

**KIRKLEES METROPOLITAN COUNCIL
INVESTMENT & REGENERATION SERVICE**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) Section 59A

DELEGATED DECISION FOR APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE

Reference no.: 2026/59/91590/E

Site: Land Off, Sowood Lane, Grange Moor, Huddersfield,
WF4 4BN

Description: Permission in principle for erection of one dwelling

Case Office: Elenya Jackson

Decision Reference: 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.

John Holmes

AUTHORISED OFFICER

Date 15-Jul-2026

Officer Report

Reference No. 2026/59/91590/E

Site Address: Land Off, Sowood Lane, Grange Moor, Huddersfield, WF4 4BN

Proposal: Permission in principle for erection of 1 dwelling

Site Description

The application relates to a parcel of land on the west of Sowood Lane, Grange Moor, Huddersfield. The site is not located within a conservation area or near any listed buildings. However, this parcel of land is allocated as Green Belt on the Kirklees Local Plan Proposals Map and is accessed by a bridleway KIR/dmno app327/10.

Description of Proposal

The application is seeking permission in principle for the erection of one dwelling. As this application relates to permission in principle, the information provided is limited to a location plan.

Negotiations

No amendments were sought or received during the course of the application process as the application is a matter of determining the principle of residential development on the site.

Relevant Planning History

2009/90974: Outline application for erection of two detached dwellings. **Refused** on 29th July 2009 for the following reasons:

The proposed development is within an area which has received approval as Green Belt, within which it is intended that new development be severely restricted. The proposal represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt, and the applicant has not demonstrated very special circumstances to justify that any harm to the openness of the Green Belt is clearly outweighed by other considerations, and therefore the proposals are contrary to the requirements of PPG2: Green Belts.

2. The existing access is sub-standard in terms of visibility at the junction of Sowood Lane with Denby Lane. The proposals would result in an intensification of use of this sub-standard access and any increase in additional turning movements in and out of a sub-standard access would not be in the best interest of highway safety and be contrary to Policies D2 and T10 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan.

3. The site is unsustainable by virtue of its remote location relative to public transport links and local services and amenities. The proposed development would therefore result in future occupants being heavily, if not completely reliant on car borne journeys. Such development is contrary to advice contained within PPS1, PPS3, PPS7 & PPG13 which aim to create sustainable communities and to encourage sustainable modes of transport.

4. The applicant has submitted insufficient information for the proposals to be properly assessed having regard to identifying and maintaining any possible ecological interest within the site, and therefore the proposals are considered contrary to advice contained within PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.

A subsequent appeal to this decision was dismissed on 4th January 2010 (appeal ref APP/Z4718/A/09/2115000)

87/00701: Outline application for detached house and garage. **Refused** 31st March 1987

Representations

The application was publicised by site notice which expired on 25th June 2026. As a result of the above publicity, Kirkburton Parish Council confirm they have no comment to make.

Consultation Responses

Relevant consultations will be sought at Technical Details Stage.

Policy

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).

The site is located within the designated Green Belt on the Kirklees Local Plan Proposals Map. The most relevant policies for consideration in this case are:

Kirklees Local Plan Policies

- **LP 1** - Achieving Sustainable Development
- **LP 2** - Place Shaping
- **LP 3** - Location of New Development
- **LP 7** - Efficient and Effective Use of Land
- **LP 11** - Housing Mix and Affordable Housing

- **LP 24** - Design
- **LP 33** - Trees
- **LP 52** - Protection and Improvement of Environmental Quality
- **LP 59** - Brownfield Sites in the Green Belt

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Kirklees Council has adopted (as of 29th June 2021) supplementary planning documents for guidance on house building, house extensions and open space, to be used alongside existing SPDs previously adopted. This guidance indicates how the Council will usually interpret its policies regarding such built development, although the general thrust of the advice is aligned with both the Kirklees Local Plan (KLP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), requiring development to be considerate in terms of the character of the host property and the wider street scene. As such, it is anticipated that these SPDs will assist with ensuring enhanced consistency in both approach and outcomes relating to development. In this case the follow SPDs (and design guides) are applicable:

- Kirklees Highways Design Guide (2019)
- Housebuilders Design Guide (2021)
- Biodiversity Net Gain Technical Advice Note (2021)

National Policies and Guidance:

National planning policy and guidance is set out in National Policy Statements, primarily the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) updated December 2024, the Planning Practice Guidance Suite (PPGS) first launched 6th March 2014 together with Circulars, Ministerial Statements and associated technical guidance. The NPPF constitutes guidance for local planning authorities and is a material consideration in determining applications.

- **Chapter 2** - Achieving Sustainable Development
- **Chapter 5** - Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes
- **Chapter 11** - Making Effective Use of Land
- **Chapter 12** - Achieving Well-Designed Places
- **Chapter 13** – Protecting Green Belt Land
- **Chapter 14** - Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change
- **Chapter 15** - Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

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.

Assessment

1. Permission in Principle Purpose

The permission in principle consent route is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development which separates the consideration of matters of principle for proposed development from the technical detail of the development. The permission in principle consent route has 2 stages: the first stage (or permission in principle stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle and the second ('technical details consent') stage is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. The technical details stage has the effect of granting planning permission.

The scope of Permission in Principle is limited to the following.

- Location
- Land Use
- Amount of Development

Issues relevant to these 'in principle' matters should be considered at the Permission in Principle Stage. Other matters should be considered at the technical consent stage (Local Authorities cannot list the information they require for applications for Permission in Principle in the same way they can for planning permission).

It is not possible for conditions to be attached to a grant of permission in principle, and its terms may only include the site location, the type of development and the amount of development. The LPA can inform the applicants what they expect to see at the technical details stage.

It is not possible to secure a planning obligation at the permission in principle stage.

The LPA may not grant permission in principle for a major development. This means where the number of houses is 10 or more, the floor space created is 1,000sqm or more or the development is carried out on a site having an area of 1 hectare or more. In this case the development is for 1 unit and the site has an area of less than 1 hectare. The resultant floor-space to be created is unknown at this stage but would need to be assessed at the Technical Details Stage. The LPA may not grant Permission in Principle for Schedule 1 development. This proposal would not be Schedule 1 development.

Local Planning Authorities must not grant permission in principle for development which is likely to affect a Habitats Site (as defined within the NPPF). The site is not in an area classified under European habitat protection or those listed in the NPPF.

2. Principle of Residential 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.

Policy 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”*.

The 2025 update of the five-year housing land supply position for Kirklees shows 4.18 years supply of housing land, and the 2023 Housing Delivery Test (HDT) measurement which was published on 12/12/2024 demonstrated that housing delivery for Kirklees for the past three years (April 2020-March 2023) has fallen below the 75% pass threshold.

As the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, and delivery of housing has fallen below the 75% HDT requirement, it is necessary to consider planning applications for housing development in the context of NPPF Paragraph 11 which triggers a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means that for decision making *“Where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out of-date (NPPF Footnote 8), granting permission unless: (i) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed (NPPF Footnote 7) ; or (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.”*

It is noted that this site is located within the designated Green Belt. Irrespective of the Council's position on the five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, the National Planning Policy Framework at Paragraph 11 is clear that in the event a Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, the council should grant permission “unless the application of policies that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed. Footnote 7 at Paragraph 11d) states that the protected areas include land designated as Green Belt. Although the council are not able to demonstrate a five-year supply of housing, the tilted balance would not be engaged for this proposal.

Therefore, the principle of developing on Green Belt land must be assessed in order to determine whether the principle of development is acceptable. The proposal will also be assessed against all other material considerations.

Location and Land Use – Green Belt

The application site is located within the designated Green Belt on the Kirklees Local Plan Proposals Map. As such, Green Belt policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Kirklees Local Plan are relevant.

Paragraph 143 of the NPPF identifies five purposes of the Green Belt, these are as follows:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
- a) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.
- b) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- c) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- d) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Paragraph 153 states that *“When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness (footnote 55). Inappropriate development is by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. ‘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.’”*

Paragraph 154 of the NPPF states *“a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:*

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry.
- a) *the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use), including buildings, for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;*
- b) *the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; Other than in the case of development on previously developed land or grey belt land, where development is not inappropriate.*
- c) *the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.*
- d) limited infilling in villages.
- e) *limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and*
- f) *limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.*

The application relates to residential development and as such would not fall under exceptions a, b, c, d or f.

With regard to sub-paragraph e), Paragraph 19.31 of the Kirklees Local Plan outlines the Councils approach to assessing infilling in villages: *“Any application for infill development within the Green Belt will therefore be judged in the first instance on*

whether the settlement is a village for the purposes of Green Belt policy. If it is established that the site is within a village the plot should be small, normally sufficient for not more than two dwellings and within an otherwise continuously built-up frontage."

The site is not located within a village and therefore does not fall under exception e.

Regarding exemption g,

Policy LP59 of the Kirklees Local Plan outlines:

"Proposals for infilling within existing brownfield sites or for their partial or complete redevelopment will normally be acceptable, provided that:

- a) in the case of infilling, the gap is small and is located between existing built form on a brownfield site.*
- a) in the case of partial or complete redevelopment the extent of the existing footprint is not exceeded; and*
- b) redevelopment does not result in the loss of land that is of high environmental value which cannot be mitigated or compensated for."*

In the supporting text for LP59, Paragraph 19.33 of the Kirklees Local Plan states: *"The redevelopment of the site, either in the same use or for a new use, may be acceptable provided that the redevelopment is designed so as not to have any more impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing built form"*

Annex 2 of the NPPF defines Previous Developed Land as:

"Land which has been lawfully developed and is or was occupied by a permanent structure and any fixed surface infrastructure associated with it, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed) It also includes land comprising large areas of fixed surface infrastructure such as large areas of hardstanding which have been lawfully developed. Previously developed land excludes: land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings; land that has been developed for minerals extraction or waste disposal by landfill, where provision for restoration has been made through development management procedures; land in built-up areas such as residential gardens, parks, recreation grounds and allotments; and land that was previously developed but where the remains of the permanent structure or fixed surface structure have blended into the landscape".

Based on the submitted information and historical imaging of the site, the site is not considered to constitute previously developed land, and therefore the proposal does not fall within the Green Belt exceptions for redevelopment under Paragraph 154(g) of the NPPF.

This conclusion is drawn having cognisance of the Appeal decision in relation to the 2009 refusal, detailed in the planning history section of this report. Within the decision letter of the Inspectorate (Appeal ref: APP/Z4718/A/09/2115000) paragraph 5 & 7 are of relevance:

5. The appellant advises that the buildings were formerly farm workers' cottages that were last used for residential purposes in the 1930s. A local resident states that the houses that stood on the land were condemned in the 1950s and had to be demolished, and that the existing collapsing building on the site was built as a store/poultry house. No other evidence of residential use has been provided.

7. It was apparent at my site visit that the buildings are derelict and in a state of severe disrepair, with no roofs and areas of collapsed walling. They have not been used for residential purposes for probably 70 years on the appellant's reckoning, and there is no evidence before me to indicate they have been put to any other use since. Moreover, there is nothing before me to show the owner's intention for the buildings. In these circumstances, I conclude that the residential use of the buildings has been abandoned. I shall therefore treat the appeal proposal as being one involving new residential development.

The above conclusions were drawn 16 years prior to the application submitted. However they remain relevant given the site is in largely the same state, albeit there does appear to have been clearance of vegetation at the site undertaken at some point since September 2025 (when viewing street imagery from that date available online).

Within the NPPF, 'grey belt' 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 any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in Paragraph 143. 'Grey belt' excludes land where the application of the policies relating to the areas or assets in footnote 7 (other than Green Belt) would provide a strong reason for refusing or restricting development.'

Paragraph 155 of the NPPF states that the development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where all the following apply:

- a) *The development would utilise Grey Belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.*
- a) *There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed (footnote 56).*
- b) *The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework (footnote 57); and*
- c) *Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157.*

With regard to Paragraph 155(a) an assessment must be made in regard to whether the proposal would not strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in Paragraph 143 in order to be considered grey belt.

Paragraph 143 of the NPPF identifies five purposes of the Green Belt, these are as follows:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
- a) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.
- b) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- c) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- d) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The site would not strongly contribute to preventing unrestricted urban sprawl, and it is not considered that the development as submitted would fundamentally undermine the purposes of the Green Belt in terms of paragraph 143. the location of the development is such that it is not considered to make a strong contribution to preventing the merging of towns or preserving the setting / special character of historic towns. The proposal is not therefore considered to strongly contribute to any of purposes (a), (b), or (d) in Paragraph 143 and could be considered grey belt.

Turning to the other purposes set out in paragraph 143, taken together with those previously discussed it is considered that whilst leading to encroachment, and having an impact in relation to encouraging the development of previously developed land, the proposal would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. The proposal is therefore concluded to meet the requirement of paragraph 155(a) of the NPPF.

Paragraph 155(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that '*there is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed*'. Kirklees currently has a 4.18-year housing land supply, which falls below the required five-year supply. As such, there is a demonstrable unmet need for housing within the Kirklees district. Paragraph 155(b) is therefore met by the development proposal.

Sustainable Development (Paragraph 155c)

The application site is located approximately 4 miles from Ravensthorpe district centre (North), 2 miles from Edge top road local centre, 5 miles from Batley town centre (North-West) and 7 miles from Holmfirth Town centre (South-West). These would be the nearest centres with a range of amenities and services. Settlements closer to the site have a limited range of services / amenities.

The site is accessed via a single width road, with no street lighting and no public footpath. The nearest school is an approximate walk of 0.7km with other services being a similar distance and with the nearest bus routes being an approximate distance of 1km. the use of a cycle is unlikely to be realistically encouraged given the nature of the access to the site.

Paragraphs 110 and 115 of the NPPF are relevant in the consideration of this scheme, setting out the following:

The planning system should actively manage patterns of growth in support of these objectives. Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. This can help to reduce congestion and emissions, and improve air quality and public health. However, opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas, and this should be taken into account in both plan-making and decision-making.

In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:

- a) sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision for the site, the type of development and its location;*
- b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*
- c) the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements and the content of associated standards reflects current national guidance, including the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code; and*
- d) any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach.*

It is concluded that future occupiers of the dwelling would depend largely/mainly on the use of private car to reach the services and facilities they need to meet their daily needs. Therefore, the proposed development would not be in a sustainable location.

The character of the area is rural with limited residential properties in close proximity to the site. Officers consider the development would very much result in an isolated home in the countryside, which the Framework states in paragraph 84 should be avoided unless one of five circumstances apply, the most relevant being criterion (e); that the design is of exceptional quality, in that it: i. ii. is truly outstanding, reflecting the highest standards in architecture, and would help to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas; and would significantly enhance its immediate setting, and be sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. It is considered that the application cannot be assessed against this standard as technical details are not applicable as part of a permission in principle and the application would therefore be considered unacceptable. In any event, the proposal would not meet criterion c of paragraph 155 of the NPPF which is critical to the consideration of the principle of development given the green belt allocation of the site.

The site is not in a sustainable location, this was considered to be the case in the determination of the 2009 application (2009/90974) and the subsequent appeal. Within the appeal decision the Inspectorate sets out at paragraphs 20 & 21.

21. Grange Moor is the nearest settlement of any size to the appeal site. I have not been provided with details of services and amenities in the village, but Appeal

Decision APP/Z4718/A/09/2115000 4 during my visit noted that it has a school, a small convenience store, a hot food takeaway, a garage and a public house. Whilst these may meet the day-to-day needs of occupiers of the proposed dwellings, I consider it unlikely that residents would walk or cycle to the village given the distance involved, the absence of footways and limited street lighting, and especially in inclement weather and in the dark. Reliance on a car would therefore be highly probable.

22. Moreover, although Grange Moor is served by public transport, the site is well outside the 400m maximum recommended walking distance from a site to a public transport access point¹, and access to town centre shopping facilities, employment opportunities and leisure and sports attractions is therefore likely to be undertaken by private car.

Whilst there has been a change in policies it is considered the factors discussed within the Inspectorate decision letter remain applicable, some of the services may have reduced at Grange Moor but irrespective of this they would not have been of a standard / degree that could lead to the conclusion the site is in a sustainable location.

The application site is therefore not considered to be within a sustainable location in terms of proximity to transport links, education facilities and services. Therefore, would fail to satisfy the requirements of Paragraph 155c of the NPPF.

Golden Rules (Paragraph 155d)

With regard to Paragraph 155 (d), the development would not constitute major development and therefore does not require justification to part d.

It is concluded that the site does not make strong contribution(s) to purposes (a), (b), or (d) and therefore, it can be considered 'grey belt' land.

However, officers consider that the development would constitute inappropriate development on the basis it fails to be an exception falling within either paragraph 154 or 155 of the NPPF as discussed earlier within this section of the report. This conclusion is drawn as the site is located in an unsustainable location failing to comply with criterion c of paragraph 155 of the NPPF. Therefore, the proposed development is considered unacceptable in principle as it would constitute inappropriate development for which no very special circumstances have been demonstrated or are considered to exist more generally. Refusal is therefore recommended.

3. Quantum of Development

The proposed development is seeking permission in principle for one dwelling. Policy LP7 of the Kirklees Local Plan establishes a desired target density of thirty-five dwellings per hectare. By that standard, this site in theory, could accommodate one

dwelling. One dwelling is proposed in this instance, which is considered appropriate given the density of development.

Accordingly, the proposed quantum and density of development is considered to be consistent with Policy LP7 of the Local Plan and Chapter 11 of the NPPF. When appropriately designed, the provision of one dwelling on this site would not result in overdevelopment.

4. Other Matters

Biodiversity

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 granted pursuant to an application submitted after 12 February 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.

Notwithstanding this, the Kirklees Mapping System does not identify the site as falling within a designated site as defined by the Habitats Regulations. On this basis, impacts on protected habitats are not considered to be a constraint at this stage, although ecological matters would need further consideration at the Technical Details Stage.

Contaminated Land

The application is for a new residential property which is a sensitive end use and could be affected by any contamination present or brought onto the site. As such, this matter would be considered at the Technical Details Stage.

Public Right of Way

It is important to note that bridleway KIR/dmno app327/10 would be used for access. PROWs must remain open and unaffected by the proposed development. As such, this matter would be detail with at a Technical Details Stage.

Trees

It is noted that several trees are located within the site and there are several TPO trees to the south of the site. As such, at any subsequent Technical Details Stage, a Tree survey would be required to be submitted.

All other matters would be dealt with at the Technical Details stage.

5. Representations

The response of Kirkburton Parish Council is noted

6. Conclusion

The permission in principle consent route is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development which separates the consideration of matters of principle for proposed development from the technical detail of the development. The permission in principle consent route has 2 stages: the first stage (or permission in principle stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle and the second ('technical details consent') stage is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. The technical details stage has the effect of granting planning permission.

The scope of this Permission in Principle is limited to the following;

- Location
- Land Use
- Amount of Development

The location of development is considered unacceptable for the context of the site. Given such, this permission in principle application has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan and other material considerations. It is considered that the permission in principle would not constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for refusal

Recommendation: Refusal of Permission in Principle

Application: 2026/90715 - Land off, Mountain Way, Kirkheaton, Huddersfield, HD5 0EW

Proposal: Permission in principle for erection of 1 dwelling

Reason for refusal:

1. The proposal would not constitute the redevelopment of previously developed land, would fail to represent development within a sustainable location and would result in the creation of an isolated dwelling. The proposal would therefore fail to constitute any of the exceptions set out in Paragraphs 154 and 155 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). No very special circumstances have been demonstrated that would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and any other harm, and the development is therefore contrary to policies contained within Chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Kirklees Council hereby give notice that PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE HAS BEEN REFUSED for the carrying out of the above development in accordance with the application plans and documents submitted or as may otherwise be amended following written approval by the Local Planning Authority. The Permission in Principle REFUSED is for the erection of one dwelling.

Plans and specifications schedule: -

Plan Type	Reference	Revision	Date Received
Location Plan			20/06/2026

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 Planning Authority has, 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 negotiations were required to be undertaken during the application process as the application is a matter of determining the principle of residential development on the site is unacceptable.