

Objection to proposed dwelling at Meadow View

Application Number: 2026/92525

Site Address: Meadow View, 15 Cliff Road, Holmfirth, HD9 1UY

Proposed Development: Permission in Principle for erection of one dwelling

Dear Planning Officer,

We are writing _____ to object to this application. Having read the Planning Statement, we do not think it has adequately explained why this particular piece of Green Belt land is suitable for an additional dwelling. [1][2]

We understand that Permission in Principle decides the location, land use and amount of development, with detailed design considered later. Our concerns therefore focus on the suitability of this site, its landscape setting and the evidence used to justify another house here. [3]

The grey belt assessment needs a fuller explanation

The Planning Statement concludes that the site has “no effect on urban sprawl” and “no effect on any historic town”, but gives little explanation of how those conclusions have been reached for this piece of land. [2]

Annex E of the National Planning Policy Framework requires assessment of the relevant Green Belt purposes, taking account of the circumstances of the land. We ask the Council to explain how this site relates to the existing settlement and whether development would extend the built area into the open hillside. Being beside an existing house does not, by itself, answer those questions. [4]

Local policy also matters. Kirklees Local Plan policy LP24(a) requires development to respect and enhance townscape and landscape character. Policy LP32 requires proposals to take account of and seek to enhance landscape character, including the setting of settlements and buildings and the pattern of field boundaries. We ask the Council to consider those policies when assessing whether this open hillside site can appropriately accommodate another dwelling, alongside the national grey-belt tests. [11]

The bus service is substantially more limited than stated

The Planning Statement says the H2 passes along Cliff Road “every 30 minutes” and relies on this to support its conclusion that the site is in a sustainable location. [2]

The published H2 timetable, using Stotts Coaches’ Bus Open Data Service data, shows four journeys a day at two-hour intervals, Monday to Saturday, with no Sunday service. [14]

This is a substantial difference in the service available for everyday journeys. We ask the Council to reassess the sustainability argument using the actual service. A limited bus service does not settle the whole question, but the case should not rest on a half-hourly service that does not exist. The sustainable-location requirement remains part of policy GB7(1)(g), even though this proposal is for only one dwelling. [4]

The effect on the hillside needs proper consideration

The site is an open paddock on the hillside beside Meadow View. From Greenfield Road, Meadow View is already a prominent and, in our view, incongruous feature on the hillside. We are concerned that introducing another dwelling on the adjoining open land would compound that visual impact and further erode the landscape character of this particular site.

We ask the Council to consider the site from Greenfield Road and other relevant public viewpoints, including the relationship between the open paddock, existing buildings and the wider Holmfirth landscape. The Planning Statement does not provide a clear assessment of those relationships. [2]

Our concern is the additional built development on this open land, whatever the eventual architectural style. Another dwelling would extend the presence of buildings across this part of the hillside. The Council needs to consider whether that is acceptable in this location before establishing the principle of another house. [3]

Previous local evidence about openness remains relevant

During preparation of the Kirklees Local Plan, H282, “Land to the east of, Cliff Road, Holmfirth”, was identified as a rejected housing allocation. The Council’s response identified the importance of undeveloped gaps along Cliff Road to openness and the character of the prominent undeveloped backdrop. [5]

We understand that this was a Local Plan allocation assessment, not a decision on the present application. It is relevant local context, however. We ask the Council to explain how another dwelling on this particular paddock would affect the openness and hillside character identified in that earlier assessment.

The replacement dwelling does not automatically justify another house

The Planning Statement refers only to the adjoining dwelling approved in 2018. That permission was for demolition and replacement of an existing dwelling, with a detached garage. This application is different: it seeks an additional dwelling on adjoining Green Belt land. [2][6]

The fuller history helps explain that distinction. The 2016 replacement-house application relied in part on lawful extensions to Wood Bungalow when comparing the size and Green Belt impact of its replacement, although only the foundations of those extensions had been built. The 2018 statement records the earlier approval in November 2017 and describes the later scheme as a modified proposal. The garden pod and decking followed under a separate permission in 2025. [7][8][9]

In a 2021 appeal concerning another Cliff Road site, the appellant’s consultant described Wood Bungalow as “a modern development, out of character with the surrounding properties”. This was the consultant’s opinion, not a finding by the Council or an Inspector. We do not rely on that comment as proof of harm, but ask for the landscape effect of this additional dwelling to be assessed on its own merits. [10]

Our concern is specific to this development history. Meadow View was permitted as a replacement dwelling under particular circumstances. Its existence, and the subsequent garden pod, should not automatically justify a second dwelling on the adjoining land. The current proposal needs to stand on its own merits.

The housing evidence should be brought up to date

The Planning Statement cites a February 2024 housing land supply of 3.96 years and a 2022 Housing Delivery Test result of 67%. The Council's Authority Monitoring Report 2024/25, published in December 2025, records a supply of 4.18 years, while the latest government Housing Delivery Test, published on 17 August 2026, records 65% for Kirklees. The application should be assessed using the latest evidence, rather than the older figures quoted. [2][12][13]

We recognise that these figures still show an unmet housing need and that one additional home would make a contribution. However, unmet need is only one part of the applicant's case under policy GB7(1)(g). It does not remove the other requirements, including grey-belt status and a sustainable location. We ask the Council to weigh the benefit of one dwelling against the site-specific landscape concerns and apply the current policy tests in full. [4]

Conclusion

We do not think the application has adequately demonstrated that this particular site is suitable for another dwelling. The bus information materially overstates the service available, the grey-belt assessment is very brief, and the effect of extending built development across this hillside needs fuller consideration.

We therefore ask the Council to **refuse Permission in Principle**. Before reaching its decision, we ask it to address these site-specific concerns using accurate transport information, the relevant local landscape evidence and the full history of the adjoining replacement dwelling.

Yours faithfully,

Sources referenced

- [1] Kirklees Council, application 2026/59/92525/W. [View source](#)
- [2] AKPlanning, Planning and Design and Access Statement, 8 September 2026, particularly pages 2 to 5. [View source](#)
- [3] GOV.UK Planning Practice Guidance, Permission in Principle, scope of the application. [View source](#)
- [4] National Planning Policy Framework, August 2026, policy GB7(1)(g), policy TR3 and Annex E. [View source](#)
- [5] Kirklees Draft Local Plan, rejected housing site H282 and Council response in the Summary of Comments on Rejected Options, PDF page 85. [View source](#)
- [6] Kirklees Council, replacement dwelling and garage, application 2018/90732. [View source](#)
- [7] Enzygo, Supporting Planning Statement, August 2016, application 2016/92663. [View source](#)
- [8] Northern Design Partnership, Design and Access Statement, February 2018, application 2018/90732. [View source](#)
- [9] Kirklees Council, garden pod and decking, application 2025/90323. [View source](#)
- [10] RBA Town Planning, appeal statement for 2021/91373, paragraphs 6.7 to 6.9. [View source](#)
- [11] Kirklees Local Plan Strategy and Policies, adopted February 2019, LP24(a) Design (printed page 111) and LP32 Landscape (printed page 135). [View source](#)
- [12] Kirklees Authority Monitoring Report 2024/25, housing land supply (printed page 15). [View source](#)
- [13] MHCLG, Housing Delivery Test 2025 measurement, published 17 August 2026, Kirklees row. [View source](#)
- [14] H2 timetable, Stotts Coaches operator data via Bus Open Data Service, displayed by bustimes.org. Weekday and Saturday services checked 21 September 2026. [View source](#)