Fao. Joanna Rednall
Planning and Development
K.M. C.

30 October 2026

Hello,

Proposed change of use, conversion and alteration of an existing redundant water pumping station into short-stay visitor accommodation, together with associated internal and external alterations

At

The water tower, Green Side Road, Thurstonland, Huddersfield HD4 6XA .
Application reference 2026/92537/El

I am acting on behalf of a number of local residents in respect of their objection to the above application.
I would stress at the onset that there is no objection to the change of use as such.

However, the works proposed to the building itself, the impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the visual impact of the works themselves are such that permission should be refused.
I deal with each issue in turn.

ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE APPEARANCE OF THE BUILDING

1.1 The redundant water tower is an isolated, fairly modest building set in broad open countryside. It is neither listed nor is it in a conservation area.

Its unusual overall design is restrained by its red brick and brown render finish.

CURRENT APPROVAL

1.2 It is noted that the Council saw fit to grant planning permission for replacement of the concrete flat roof with a new pitched/hipped roof on 11th August 2026 (2026/91469) subject inter alia, to

condition 3 that the roof tiles shall be either natural stone, slate or roof tiles of a dark grey colour finish.

1.3 The reason for the condition was in the interests of visual amenity and to preserve the openness of the Green Belt to accordance with policies LP24 and LP 57 of the Kirklees local plan and policies contained in chapter 12 and 13 of the NPPF.

1.4 Policy LP24 states that "Good design should be at the core of all proposals in the district…"

1.5 "Proposals should promote good design by ensuring: a) The form, scale, layout and details of all development respects and ENHANCES (my emphasis) the character of … the landscape."

1.6 Policy LP57 of the local plan includes that, "proposals for the alteration of buildings in the Green Belt will normally be acceptable provided that 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."

1.7 It is noted that the Officers Report on that application includes that, "the proposed Marley Modern tiles are considered appropriate to the character of the existing building and would not materially detract from the rural character of the Green Belt and notes "… the use of materials that are sympathetic to the existing buildings". As such, the proposal would not appear usually intensive or harmful to the character and appearance.

<u>THE CURRENT APPLICATION</u>

It is acknowledged that the approval by the Council of the formation of a pitched/hipped roof is a material consideration. As such it is accepted that the principle of a similar roof of similar height as now proposed is established.

1.9 However, what is not considered acceptable is the change in the choice of external materials to a glass base, red zinc cladding and a polished steel top, which the agent refers to in the planning Supporting Statement as "…contemporary interventions that are both functional and visually appropriate to the existing structure".

1.10 My client's view is that such a roof treatment is an inappropriate and unacceptable addition detracting from the existing restrained exterior of the building.

1.11 Such inappropriateness will be further emphasised by the proposed change from a brown to a white render of the exterior walling which comprises the majority of the exterior finish.

1.12 The view is taken that these changes, far from being visually appropriate to the existing structure as claimed, will result in an inappropriate intrusion into the broad landscape setting, appearing more akin to an imitation lighthouse at the end of a seaside pier rather than a sensitive conversion of a historic structure, especially so when sunlight is reflected towards Green Side Road from the polished steel apex of the new roof.

1.13 Cited at paragraphs 1.3 to 1.7 to this objection letter are policies particularly relevant in respect of the approved application to change the roof design.

1.14 These local plan policy considerations are equally important in the determination of this current application. As such it is considered that the only logical decision is to refuse it because of its conflict with those policies especially in respect of

-Failing to enhance the character of the landscape (policy LP24):and

-Materially detracting from the Green Belt setting (policy LP57).

1.15 NPPF I now deal with the issue of the appearance of the proposals in the revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework issued in August 2026.

1.16 Chapter 14 sets out policies to achieve well-designed places. Policy DP3 sets out that a key principle is set out at paragraph 1 that development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting) so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings '…such that through … the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, re use and integration of heritage assets'. The proposals clearly do not achieve this.

1.17 Paragraph 3 states that 'Development proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with paragraph 1 of this policy …' That is the case here.

2.0 ADVERSE IMPACT ON THE GREEN BELT

2.1 It is interesting to note that the description of the current application fails to acknowledge the external works proposed to give access to and serve the proposed development.

2.2 The works are shown on the submitted Site Plan A1L and Block Plan A3L and described at page 10 of the Planning supporting statement.

2.3 The existing entrance to the field which is to be used as access comprises a dirt track accessed through an opening between stone boundary walls. The proposed route to the water tower will be formed with a grass reinforced grid system instead of merely using the edge of the field, a part of the proposals to which no objection is raised.

2.4 However, objection is raised because of the cumulative impact of other works proposed comprising a dedicated parking area for visitors, vehicle and pedestrian gates, a storage area for luggage carts, an electrical charging station and a vehicle turning space all at the site entrance.

2.5 It is considered that these works at a conspicuous position alongside Green Side Road will undoubtedly have an adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt in this otherwise open, rural landscape.

2.6 One of the objectives of Green Belt policy as set out in the NPPF is set at GB2-to 'assist in safeguarding the countryside from development'.

2.7 Local Plan Policy LP56 requires that the openness of the Green Belt is preserved and that '…the facility is unobtrusively located and designed so as not introduce a prominent urban element into a countryside location, including the impact of any new or improved access and car parking areas':

2.8 It is concluded that the access arrangements and facilities at the entrance will have a material and adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt and for that reason should also be refused.

3.0 ADVERSE IMPACT ON VISUAL AMENITY

3.1 Local Plan Policy (LP24) requires that proposals should promote good design by ensuring 'a) the form, scale layout and details of all development respects and enhances the character of the … landscape'.

3.2 The setting for the proposals is an open rural landscape centred on an existing dirt track opening.

3.3 The proposals at the site entrance adjacent to Green Side Road will introduce an alien, visually intrusive element which is inappropriate in its setting. For that reason, the proposal should also be refused for its conflict with local plan policy.

4.0 CONCLUSION

4.1 It is considered that though there is merit in bringing back the water tower into use, the negative impacts such that they outweigh the advantages. As such the application should be refused.