

GEORGE F. WHITE



SITE H49a: MATTER TWO
MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS
4TH SEPTEMBER 2017

HELEN BOSTON

1.0 **Introduction**

- 1.1 George F. White (Planning and Development) are instructed by Mr John Lund ('the Site Owner'), Site H49a (Land adjacent Brick Hill Farm, Oddfellows Street, Scholes, Cleckheaton) to submit representations to the Kirklees Local Plan; Stage 1 Matters, Issues and Questions, 10 July 2017.
- 1.2 The publication of the plan and the need to accommodate the new homes and jobs, within Kirklees up to 2031, is strongly supported.
- 1.3 In responding to the Matters, Issues and Questions Document, we have considered each of the questions and make representations only to those considered relevant at this time. We would also like to rely on the submissions to date, which for ease of reference has been appended to this submission.
- 1.4 We welcome the opportunity for further engagement and the opportunity to appear at the Examination in Public.
- 1.5 We trust that you will confirm that these representations are duly made and will give due consideration to these comments.
- 1.6 Please do not hesitate to contact us to discuss any issues raised in this Representation further.

2.0 **Matter 2 – Spatial development strategy**

Issue – Does the overall growth and spatial strategy for the Plan present a positive framework which is consistent with national policy and will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development?

Policies PLP 2, 3

3.0 Questions

a) Are the boundaries of the sub-areas, as established in the Place Shaping chapter, appropriately defined?

b) Does the Plan's Vision and Place Shaping Chapter provide a clear framework for the future growth and development of different sub-areas of the borough?

3.1 Yes. It is our opinion that the "Vision" is following the fundamental aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, which is to achieve sustainable development. Kirklees's "Vision" is clear, they have identified within their "Vision" what the issues are within the district and identifies the strategic areas for growth.

3.2 For example the "Vision" refers to the ageing population. Policies PLP 47 and PLP 49 look to support this "Vision".

3.3 It is our opinion that in line with the NPPF, the "Vision" will support development which is sustainable.

c) The Plan seeks to fully meet the objectively assessed employment and housing needs for the district, and proposes an urban focus with some releases of land from the Green Belt. What alternative strategies were appraised, and why were they discounted?

d) Paragraph 2 of the spatial development strategy (page 36 in the Plan) seeks to focus 'most growth' in the main urban areas of Huddersfield and Dewsbury. Is this strategy and distribution clearly defined, justified and sustainable? To what extent will it be achieved?

e) What is the Council's spatial development strategy for other parts of Kirklees? Is the strategy and distribution of growth clearly defined in the Plan and justified? How have place-making principles (an area's character, constraints and opportunities) been balanced against settlement sustainability?

f) Is the proposed allocation of land at Storthes Hall justified and consistent with the Council's spatial development strategy?

g) Does the spatial development strategy in the Plan provide a clear framework in respect of retail and office development?

h) Should the Council's spatial development strategy, as set out on pages 36 and 37 of the Plan, be expressed as a policy?

i) Does Policy PLP 3 provide a clear framework on locational requirements, in line with paragraph 154 in the NPPF? Does the policy give sufficient recognition to the protection of the Green Belt and the countryside? How will the development of brownfield sites be realised early in the Plan, as set out in criterion 2c?

3.4 It is our opinion that Policy PLP 3 has addressed the needs of the whole of the Borough. It identifies and addresses the needs of both the urban and rural areas. It is our opinion that development should not solely be focused on urban areas, it is imperative that the Policy supports and sustains the rural communities.

3.5 Whilst we support Policy PLP3 and believe it will encourage development within both urban and rural areas. We do however consider a settlement hierarchy would clearly set out where exactly development is likely to be supported and the level of the development in that locality. We feel this would aid further in the understanding of this policy.

3.6 Whilst the plan does not give any methods to controlling the proposal as set out in Criterion 2c, it will in our opinion give the LPA the opportunity to manage development in the urban areas, whilst not prejudicing development in the rural areas, which are less likely to have abundance on Brownfield Sites.

3.7 We are pleased to see that the policy has demonstrated that development within urban areas will not be at the expense of rural areas.

j) What effect will the Plan's growth and spatial development strategy have on air quality and carbon emissions?

4.0 **Conclusion**

- 4.1 Whilst the Local Plan will be examined by the Inspector, who will ultimately conclude whether the plan has been prepared with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements and sound. We are satisfied that the Plan the Inspector is being asked to consider is positively prepared and justified, effective and consistent.

GEORGE F. WHITE

www.georgefwhite.co.uk



Alnwick	t 01665 603231
Wolsingham	t 01388 527966
Barnard Castle	t 01833 690390
Bedale	t 01677 425301
Shiptonthorpe	t 01430 876010
Duns	t 01361 883488

AGRICULTURE RESIDENTIAL COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT ENERGY ENVIRONMENTAL