

Kirklees Local Plan Examination

Stage 4 hearings Other Site Allocations

DEWSBURY AND MIRFIELD SUB-AREA (Matters 34-36)

MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS (MIOs)

3 January 2018

Inspector – Ms Katie Child BSc. (Hons) MA MRTPI

Programme Officer – Yvonne Parker tel. 07813 334305 / 01282 450522
9A Priory Court, Burnley BB11 3RH
Email: yvonne.parker@kirklees.gov.uk

Introductory Notes

The Stage 4 hearing sessions are due to commence on **Tuesday 20th February 2018**. The matters, issues and questions (MIOs) in this document will form part of the discussion at the hearings (with MIOs on other sub-areas and general matters)

Prior to this, hearing statements on the MIOs are invited from representors. Hearing statements should:

- Be prepared separately on each site. (or site groups where specifically linked)
- Be as short as possible.
- Indicate whether any changes are needed to make the Plan sound.
- **Please put the SITE NUMBER and MATTER NUMBER on each statement.**
Failure to do so may result in your statements being returned.

An electronic version and three paper copies of each hearing statement should be submitted to the Programme Officer and received by:

- **email – Thursday 25th Jan 2018 (by 6pm) (please email each statement separately and with the Site and Matter number in the title)**
- **post - Friday 26th Jan 2018 (by 1pm) to the above address (please mark the Site and Matter numbers on the envelope)**

For further details see the *Examination Guidance Note* and *Hearings Programme* on the Council's website at <http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-policy/local-plan.aspx>. Please note that hearings statements are optional, and you may wish to rely on previous submissions.

If you wish to appear at the hearing sessions and take an active part in discussions please confirm your attendance with the Programme Officer by **9th January 2018**. Please note only those who have previously made representations relevant to the matters being discussed and are seeking to change the Plan have a right to participate at the hearing sessions. However, the sessions are open for anyone to observe.

Matter 34 – Dewsbury and Mirfield¹ housing and mixed use allocations: Green Belt releases

Issue - Are the proposed Green Belt release housing and mixed-use allocations in the Dewsbury and Mirfield Sub-Area justified, effective, developable/deliverable and in line with national policy?

H307 – land to the east of Long Lane, Earlsheaton (15 dwellings)

- a) Does the proposal provide appropriate mitigation against flood risk?
- b) Does the proposal provide sufficient clarity on how biodiversity constraints will be effectively mitigated?
- c) Is the site available and deliverable in the timescale set out in the Council's housing trajectory²?
- d) 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? If so, what are they?

H559 – land to the east of Leeds Road, Chidswell (279 dwellings)

- a) How will access to site MX1905 be facilitated? What effect will this have on scheme phasing? Is proposed modification ADMM23 necessary for soundness reasons?
- b) How were the site boundaries determined?
- c) The housing trajectory indicates that 150 dwellings will come forward within five years, with the first units delivered in 2020/21. What preparatory work has been undertaken and when is a planning application anticipated? Are the estimated delivery timescales reasonable and justified? Are there phasing implications arising from impacts on the Strategic Road Network?
- d) What effect would the proposed boundary change and allocation have on the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it? In particular, how would the existing gap between Dewsbury and Gawthorpe be affected? Are there exceptional circumstances that justify altering the Green Belt? If so, what are they?

H661a - land to the east of High Street, Batley (61 dwellings)

- a) Has the impact of the proposal on the historic environment been adequately assessed and appropriate mitigation measures put in place?
- b) Is the site available and deliverable in the timescale set out in the Council's housing trajectory?

¹ Dewsbury and Mirfield Sub-Area, but including site MX1905 which is located in the Batley and Spen Sub-Area, and excluding site H2576 which is incorporated in the Kirklees Rural section of the MIQs.

² As set out in the Council's updated Housing Supply Topic Paper (December 2017) (EX30.2).

- c) 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? If so, what are they?

H46 – land to the south-west of Dewsbury Rams RLFC, Owl Lane, Shaw Cross (206 dwellings)

- a) 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? If so, what are they?

H2089 – land south of Ravensthorpe Road / Lees Hall Road, Dewsbury (2,310 dwellings within the Plan period, 1,690 dwellings beyond the Plan period)

- a) The Access Statement Technical Note (SS14) identifies a need for four access points into the site. What is the estimated dwelling capacity that could be served from each of these points? How is this capacity reflected in the phasing plan and housing trajectory? Has necessary third party land been secured?
- b) The Technical Note and Delivery Framework identify the need for strategic highway intervention at about the 2000th dwelling, with one solution being the provision of a new bridge and strategic highway through the site.
- i. How would the new strategic road link into the scheme, and has a potential route been incorporated into the masterplanning work?
 - ii. How would the strategic road link be funded, and what effect would it have on the viability of the development scheme?
 - iii. Are other potential options being investigated?
- c) At what stage would improvements to Ravensthorpe station be required? What would these improvements involve and how would they be delivered/funded?
- d) Should the proposal clearly specify the number/location of access points required and highways/transport infrastructure requirements?
- e) Does the Plan provide sufficient detail on other infrastructure requirements, including education, open space, allotments and provision of a Local Centre? Should the Plan specify the amount of land required for the provision of such facilities, along with details of timing/phasing? How and at what stage will provision be made for early years/childcare and secondary education facilities? What size/form of Local Centre was factored into the Viability Assessment?
- f) Should the proposal provide clearer detail on mitigation required in association with biodiversity, including the retention of existing habitats? Has ecological and arboricultural survey work been completed?
- g) Why does the Masterplan show residential development in southern sections of the site which are identified in the Landscape Framework Plan as 'areas of development stand-off' which are important for visual reasons?
- h) Have constraints relating to air quality, noise, contamination and land stability been satisfactorily investigated and addressed? Are related mitigation measures and

requirements clearly expressed in the Plan? How have these constraints and measures impacted on the viability of the scheme?

- i) Is the indicative site capacity justified, having regard to landscape, environmental and other constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure? How many dwellings are likely to be accommodated on land that is currently not within the Green Belt, both within the Plan period and over the whole development period? How many hectares will be required for development up to 2031 (2,310 houses)?
- j) The housing trajectory indicates that 710 dwellings will come forward within five years, with the first units delivered in 2018/19. Are the estimated delivery timescales reasonable and justified?

[the Council is requested to provide a detailed delivery programme which sets out phasing information relating to different parts of the sites and timings of key stages, including preparatory work, marketing/appointment of housebuilders/development companies, EIA work if necessary, Section 106 work, other legal and contract work, preparation of outline/full/other applications, planning application determination, discharge of conditions, site preparation, commencement of development. Anticipated timings of key infrastructure delivery should be provided as part of this programme.]

- k) What effect would the proposed boundary change and allocation have on the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it? In particular, how would the existing gap between Dewsbury and Thornhill be affected? Are there exceptional circumstances that justify altering the Green Belt? Is there evidence to demonstrate that the section of the site likely to come forward beyond 2031 would be justified and needed to meet housing requirements in the longer term?

H40 – land south-west of Sheep Ings Farm, Granny Lane, Mirfield (74 dwellings)

- a) Has the impact of the proposal on heritage assets been adequately assessed and addressed? Should protection and mitigation measures linked to the Heritage Impact Assessment (LE67) be specified in the Plan?
- b) Is the site available and deliverable in the timescale set out in the Council's housing trajectory?
- c) 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? If so, what are they?

H205 – land to the east of Slipper Lane, Mirfield (21 dwellings)

- a) What is the relationship between site H205 and MX1929 (see section below)? Should they be combined in a single text box/policy and a joint Masterplan required?

- b) Is the site available and deliverable in the timescale set out in the Council's housing trajectory?
- c) 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? If so, what are they?

H333 – land to the east of Northorpe Lane, Mirfield (48 dwellings)

- a) Is the site available and deliverable in the timescale set out in the Council's housing trajectory?
- b) 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? If so, what are they?

MX1905 – land east of 932-1110 Leeds Road, Shaw Cross/Woodkirk, Dewsbury (1,535 dwellings and 122,500 m2 employment)

MX3394 – Lees House Farm, Leeds Road, Dewsbury (38 dwellings and 3,816 m2 employment)

- a) What is the relationship between sites MX1905 and MX3394? Is access between the sites achievable given the Public Rights of Way along the south-eastern and northern boundaries of MX3394?
- b) How was the proposed mix of uses and the amount of dwellings/employment floorspace determined? Is there evidence that this mix is viable and deliverable? Should the Plan provide clearer details regarding the type/form of employment floorspace anticipated on MX1905, as set out in Table 3.2 of Interim Transport Assessment Scoping Note 2016 (SS13)?
- c) How does allocation MX1905 fit with the Leeds City Region Strategic Economic Plan and the Kirklees Economic Strategy?
- d) Should the Plan clearly specify the number/location of access points required and highways/transport infrastructure requirements? Has the necessary third party land been secured for access solutions to MX1905?
- e) Does the Plan provide sufficient detail on other infrastructure requirements for site MX1905, including education, open space, other recreation facilities and the provision of a Local Centre? Should the Plan specify the amount of land required for the provision of facilities, along with details of timing/phasing? How and at what stage will provision be made for early years/childcare and secondary education facilities?
- f) Should the proposal provide clearer detail on mitigation required in association with biodiversity and landscaping on site MX1905, including the retention of existing woodland habitats? Has ecological and arboricultural survey work been completed?

- g) Have constraints for site MX1905 relating to air quality, flood risk, drainage, noise, odour, contamination and land stability been satisfactorily investigated and addressed? Are related mitigation measures and requirements clearly expressed in the Plan? How have these constraints/measures impacted on the viability of the scheme?
- h) The housing trajectory indicates that 355 dwellings will come forward within five years, with the first units delivered in 2019/20. To date no planning application has been submitted. Are the estimated delivery timescales reasonable and justified?

[the Council is requested to provide a detailed delivery programme which sets out phasing information relating to different parts of the sites and timings of key stages, including preparatory work, marketing/appointment of housebuilders/development companies, EIA work if necessary, Section 106 work, other legal and contract work, preparation of outline/full/other applications, planning application determination, discharge of conditions, site preparation, commencement of development. Anticipated timings of key infrastructure delivery should be provided as part of this programme.]

- i) What effect would the proposed boundary changes and allocations have on the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it? In particular, how would the existing gap between Dewsbury and settlements within Wakefield be affected? Are there exceptional circumstances that justify altering the Green Belt? If so, what are they?

Matter 35 – Dewsbury and Mirfield employment, housing and mixed use allocations: urban sites (non-Green Belt)

Issue – Are the proposed employment, housing and mixed-use allocations in the urban areas of Dewsbury/Mirfield justified, effective, developable/deliverable and in line with national policy?

- E1899 - land to the north and east of 1-3 Greaves Road, Dewsbury (2,367 m²)
- E1879 – land south of Tilcon Coal Yard, Bretton Street, Dewsbury (2,904 m²)
- H367 – Magma Ceramics. Preston Street, Earlsheaton, Dewsbury (40 dwellings)
- H813 – land to the west of School Street, Chickenley, Dewsbury (49 dwellings)
- H1937 – Cliffe Street, Dewsbury (47 dwellings)
- H2148 – Providence Street, Earlsheaton, Dewsbury (30 dwellings)
- H776 – land between Oxford Road and Reservoir Street, Dewsbury (26 dwellings)
- H778 – land off Huddersfield Road, Dewsbury (11 dwellings)
- H1664 – Red Laites Court, Ravensthorpe, Dewsbury (15 dwellings)
- H85 – land north of 10 Kimberley Street, Thornhill Lees, Dewsbury (22 dwellings)
- H95 – land east of The Combs, Hall Lane, Thornhill, Dewsbury (18 dwellings)
- H192 – Headfield Mills, Savile Road, Savile Town, Dewsbury (35 dwellings)
- H269 – land north-west of Forge Lane, Thornhill Lees, Dewsbury (93 dwellings)
- H1754 – land off Smithy Parade, Dewsbury (21 dwellings)
- H1660 – land east of Heckmondwicke Road, Dewsbury Moor (62 dwellings)
- H2646 – Lock Street, Thornhill, Dewsbury (104 dwellings)
- H3379 – land north of Hall Lane, Thornhill, Dewsbury (38 dwellings)
- H197 – former allotments, Leeds Road, Mirfield (22 dwellings)
- H794 – Flash Lane, Mirfield (60 dwellings)
- MX1929 – land at Slipper Lane, Mirfield (166 dwellings and 17,234 m²)

The following general questions apply to each of the above sites. Additional site-specific questions are set out in the sections below.

General

- a) Is the site suitable for the proposed use? Does the Plan provide clear guidance on requirements and constraints, and seek appropriate mitigation measures?
- b) Is the indicative site capacity appropriate, taking account of constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure? For mixed-use schemes, how was the mix/proportion of uses determined?
- c) Is the site available and deliverable in the timescales envisaged?³

E1879 – land south of Tilcon Coal Yard, Bretton Street, Dewsbury

- i) Has the impact of the proposal on heritage assets been adequately assessed and addressed?

³ For dwellings, as set out in the Council's housing trajectory.

H2148 – Providence Street, Earlsheaton, Dewsbury

- i) Has the impact of the proposal on heritage assets been adequately assessed and addressed?

H95 – land east of The Combs, Hall Lane, Thornhill, Dewsbury

H3379 – land north of Hall Lane, Thornhill, Dewsbury

- i) Have the impact of the proposals on heritage assets been adequately assessed and addressed? Should protection and mitigation measures linked to the Heritage Impact Assessment (LE69) be specified in the Plan?
- ii) What is the relationship between sites H95 and H3379? Is there a need for the sites to be comprehensively planned?

H269 – land north-west of Forge Lane, Thornhill Lees, Dewsbury

- i) Is the proposal in line with paragraph 74 in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)?
- ii) Has the impact of the proposal on heritage assets been adequately assessed and addressed?

H1660 – land east of Heckmondwike Road, Dewsbury Moor

- i) Is the proposal in line with paragraph 74 in the NPPF?

Matter 36 – Dewsbury and Mirfield safeguarded land

Issue - Are the proposed safeguarded land allocations in Dewsbury and Mirfield justified, effective and in line with national policy?

- SL2168 – south of Tolston Street, Chickenley, Dewsbury
- SL2273 – south of junction of Leeds Road and Sugar Lane, Dewsbury
- SL2201 – north of 42-90 Ravensthorpe Road, Thornhill Lees, Dewsbury
- SL2198 – land west of 241-299 Heckmondwike Road, Dewsbury Moor
- SL2302 – north of Sutcliffe Memorial Ground, Jackroyd Lane, Mirfield
- SL2171 – west of 27-75 Greenside Road, Mirfield
- SL2163 – Balderstone Hall Lane, Mirfield

The following two questions apply to each of the above sites:

- a) Are identified access/other constraints i) capable of being resolved, and ii) unlikely to be resolved until 2031 or beyond?
- b) Is the site available for development, and is there evidence of an active landowner/developer who is seeking to bring forward the site?