing the Landscape Character of the Holme Valley
- Policy 2 – Protecting and Enhancing the Built Character of the Holme Valley and Promoting High Quality Design
- Policy 12 – Promoting Sustainability
- Policy 13 – Protecting Wildlife and Securing Biodiversity Net Gain

National Policies and Guidance

National planning policy and guidance is set out in National Policy Statements, primarily the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) published 12th December 2024, the Planning Practice Guidance Suite (PPGS) first launched 6th March 2014 together with Circulars, Ministerial Statements and associated technical guidance.

A consultation draft of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 16th December 2025. As a consultation, the document is at an early stage and subject to change. Accordingly, for the purposes of this application, no weight is given to the current consultation document.

The NPPF constitutes guidance for local planning authorities and is a material consideration in determining applications. Considered to be of relevance to the consideration of this application are policies within the following chapters:

-

- Chapter 2 – Achieving sustainable development
- Chapter 9 – Promoting sustainable transport
- Chapter 12 – Achieving well-designed places
- Chapter 13 – Protecting Green Belt Land
- Chapter 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Supplementary Planning Guidance

House Extensions and Alterations SPD (June 2021)
Kirklees Highway Design Guide (November 2019)

Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan

Legislation

The Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 sets out that in considering planning applications the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Assessment

The following matters are considered in the assessment below –

1. Principle of development
1. Impact upon visual amenity
2. Impact upon residential amenity
3. Impact upon highway safety
4. Other matters
5. Representations
6. Conclusion

1 – Principle of development:

Policy LP1 states that when considering development proposals, the Council will take a positive approach that reflects the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. LP1 goes on further to stating that:

The Council will always work pro-actively with applicants jointly to find solutions which mean that the proposal can be approved wherever possible, and to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area.

Policy LP2 sets out that all development proposals should seek to build on the strengths, opportunities and help address challenges identified in the Local Plan. Policy LP24 of the KLP is relevant and states that “good design should be at the core of all proposals in the district”.

Land allocation – Green Belt

Policy LP57 of the Kirklees Local Plan relates to the extension, alteration or replacement of existing buildings, specifically stating the following: -

‘Proposals for the extension, alteration or replacement of buildings in the Green Belt will normally be acceptable provided that:

a. in the case of extensions the original building remains the dominant element both in terms of size and overall appearance. The cumulative impact of previous extensions and of other associated buildings will be taken into

account. Proposals to extend buildings which have already been extended should have regard to the scale and character of the original part of the building;

b. in the case of replacement buildings, the new building must be in the same use as and not be materially larger than the building it is replacing;

c. the proposal does not result in a greater impact on openness in terms of the treatment of outdoor areas, including hard standings, curtilages and enclosures and means of access; and

d. the design and materials should have regard to relevant design policies to ensure that the resultant development does not materially detract from its Green Belt setting'

Policy LP58 of the Kirklees Local Plan states that: *"proposals to change the use of land in the Green Belt to a domestic garden will not normally be permitted. Where it can be shown that very special circumstances exist that would warrant allowing the proposal, consideration will need to be given to the following*

a. the degree, location and orientation of the enclosure, which should cause least harm to the openness of the Green Belt; and that

b. the means of enclosure is appropriate to its setting and is of a high quality of materials and design."

Section 13 ('Protecting Green Belt Land') of the National Planning Policy Framework is relevant and in particular the following paragraphs: -

Paragraph 142: *'The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. 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.'*

Paragraph 143 specifies the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt, which are:-

a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;

b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;

d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and

e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF states that inappropriate development in the Green Belt should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

Paragraph 153 of the NPPF goes on to note 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 considerations.

The application seeks planning permission for erection of garage extension and change of use of land from agricultural to residential. The submitted location plan details the ownership of the site to extend around the dwelling

and land further south, and it is considered that not all of the land within the red line boundary constitutes the curtilage of the dwelling.

The Oxford English dictionary definition of curtilage is 'A small court, yard, garth or piece of ground attached to a dwelling-house, and forming one enclosure with it, or so regarded by the law; the area attached to and containing a dwelling-house and its outbuildings'

There is case law surrounding the definition of curtilage, which is considered to be relevant to the consideration of this case. Firstly in *Dyer v Dorset CC* [1989] it was held that curtilage constitutes a piece of ground attached to a dwellinghouse and forming one enclosure with it; thereby the area attached to and containing a dwellinghouse and its outbuildings. In the case of *McAlpine v Secretary of State for the Environment* [1995] the judgement that was arrived at in the *Dyer* case was maintained and further concluding that curtilage is constrained to a small area around a building. Finally, the Court of Appeal in *Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport, and the Regions v Skerritts of Nottingham* [2000] set out that the definition of a curtilage in relation to a building must remain a question of fact and degree in each case.

It is clear then that an intimate association between the curtilage of a dwelling and the dwelling itself needs to exist for it to be defined as curtilage.

When reviewing aerial imagery of the site, the land south of Moss Edge Farm appears to have been soft landscaping in 2002, 2006, 2009, 2012, 2018 and 2021 and appears to have been hard-surfaced by 2025 and would therefore not constitute the residential curtilage associated with Moss Edge Farm. Having regard to the physical layout of the site the extent of the curtilage could not reasonably be argued to be greater than that of the garden area to the east and the small hardstanding area to the front. Whilst ownership of the larger site is noted, this does not automatically mean that all land in ownership of the applicant which is around a dwelling would necessarily form the curtilage of the dwelling. The proposed development would therefore result in a material change of use of land designated Green Belt and would conflict with the purpose of the Green Belt set out in paragraph 143c of the NPPF.

Notwithstanding this, it is considered the LPA is still able to progress and determine this application and make an assessment of the planning merits of the scheme, including that of the change of use of the land.

The material change of use of land is identified at paragraph 154(h) as an other form of development that may be an appropriate exception provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

The submitted planning statement details that the garage 'is sited partially outside of the residential curtilage as deemed by Kirklees Planning Authority', however no timeframe is provided in terms of when it specifically became hard standing. The statement goes on to set out that the proposals are fairly small in terms of additional volume, with an overall increase of 12% over the

original built volume. The scale and quantum of the proposed development are considered proportionate to the host dwelling and would not constitute a disproportionate addition to the original building.

The content of the submitted statement is noted, however it is clear that the land upon which the proposal would be sited does not lawfully constitute garden land and it is not considered that there are any compelling reasons set out, or which exist more generally, that would constitute very special circumstances that outweigh the harm of the development which arises from the encroachment of urban development into the Green Belt as a result of the development proposal.

As set out at policy LP58, change of use of land to domestic garden will not normally be permitted other than where it can be shown that very special circumstances exist that would warrant allowing the proposal.

In this case the proposal would see encroachment into the Green Belt conflicting with one of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, the extent of the encroachment goes beyond the established building line whereby built form of residential properties is up to the Green Belt boundary rather than within it.

The encroachment of built form as a result of hardstanding areas and extensions proposed as part of this application has a harmful impact eroding the openness of the Green Belt through the introduction of urban features in a part of the site which was previously free from development and contributed to the wider openness of this part of the Green Belt. The proposal is therefore considered to have a visually harmful impact in this regard in relation to the openness of the Green Belt and is also considered to have a harmful impact by reason of inappropriateness given it relates to inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

The proposal is considered to constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt which would adversely impact on both the visual and spatial aspects of openness of the Green Belt and for which no very special circumstances are considered to exist. It is therefore concluded the development would be contrary to policies contained within Chapter 13 of the NPPF as the development would encroach into the countryside and extend the residential curtilage contrary to paragraph 143c. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy LP2 which seeks to ensure all development proposals build on the strengths, opportunities and help address challenges identified in the Local Plan.

2 – Impact upon visual amenity

Policy LP24 (Design) of the Council's adopted Local Plan sets out that proposals should promote good design by ensuring the form, scale, layout and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the townscape, extensions are subservient to the original building, are in keeping with the existing buildings in terms of scale, materials and details and

minimise impact on residential amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF is also of relevance to the consideration of this application.

Key Design Principles 1 and 2 of the Council's adopted House Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) seek to ensure development is subservient to the host property and in keeping with the character of the locality. Principle 7 of the House Extensions SPD requires development to ensure an appropriately sized and useable area of private outdoor space is retained.

Policy 1 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Plan HVNP sets out that development proposal should demonstrate how they have been informed by the key characteristics of the Local Character Assessment (LCA).

Policy 2 of the HVNP states that new development should protect and enhance local built character and distinctiveness, strengthen the local sense of place by respecting the existing grain of development in the surrounding area, use local materials and detailing which add to the quality or character of the surrounding environment, respect the scale, mass, height and form of existing buildings in the locality and their setting. Furthermore this policy sets out that development should sit in with and neither dominate or have a detrimental; impact on its surroundings and neighbouring properties.

The application site is within Landscape Character Area 3 - Hade Edge Upland Pastures

Key landscape characteristic of the area where are

- The open landscape has long distance views of the settled corridor of the River Holme and Kirklees district beyond as well as local views of open water bodies such as Boshaw Whams and Holme Styes.
- Stone boundary walls are common features creating a strong sense of visual unity.
- A network of Public Rights of Way (PRoW) follows local lanes or field boundaries. Minor roads and PRoW, including sections of the Kirklees Way and the Barnsley Boundary Walk long distance footpaths, connect farmsteads located on the valley sides. National Cycle Route no. 68 also passes through this area.

Key built characteristic of the area are

- Dispersed settlements characterised by their former domestic textile manufacturing, mill buildings and agricultural heritage along with isolated farmsteads set within an upland agricultural landscape.
- Hade Edge is the largest of the settlements containing some services and modern and older development and lies on a plateau at Dunford Road / Penistone Road.
- Former textile/woollen mills set within the valley of the River Ribble.

- Vernacular building materials include millstone grit in properties and boundary walls.

Notwithstanding the conclusion of the development insofar as whether it constitutes a disproportionate addition (in terms of an assessment of the development within the Green Belt) an assessment of other elements of the visual impact is undertaken as follows.

The proposed garage would be adjoined to the south facing elevation of the host and would therefore constitute a side extension. Section 5.17 of the Extensions SPD provides the following guidance for single side extensions:

5.17 Single storey side extensions should be offset and complement the original building. As such, single storey side extensions should:

- *not extend more than two thirds of the width of the original house;*
- *not exceed a height of 4 metres; and*
- *be set back at least 500mm from the original building line to allow for a visual break.*

In this case, the proposed extension is modest in scale and would not exceed two-thirds of the width of the host dwelling. It would have a maximum height of no more than 4m and would be set back by 0.2m from the principal elevation, providing a subtle visual break between the original dwelling and the extension.

The extension would incorporate a pitched roof set below the ridge height of the existing dwelling and would be constructed using materials to match the existing building. The roof form reflects that of the host dwelling, and the scale, proportions, and detailing are considered to integrate well with the existing built form. Overall, the proposal would appear as a subordinate addition to the host that respects the character and appearance of the dwelling and maintains the linear form of the building.

However, despite the above considerations, officers consider the principle of the side extension would be unacceptable in this case. This is because the development as a whole would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt in terms of extending the residential curtilage and encroachment into the countryside, contrary to the aims of paragraph 143c of the NPPF.

It is considered that the visual impact of the development in terms of the use of the materials and being designed to be of a style / design which is in keeping with the host property is acceptable having regard to the aforementioned policies. Notwithstanding this conclusion, it is considered that this does not overcome the harm identified by virtue of the change of use of the land and the subsequent encroachment which results from such a change of use as set out in the 'Principle' section of this report.

3 – Impact on residential amenity:

Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework seeks to ensure development has an acceptable impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Key Design Principles 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Council's adopted House Extensions & Alterations SPD seek to ensure development does not have a detrimental impact upon privacy of neighbouring occupiers, cause unacceptable levels of overshadowing or be unacceptably oppressive / overbearing.

Policy 2 of the HVNP sets out that proposals should be designed to minimise harmful impacts on general amenity for present and future occupiers of land and buildings and prevent or reduce pollution as a result of noise, odour, light and other causes. Light pollution should be minimised and security lighting must be appropriate, unobtrusive and energy efficient.

The House Extensions and Alterations SPD sets out a number of design principles which will need to be considered when assessing a proposal's impact on residential amenity, which state:

- Principle 3 – that: *“extensions and alterations should be designed to achieve reasonable levels of privacy for both inhabitants, future occupants, and neighbours”.*
- Principle 4 – that: *“extensions and alterations should consider the design and layout of habitable and non-habitable rooms to reduce conflict between neighbouring properties relating to privacy, light and outlook.”*
- Principle 5 – that: *“extensions and alterations should not adversely affect the amount of natural light presently enjoyed by a neighbouring property”.*
- Principle 6 – that: *“extensions and alterations should not unduly reduce the outlook from a neighbouring property.”*

The proposed development is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. No additional windows are proposed as part of the extension, and it would be separated from neighbouring properties by approximately 36m from The West Barn and 30m from The Stables. Given these separation distances, together with the modest scale of the extension, the proposal is not considered to result in any harmful overlooking, overshadowing, or overbearing impacts.

It is therefore considered that in terms of residential amenity, the proposed would comply with Policy LP24 of the Kirklees Local Plan, Principles 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the adopted House Extensions and Alterations SPD, and advice within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4 – Impact on highway safety:

Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan and policies within chapter 9 of the NPPF relate to access and highway safety and are considered to be relevant to the consideration of this application. The Council's adopted Highway Design Guide and Key Design Principle 15 of the adopted House

Extensions & Alterations SPD which seek to ensure acceptable levels of off street parking are retained are also considered to be of relevance.

The proposed development would not increase the number of bedrooms within the dwelling and, as such, is not expected to result in an increase in the number of occupants or generate additional parking demand. The existing access arrangements would remain unchanged.

The proposal includes the provision of two parking spaces by way of the garage. However, it is considered that there is already sufficient space within the existing curtilage to accommodate off-street parking without requiring the proposed change of use of adjoining land. Consequently, the proposed extension of the residential curtilage into the Green Belt is not considered necessary to provide parking provision.

It is therefore considered that in terms of access and highway safety / parking the proposed would comply with Policies LP21 and LP22 of the Kirklees Local Plan, principle 15 of the Council's Street Design Guide and chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5 – Other matters:

Ecology

Policy 13 (Protecting Wildlife and Securing Biodiversity Net Gain) of the Home Valley Neighbourhood Plan sets out that development proposals should demonstrate how biodiversity will be protected and enhanced including the local wildlife, ecological networks, designated Local Wildlife Sites and habitats.

Chapter 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework are relevant, together with The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 which protect, by law, the habitat and animals of certain species including newts, bats and badgers.

Policy LP30 of the Kirklees Local Plan requires that proposals protect Habitats and Species of Principal Importance.

The site is not within a bat alert layer on the Council's GIS system and there are no records of bat roosting at the site.

A Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of 10% for developments is a mandatory requirement in England under the Environment Act 2021, subject to some limited exceptions. Unless exempt, every planning permission for minor sites granted pursuant to an application submitted after 02 April 2024 is deemed to have been granted subject to a pre-commencement condition requiring a Biodiversity Gain Plan to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority prior to commencement of the development.

The applicant has stated the application falls under the 'Di-Minimus' exemption category within the application forms. Therefore, in light of the submitted detail it is considered the application is exempt from a BNG uplift.

Climate Change

On 12th November 2019, the Council adopted a target for achieving 'net zero' carbon emissions by 2038, with an accompanying carbon budget set by the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research. National Planning Policy includes a requirement to promote carbon reduction and enhance resilience to climate change through the planning system and these principles have been incorporated into the formulation of Local Plan policies. The Local Plan pre-dates the declaration of a climate emergency and the net zero carbon target, however it includes a series of policies which are used to assess the suitability of planning applications in the context of climate change. When determining planning applications the Council will use the relevant Local Plan policies and guidance documents to embed the climate change agenda.

Considering the modest nature of the proposed development, it is considered that the proposed development would not have an impact on climate change that needs mitigation to address the climate change emergency. A Climate Change statement has been submitted with this application.

6 – Representations:

None received

7 – Conclusion:

The NPPF has introduced a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The policies set out in the NPPF taken as a whole constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development means in practice.

This application has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan and other material considerations. The proposed change of use of land from agricultural to residential would extend the residential curtilage into the Green Belt, which would fail to safeguard the countryside from encroachment and would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt and would lead to an urbanising feature which has a visually harmful impact in relation to the countryside setting within which it would be viewed. The proposed development would therefore represent a visually harmful development that also constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt for which no very special circumstances have been submitted to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt or any other harm. The proposal therefore fails to accord with policies LP24 & LP58 of the Kirklees Local Plan Policy 2 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan and policies within Chapters 12 and 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

It is considered that the development would not constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

REFUSE

Decision Authorisation - Delegated Powers

Application Number: 2026/91480

Officer Recommendation: REFUSE

Reason:

1. The proposed change of use of land from agricultural to residential would extend the residential curtilage into the Green Belt, which would fail to safeguard the countryside from encroachment and would not preserve the openness of the Green Belt and would lead to an urbanising feature which has a visually harmful impact in relation to the countryside setting within which it would be viewed. The proposed development would therefore represent a visually harmful development that also constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt for which no very special circumstances have been submitted to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt or any other harm. The proposal therefore fails to accord with policies LP24 & LP58 of the Kirklees Local Plan Policy 2 of the Holme Valley Neighbourhood Development Plan and policies within Chapters 12 and 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Plans and specifications schedule:-

Plan Type	Reference	Version	Date Received
Location Plan	1835 00_01	-	01/06/2026
Existing Plans	1835 00_02 R01	-	01/06/2026
Proposed Plans	1835 01_01 R01	-	01/06/2026
Design and Access Statement for Residential development of Farmhouse at Moss Edge Farm, Holmbridge	-	-	01/06/2026
Climate Change Statement	-	-	03/06/2026
Application Form	-	-	01/06/2026

Pursuant to article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Local Authority have, where possible, made a pre-application advice service available, complied with the Kirklees Development Management Charter 2024 and otherwise actively engaged with the applicant

in dealing with the application. No amendments have been sought in the processing of this application as it was considered significant amendments would be required beyond the scope of the application to overcome the harm identified.

Report Dated:

23/07/2026

No coal