

MATTER 32 – HUDDERSFIELD MIXED-USE ALLOCATIONS

Site MX1930 – land north of Blackmoorfoot Road, Crosland Moor

Issue - Are the proposed mixed use allocations in Huddersfield justified, effective, deliverable and in line with national policy?

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The allocation of Site MX1930 for development is not sound as it is neither justified nor is it consistent with either the emerging Policies in the Local Plan or with national policy guidance.
- 1.2 Paragraph 126 of the NPPF sets out a requirement for Local Plans to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. When considering the impact of a proposed development upon the significance of a designated heritage asset, Paragraph 132 of the NPPF makes it clear that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and explains that significance can be harmed by development within its setting. There are a number of Listed Buildings to the east of this area including the Grade II* Crosland Hall. The loss of this site and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to its significance.
- 1.3 A Heritage Impact Assessment has been produced to ascertain whether or not this site could be developed in a manner consistent with the conservation of this Listed Buildings in its vicinity. This has identified that parts of Site H761 contribute to the setting of Crosland Hall and concludes that their loss and subsequent development would be likely to cause harm to elements which contribute to their significance. However, the Heritage Impact Assessment has not set out clearly or explicitly the locations of these areas or what measures might be necessary to reduce the potential harm which the development of this site might cause to this particular designated heritage asset.
- 1.4 As a result, the extent of the area that is proposed for developed coupled with the lack of any specific measures within the Plan to ensure that any development will take place in a manner consistent with its conservation could

result in a form development which would harm elements which contribute to its significance.

1.5 Consequently, the allocation of Site MX1930 for development as proposed in the Submission Local Plan would be in conflict with the following aspects of the emerging Local Plan:-

- The Spatial Vision – in that it conflicts with the intention that development will take place in a sustainable way (balancing economic, social and environmental priorities), that the local character and distinctiveness of Kirklees and its places will be retained, or that the natural, built and historic environment will be maintained and enhanced through high quality, inclusive design
- Spatial Objective 8 - in that it will not protect or enhance the characteristics of the historic environment
- Policy PLP35 – in that it will not conserve elements which contribute to the significance of a designated heritage asset.

1.6 It would also be contrary to national policy guidance as set out in the NPPF insofar as it would not:-

- Help to deliver a “*positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment*” as is required by NPPF Paragraph 126.
- Contribute to protecting or enhancing the historic environment. Therefore, it will not deliver sustainable development in terms of the conservation of the historic environment [NPPF Paragraph 7].
- Conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. Therefore it will runs contrary to one of the Government’s Core Planning Principles [NPPF Paragraph 17].
- Give great weight to the conservation of the area’s designated heritage assets [NPPF, Paragraph 132]

2 Response to the Inspector's questions

Question e) 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 (LE99) be specified in the Plan?

- 2.1 The Heritage Impact Assessment has provided an excellent summary of the historic development of this area, it has identified the elements which contribute to the significance of the various Listed Buildings in its vicinity and has set out a good evaluation of the contribution which this site makes to their setting. It concludes that the development of this area would be unlikely to impact upon any of the Grade II Listed Buildings. We would concur with that assessment. However, the Heritage Impact Assessment considers that parts of Site MX1930 do contribute to the significance of Crosland Hall and that their development could harm the setting of this building. Again, we would concur with that evaluation.
- 2.2 However, it is unclear precisely how the Heritage Impact Assessment envisages that this harm might be mitigated or which areas should remain undeveloped in order to lessen the adverse effects which residential development might cause to the significance of this Listed Building.
- 2.3 On the basis that the Heritage Impact Assessment has not set out clearly or explicitly what measures would be necessary to reduce the potential harm which the development of this site might cause to Crosland Hall coupled with the lack of any specific measures within the Plan to ensure that any development will take place in a manner consistent with their conservation this allocation is, at present, Unsound.

3 Conclusions

- 3.1 The Heritage Impact Assessment has identified that parts of Site MW1930 contribute to the significance of Crosland Hall - a Grade II* Listed Building. The loss of these areas, therefore, would be likely to result in harm to the significance of this asset. However, it is not clear from the Heritage Impact Assessment how that harm might be effectively mitigated. In terms of NPPF Paragraph 134, this is likely to constitute less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset. Whilst the degree of harm may be less than substantial, nevertheless, it would still be causing harm to a designated heritage

asset. As such, therefore, it would not be delivering sustainable development in terms of protecting and enhancing the historic environment, it would conflict with one of the Government's Core Planning Principles (that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance), nor would it be likely to provide the positive strategy for the conservation of the historic environment that is required for Local Plans.

4 Suggested Change

4.1 It is recommended that:-

- (a) The Heritage Impact Assessment is amended to specifically set out the mitigation measures necessary to ensure that the development of site MX1930 takes place in a manner consistent with the conservation of Crosland Hall
- (b) The Recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment are securely tied into the Local Plan