

Written Statement – Matter 44

Kirklees Local Plan

Holme Valley South Allocations

On behalf of Taylor Wimpey

30 January 2018



I. Introduction

- 1.1. This is a Written Hearing Statement prepared by Spawforths on behalf of Taylor Wimpey in respect of:
- Matter 44: Holme Valley South Allocations
- 1.2. Taylor Wimpey has significant land interests in the area and has made representations to earlier stages of the Local Plan process.
- 1.3. The Inspector's Issues and Questions are included in bold for ease of reference. The following responses should be read in conjunction with Taylor Wimpey's comments upon the submission version of the Kirklees Local Plan, dated December 2016 and to previous Matters and Issues at this Examination in Public.
- 1.4. Taylor Wimpey submits this statement for consideration as part of this matter in written form only, but reserves the right to seek appearance at the respective Hearing session should a need arise.

2. Holme Valley South Allocations

a) Is the site suitable for the proposed use? In the case of employment, housing and mixed-use allocations, does the Plan provide clear guidance on requirements and constraints, and seek appropriate mitigation measures?

- 2.1 Taylor Wimpey is concerned that the distribution of housing allocations in the Holme Valley South part of the Kirklees Rural sub-area is allocating sites in a range of very small settlements including land currently identified as Green Belt and Provisional Open Land (POL).
- 2.2 Housing sites have been identified in Holmbridge, Hade Edge, Scholes, Netherthong, Uppertonhong and Thongsbridge, as well as Thurstonland (dealt with at Matter 45).
- 2.3 Considering each settlement individually and with reference to the Council's Additional Evidence Document of December 2017 (EX38):
- 2.4 **Holmbridge** is identified as a settlement with the second lowest score in the sub-area for accessibility. It has a population of 1,198. Yet the settlement has been allocated two sites totalling some 42 units, one of which is greenfield.
- 2.5 **Hade Edge** has a population of just 440, but has been allocated 66 housing units. It is appreciated that this site is currently being developed. Nevertheless, this scheme represents a potential uplift in population of nearly 140 based on 2.1 people per dwelling average. This would mean that the village would grow by a third. EX38 indicates that the village has the lowest accessibility score in the district.
- 2.6 At **Scholes**, the population of 1,527 will be increased by nearly 400 or by about a quarter through two housing allocations. One of the allocations already has planning permission for circa 40 dwellings. Nevertheless, the settlement has a low accessibility score and is taking 5% of the growth in the Kirklees Rural sub-area.
- 2.7 **Netherthong** again has a very low accessibility score and a population of 1,646. It has three allocations for housing all of which fall on UDP Provisional Open Land allocations.
- 2.8 At **Uppertonhong**, the village has a very low accessibility score and a population of just 953. It is acknowledged that what was land allocated as Provisional Open Land is now under construction.

- 2.9 At **Thongsbridge**, a settlement of just 1,317 sees allocations of 173 units on three sites including Green Belt land. This would mean an additional c.360 population again, a huge 25% growth on existing.
- 2.10 Taylor Wimpey is unclear as to why so many of these sites are being identified in these settlements, and yet a deliverable site at Penistone Road, Shelley has been rejected and indeed, there are no allocations proposed in that settlement.
- 2.11 Shelley is sustainable and has a number of facilities that serve it including primary school, public houses, and shops. It is connected by a range of means of transport with bus connections to Denby Dale and Huddersfield. According to the Council's Additional Evidence Document of December 2017 (EX38), the settlement is of a decent size (population 2,737) as compared to other villages in the rural sub-area.
- 2.12 The site at Penistone Road, Shelley provides an accessible, deliverable housing opportunity to deliver growth for the settlement. It is available now. The site at Penistone Road should be considered for allocation, as there are no housing allocations in Shelley proposed in the Local Plan. A Plan is provided of the site at Appendix A.

Proposed Change

- 2.13 To overcome the objection and address soundness matters, the following changes are proposed:
- Review the allocation of sites in smaller settlements
 - Review the approach to Green Belt review and safeguarded sites to accord with national guidance
 - Remove the site at Penistone Road, Shelley from the Green Belt (H169/H2731)
 - Allocate further safeguarded sites

b) Is the indicative site capacity appropriate, taking account of constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure? For mixed-use sites - how was the mix/proportion of uses determined?

2.14 As indicated above, Taylor Wimpey are concerned about the amount of units that are being identified in smaller settlements ahead of certain larger ones. That capacity should be directed elsewhere.

c) Is the site available and deliverable in the timescales envisaged?

2.15 Taylor Wimpey do not wish to comment in this regard.

d) For sites currently in the Green Belt - what effect would the proposed boundary change and allocation have on the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it? Are there exceptional circumstances that justify altering the Green Belt?

2.16 Taylor Wimpey do not have a particular view but query why certain sites in Green Belt on the edge of smaller settlements should be considered ahead of allocations in certain larger settlements.

2.17 Taylor Wimpey have previously advocated Green Belt Review and change in Shelley and have identified the appropriate aforementioned housing allocation at Penistone Road, identified above.

3. Appendix I: Penistone Road, Shelley



