

ADDENDUM TO PLANNING SUPPORTING STATEMENT

location	Land to the North of 5 Field Head Farm Court, Shepley, Huddersfield, HD8 8FH
application	Erection of a Single Storey Detached Dwelling and Associated Access
client/applicant	Mr & Mrs M Partridge
job number	26/1360
date	August 2026

ARCHITECTURE | PLANNING | DESIGN

Malkin Farm
Brow Lane
Holmfirth
HD9 2RJ

paul@paulmatthewsarchitectural.co.uk
www.paulmatthewsarchitectural.co.uk

Company Registration Number: 09898149 - Company Registered in England and Wales

INTRODUCTION

This Addendum to the previously submitted Planning Supporting Statement and Design & Access Statement has been prepared following the significant change - the new NPPF which was published on 17 August 2026, replacing the December 2024 Framework.

The Planning Supporting Statement, originally submitted with the application, was prepared in July 2026 and consequently assessed the proposal principally against the December 2024 version of the NPPF.

The August 2026 NPPF has now replaced the December 2024 Framework. Its National decision-making policies are material considerations which apply to planning decisions from the date of publication.

This Addendum should therefore be read alongside the submitted Planning Supporting Statement and Design and Access Statement. It does not seek to repeat the detailed site assessment contained within that document. Instead, it identifies the principal changes to national policy relevant to this application and demonstrates that the proposal remains compliant with, and is supported by, the revised August 2026 NPPF.

The new Framework restructures National Policy into *named policies* rather than the previous *paragraph-based* approach. Its decision-making policies apply from the date of publication, so this planning application should be determined having regard to the August 2026 NPPF.

The changes are, in several respects, are still reflected with the proposals, in particular, Policy GB7 now expressly identifies development utilising Grey Belt as development which is not inappropriate in the Green Belt, subject to the specified tests.

The new Annex E (Green Belt Assessments) is also particularly relevant as it puts into the NPPF itself the assessment principles previously relied upon from the former NPPF guidance; villages are not large built-up areas for Purpose A; Purpose B concerns merging of towns rather than villages; and Purpose D concerns historic towns rather than villages.

Of particular relevance is the revised national policy relating to:

- Sustainable development and decision-making;
- Housing delivery and unmet housing need;
- Green Belt development;
- Grey Belt land;
- The assessment of Green Belt purposes;
- Sustainable locations;
- Effective use of land; and
- The planning balance.

The revised Framework materially changes the numbering and structure of national policy. Accordingly, references within the original Planning Supporting Statement to paragraphs of the December 2024 NPPF should now be read alongside the equivalent policies contained within the August 2026 Framework.

AUGUST 2026 NPPF

Annex A of the August 2026 NPPF confirms that its policies are material considerations which must be taken into account in decision-making from the date of publication.

The application should therefore be determined having regard to the revised Framework notwithstanding that the original Planning Supporting Statement preceded its publication.

The revised NPPF continues to recognise the statutory primacy of the development plan, but the national decision-making policies contained within the Framework are material considerations to be considered alongside the Kirklees Local Plan. It should also be noted national policies take precedence where local policies are inconsistent with the NPPF.

Where development plan policies are materially inconsistent with the national decision-making policies of the new Framework, Annex A provides that such policies should be afforded very limited weight, subject to the qualifications contained within the Framework.

The August 2026 NPPF therefore represents an important and up-to-date material consideration in determination of this application.

GREEN BELT – (REVISED NATIONAL POLICY)

Chapter 13 of the August 2026 NPPF contains the revised national Green Belt policies.

The principal decision-making policies are now:

GB6 – Control of Development in the Green Belt

and

GB7 – Development which is not inappropriate in the Green Belt.

Policy GB6 establishes that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it falls within one of the categories identified within Policy GB7.

Where development is inappropriate, very special circumstances remain necessary. However, importantly, Policy GB7 expressly identifies categories of development which are not inappropriate development and which should therefore not be regarded as harmful to the Green Belt or required to demonstrate very special circumstances.

This distinction is very relevant to this planning application.

POLICY GB7 AND GREY BELT DEVELOPMENT

Policy GB7(1)(g) provides that development is not inappropriate in the Green Belt where all of the following apply;

1. 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;
2. There is an evidenced unmet need for the type of development proposed;
3. The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to Policy TR3.

The proposal is for one dwelling, we therefore contend this does not constitute *major development*. Consequently, the *Golden Rules* contained within Policy GB8 are not applicable to this application.

The relevant tests for this proposal are therefore those contained within Policy GB7(1)(g)(i)-(iii).

For the reasons already established within the submitted Planning Supporting Statement, and further addressed below, the proposal satisfies each of these requirements.

GREY BELT DEFINITION

The August 2026 NPPF continues expressly to recognise Grey Belt land.

The Glossary at Annex B defines Grey Belt as land within the Green Belt comprising previously developed land and/or any other land which, in either case, does not strongly contribute to any of Green Belt purposes (a), (b) or (d) identified within Policy GB2.

This is particularly relevant to the application site.

It remains acknowledged that residential garden land is not relied upon as previously developed land for the purposes of this assessment.

That does not prevent the land from constituting Grey Belt as the definition expressly encompasses “any other land” which does not strongly contribute to purposes (a), (b) or (d).

The relevant question is therefore not whether the application site is previously developed land, but whether it strongly contributes to any of those three Green Belt purposes.

The submitted Planning Supporting Statement demonstrates that it does not.

The August 2026 NPPF now provides further policy support for that conclusion through the detailed assessment criteria contained within Annex E.

ANNEX E – GREEN BELT ASSESSMENTS

A particularly significant change within the August 2026 NPPF is the incorporation of detailed Green Belt assessment methodology directly within National Policy at Annex E.

Annex E provides specific guidance for determining whether land contributes strongly, moderately, weakly or not at all to the relevant Green Belt purposes.

The assessment undertaken within the previously submitted Planning Supporting Statement is consistent with this new national methodology.

Purpose A – Checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas

Annex E expressly confirms:

“This purpose relates to the sprawl of large built-up areas. Villages should not be considered large built-up areas.”

This is directly relevant to this planning application.

Shepley is a village.

The application site therefore does not perform the strategic function envisaged by Purpose A in preventing the unrestricted sprawl of a large built-up area.

Furthermore, Annex E indicates that land making a weak or no contribution to Purpose A is likely to include land which is not adjacent to or near a large built-up area, or land which is substantially influenced or enclosed by existing development.

The application site is a small and physically contained parcel of established domestic garden land. It is associated with the existing residential development at Field Head Farm Court and is enclosed by substantial established hedgerows.

The proposed development remains within the established physical boundaries.

The proposal would not create an unrestricted outward projection of development into open countryside.

Accordingly, the site makes a weak/no contribution to Purpose A.

Purpose B – Preventing neighbouring towns merging

Annex E expressly confirms;

“This purpose relates to the merging of towns, not villages.”

Again, this provides direct national policy support for the assessment contained within the previously submitted Planning Supporting Statement.

The development of a single dwelling within this contained site at Shepley would clearly not result in neighbouring towns merging.

The site forms only an extremely small component of the much wider Green Belt and its development would not materially diminish the physical or visual separation between settlements.

Accordingly, the site makes a weak/no contribution to Purpose B.

Purpose D – Preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

Annex E similarly confirms;

“This purpose relates to historic towns, not villages.”

Shepley is a village and the application site does not form part of the setting of an historic town.

As established within the previously submitted Planning Supporting Statement, the site is also separated from the Shepley Conservation Area and from the nearest listed buildings by existing development and substantial distance.

Development of this contained domestic garden would not affect the setting or special character of an historic town.

Accordingly, the site makes a weak/no contribution to Purpose D.

Conclusion on Grey Belt Status

The August 2026 NPPF therefore provides stronger and more explicit national policy criteria against which the characteristics of the application site can be assessed.

Applying those criteria, the site does not strongly contribute to any of Green Belt purposes A, B or D.

We therefore contend that the application site consequently falls within the definition of Grey Belt land contained within Annex B of the August 2026 NPPF.

IMPACT UPON THE REMAINING GREEN BELT – POLICY GB7(1)(g)(i)

Policy GB7 additionally requires that development would not fundamentally undermine the purposes, taken together, of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

The proposed development comprises only one single-storey dwelling within an existing, long-established and strongly defined domestic curtilage.

The existing mature hedgerow to the Northern, Eastern and Western boundaries is all to be retained as part of the proposals.

These boundaries provide a strong, recognisable and defensible physical distinction between the application site and the genuinely open agricultural countryside beyond.

The proposal does not involve development extending beyond those established boundaries.

The scale of development is extremely limited in comparison with the extent of the surrounding wider Green Belt.

We contend that the development of this small, contained parcel could not reasonably be considered to fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the Kirklees plan area.

Accordingly, the proposal complies with Policy GB7(1)(g)(i).

EVIDENCED UNMET HOUSING NEED – POLICY GB7(1)(g)(ii)

Policy GB7(1)(g)(ii) requires an evidenced unmet need for the type of development proposed.

For housing development, the accompanying footnote to Policy GB7 expressly identifies unmet need by reference to circumstances including where;

- The Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites, including the relevant buffer where applicable; or
- The Housing Delivery Test result is below 75% of the housing requirement over the previous three years.

The submitted Planning Supporting Statement identifies Kirklees' housing land supply position and the acknowledged housing delivery shortfall.

Subject to the Council's most up-to-date published housing supply evidence at the date of determination, the identified shortfall represents an evidenced unmet need for additional housing.

Although this proposal delivers only one dwelling, national policy does not establish a minimum numerical contribution for the purposes of Policy GB7(1)(g)(ii).

A single deliverable dwelling nevertheless represents a positive contribution towards addressing the identified housing need.

The development is small-scale and capable of being delivered without dependence upon substantial new infrastructure.

We therefore contend that the proposals satisfies Policy GB7(1)(g)(ii).

SUSTAINABLE LOCATION – POLICY GB7(1)(g)(iii)

Policy GB7(1)(g)(iii) requires development to be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to Policy TR3.

The previously submitted Planning Supporting Statement provides a detailed assessment of the accessibility and sustainability credentials of the application site.

The site is located within the established village of Shepley and benefits from access to a significant range of services and facilities including:

- Railway services;
- Bus services;
- Convenience shopping;
- Primary education and pre-school provision;
- Health facilities;
- Community facilities;
- Recreation and sports facilities;
- Public houses, restaurants and café facilities;
- Employment opportunities; and
- Other local services/amenities.

Shepley railway station is approximately 0.4km from the application site and is readily accessible from the site.

The proposal is therefore fundamentally different from isolated residential development within open countryside.

The proposed scheme represents a single dwelling closely associated with an existing residential community and within walking distance of numerous everyday services and public transport opportunities.

The proposals also provide an Electric Vehicle Charge Point, the scale of the two bedroomed property means that the additional traffic movements arising from the dwelling would be limited.

We therefore contend that the proposals represent sustainable development in transport and locational terms and satisfies Policy GB7(1)(g)(iii)

GOLDEN RULES – POLICY GB8

Policy GB8 establishes the Golden Rules applicable to major development involving the provision of housing on relevant Green Belt sites.

The current proposal comprises one dwelling and is therefore not major development.

The requirements of Policy GB8 are therefore not applicable.

This represents an important distinction when applying Policy GB7 to this application.

The proposal does not need to demonstrate compliance with the affordable housing, infrastructure and publicly accessible green-space contributions applicable to major Green Belt housing development under Policy GB8.

EFFECT OF POLICY GB7 – NOT INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT

Having regard to the above assessment;

- The site comprises Grey Belt land;
- Development would not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the plan area;
- There is evidenced unmet housing need;
- The proposal is situated in a sustainable location; and
- Policy GB8 is not applicable because the proposal is not classed as *major development*.

We therefore contend that the proposals satisfies Policy GB7(1)(g).

This consequence, we contend is significant.

Policy GB7 expressly provides that development falling within its identified categories is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Accordingly, the proposed dwelling should not be regarded as harmful merely by reason of being development within the Green Belt and, as such, there is no requirement to demonstrate VSC (Very Special Circumstances).

This we contend represents the appropriate starting point for consideration of the application under the August 2026 NPPF.

PRESUMPTION IN FAVOUR OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The August 2026 Framework also introduces a revised policy structure for applying the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Of particular relevance, the Framework distinguishes development within the Green Belt which remains inappropriate from development which is expressly identified through Policy GB7 as not inappropriate.

Where Green Belt development is found to be not inappropriate through Policy GB7, the Framework provides a positive decision-making approach whereby proposals should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by adverse effects when assessed against the national decision-making policies of the Framework.

This, we contend, materially reinforces the case for the present development.

Once the proposal satisfies Policy GB7, the planning assessment is not governed by the restrictive VSC (Very Special Circumstances) test applicable to inappropriate Green Belt development.

Instead, the proposal falls to be considered positively against the Framework as a whole.

The identified benefits include;

- Delivery of an additional dwelling towards identified housing need;
- Utilisation of a small and contained Grey Belt site;
- Efficient use of land within an existing residential context;
- A highly energy-efficient dwelling;
- Renewable energy generation;
- Air source heat pump technology;
- Mechanical heat recovery ventilation;
- Electric Vehicle charging;
- Retention of established boundary hedgerows;
- Ecological enhancements;
- A restrained single-storey design;
- Use of locally characteristic materials;
- A self-build dwelling designed to meet the applicants' long-term needs; and
- Development within an established and sustainable village.

No adverse effects have been identified which would substantially outweigh those benefits.

The revised national planning balance therefore weighs positively in favour of granting planning permission.

EFFECTIVE USE OF LAND

The August 2026 NPPF continues to promote the effective use of land.

This planning application represents an efficient use of a substantial existing residential curtilage without extending development beyond the established landscape boundary into the open agricultural fields to the North and beyond.

The proposal retains adequate private amenity space for both the existing and proposed dwellings and does not result in overdevelopment.

The proposed single-storey form has deliberately been selected to minimise built mass and visual prominence.

The development therefore represents an efficient and proportionate use of land whilst responding appropriately to the site's physical and landscape constraints.

DESIGN, CLIMATE CHANGE AND SUSTAINABILITY

The revised Framework continues to place significant emphasis upon high-quality design, sustainable development and responding to climate change.

The proposal responds positively to those objectives.

As detailed within the originally submitted Planning Supporting Statement, the dwelling incorporates;

- A highly efficient building fabric;
- A timber-frame construction;
- Locally appropriate natural stone;
- Natural stone slate roofing;
- Solar photovoltaic panels;
- An air source heat pump;
- Mechanical heat recovery ventilation;
- Electric Vehicle charging;
- Sustainable drainage;
- Retention of established hedgerows; and
- Integrated ecological enhancement measures.

The restrained single-storey form, traditional material palette and established landscape enclosure allow the development to respond sensitively to the character of Field Head Farm Court and its wider setting.

These matters further support the proposals when assessed against the August 2026 NPPF as a whole.

PREVIOUS PLANNING AND APPEAL DECISIONS

The previous applications and appeal decisions identified within the previously submitted Planning Supporting Statement remain material considerations.

However, they were determined under materially different national Green Belt policy.

In particular, those decisions pre-date;

- The introduction of Grey Belt policy;
- The explicit national definition of Grey Belt;
- The revised exception for Grey Belt development now contained within Policy GB7;
- The detailed Green Belt assessment methodology now incorporated into Annex E;
- The express confirmation within Annex E that villages are not large built-up areas for Purpose A;
- The express confirmation that Purpose B relates to towns rather than villages; and
- The express confirmation that Purpose D relates to historic towns rather than villages.

The policy context within which the present application falls to be determined is therefore materially different from that applicable to the previous proposals.

Furthermore, the current proposal itself is materially different, comprising a substantially smaller, single-storey dwelling with considerably reduced physical and engineering works.

The previous findings should consequently be afforded appropriate weight having regard to the significantly altered national policy context and the materially different development now proposed.

CONCLUSION

The publication of the August 2026 National Planning Policy Framework does not undermine the planning case advanced within the submitted Planning Supporting Statement.

On the contrary, the revised Framework provides further explicit national policy support for the approach taken.

In particular;

- The August 2026 NPPF is now a material consideration in determination of this application;
- Grey Belt remains expressly recognised within national policy;
- The application site satisfies the revised definition of Grey Belt;
- Annex E provides direct policy support for the assessment that the site makes a weak/no contribution to Green Belt purposes A, B and D;

- Policy GB7 expressly identifies qualifying Grey Belt development as development which is not inappropriate in the Green Belt;
- The proposal would not fundamentally undermine the purposes of the remaining Green Belt across the plan area;
- The proposal contributes towards evidenced unmet housing need;
- The site represents a sustainable location within the established village of Shepley;
- The proposal is not major development and therefore the Golden Rules contained within Policy GB8 are not applicable;
- Very Special Circumstances are consequently not required;
- The proposal makes effective use of a contained residential site;
- The development delivers a high-quality and highly sustainable dwelling; and
- The benefits of granting planning permission are not substantially outweighed by any possible adverse effects.

We therefore contend that the proposals accords with the relevant national decision-making policies contained within the August 2026 National Planning Policy Framework, together with the relevant policies of the Kirklees Local Plan, noting national policies take precedence where local policies are inconsistent with the NPPF.

When the previously submitted Planning Supporting Statement is read together with this Addendum, it is considered that a robust and up-to-date planning case exists for the granting of planning permission.

The Local Planning Authority is therefore respectfully requested to determine the application having regard to the materially changed national planning policy context and to grant planning permission subject to any appropriate conditions.

Should any further information be required please don't hesitate to contact us.

We trust the LPA will engage with Paul Matthews Architectural Ltd (agent) in dealing with this application, in line with the Kirklees Development Management Charter 2024.

It would be appreciated if you could contact Paul Matthews Architectural Ltd prior to drafting up your recommendation for determination.