



## Kirklees Local Plan Examination Stage 4 – Hearings

### Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) 3 January 2018

#### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared by WYG on behalf of the Church Commissioners for England (herein referred to as “the Church Commissioners”) who have an interest at Leeds Road, Chidswell. By way of reference, our client’s land is referred to as *Land East of 932-1110 Leeds Road, Shawcross/Woodkirk, Dewsbury* (Allocation Reference MX1905).
- 1.2 The Church Commissioners’ site has been identified to deliver 1,535 dwellings, and 122,500sqm of employment development during the Plan period. They are therefore very keen to engage and assist in the preparation of a sound Local Plan which is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent. This response seeks to address the key issues to be discussed at the forthcoming Kirklees Local Plan Examination Stage 4 - Matter 26: General approach in Part 2 of the Plan
- 1.3 The response is structured such that it follows the questions posed in the Matters and Issues agenda and should be read in conjunction with our response to Matter 34 and earlier representations by WYG on behalf of the Church Commissioners to the Publication Draft Local Plan in December 2016.

#### 2.0 Matter 26: General approach in Part 2 of the Plan

**Issue – Does Part 2 of the Local Plan set out an effective framework for the delivery of allocations and the protection of designation sites, which is robust and in line with national policy?**

**a) Does the inclusion of site allocation wording in text boxes, rather than policies, have implications for the effectiveness and deliverability of Part 2 of the Local Plan?**

We will leave this for the Council to respond to this matter.

**b) Are the infrastructure and open space requirements of each site clearly set out in Part 2 of the Plan? Is it clear what developers are expected to provide and when?**

We will leave this for the Council to respond to this matter in detail. From the Church Commissioners perspective, and with specific regard to allocation MX1905, our response to matter 34e) covers our view on infrastructure requirements.

**c) Are other site constraints and related mitigation measures clearly defined in Part 2 of the Plan? Is there sufficient detail to effectively guide development and make it clear what will be permitted?  
(i-vii)**

Similarly, matter c (i-vii) overlaps with our site-specific response in relation to allocation MX1905, Matter 34 d, e and f in particular. We will not repeat our response in full but generally consider the Plan provides sufficient detail to appropriately assess the level of development allocation MX1905 could deliver and the potential impacts – Allocations and Designations document (SD2). This sets out the indicative housing and employment



capacities with potential constraints, which have been tested by the accompanying concept masterplan and background survey work prepared by the Church Commissioners to support the Local Plan allocation. The background survey work includes, amongst others, topographical survey, transport appraisal, flood risk and drainage, contamination and land stability, extended Phase 1 Habitat survey, and archaeology study and confirms there are no insurmountable issues and the principle of development on this site is suitable, deliverable and achievable. This survey work would be suitably rolled forward and updated to reflect any change in circumstances as planning applications are submitted against the allocation.

It is essential the Plan provides flexibility to respond to any changes in circumstances when the Council are seeking to plan for an 18-year period (2013 to 2031).

**d) Should Part 2 of the Plan specify when Masterplans are required in association with an allocation site? Which sites would this apply to?**

We will leave this for the Council to respond to this matter in detail but note the requirements of Policy PLP 5.

**m) On employment and mixed-use sites, how have the indicative capacity floorspace figures been derived? Has a particular proportion of different B use classes been assumed?**

From the Church Commissioners perspective, and with specific regard to allocation MX1905, our response to matter 34b) covers our view on the employment component and the desire for flexibility when the Council are seeking to plan for an 18-year period (2013 to 2031).