

CPRE welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Kirklees Draft Local Plan.

The format of our response is intended to keep our comments as brief and succinct as possible, in order to maintain focus on the key issues that concern us. Therefore, where we have objected to a particular policy, we have not attempted to exhaustively identify all the other policies and sites that this would affect.

### Summary

- 1) The draft Local Plan lacks a compelling urban, sustainable vision, which could be assisted by:
  - ! Taking a pro-active approach to brownfield development, particularly identifying areas of search for windfall sites;
  - ! Clearly segmenting the housing requirement by the types and tenures of housing that are needed, and indicating which types and tenures will be prioritised in which locations;
  - ! Increasing the minimum residential density requirements to a level that can support walkable neighbourhoods with viable shops, services and public transport;
  - ! Taking a strategic approach to the amount and locations of new green space to which new development is expected to contribute.
- 2) The consultation document does not genuinely present credible options for most of the policies. In most instances, the alternatives are presented dismissively in the format 'more prescriptive or less prescriptive' without meaningful evidence to justify the preferred option. This makes it impossible to determine, as a consultee, whether real alternatives have been considered and what their merits might be.
- 3) The housing requirement is not realistically achievable, and we have demonstrated that a lower figure would still provide for a very significant boost in housing supply without requiring allocation of the sites to which we object. Indeed, with a better approach to residential density, we believe the land take of the plan for new housing could be halved, enabling a much better focus on the most sustainable locations.
- 4) Proposed minerals allocations cannot be supported without substantial further evidence.

**Detailed Comments**

<p>Spatial Development Strategy</p>	<p>Broadly support.</p> <p>The document should also detail how the monitoring and phased release of site allocations will be used to implement the settlement hierarchy, and thereby deliver the spatial objectives. Put simply, if sites in all locations are made equally available for development to meet land supply, then there is a strong risk that sites in lower order settlements and on greenfield, peripheral sites will be developed ahead of sites in urban areas. This will undermine the recycling of brownfield sites and will also skew the spatial emphasis of the Plan compared to what is envisaged in the Spatial Development Strategy.</p>
<p>DLP 4</p>	<p>Support.</p> <p>Masterplanning of sites is very important and we welcome this policy.</p> <p>Masterplans should also indicate the density, or mix of densities, that are considered appropriate to the locality.</p>
<p>DLP 5</p>	<p>Support.</p> <p>We support the clarity of this policy in making clear that safeguarded sites should not be brought forward for development during the plan period. Given that a number of existing safeguarded sites have recently been given planning permission for development, it is important to ensure that development control policies are strong enough to avoid that risk.</p> <p>Considering that sites chosen for safeguarding are generally more peripheral - and therefore less sustainable - as development locations compared to allocated housing sites, the policy justification should also make clear that development of safeguarded sites while existing allocated sites remain available should be considered to be unsustainable and not consistent with Policy DLP1.</p>
<p>DLP6</p>	<p>Object.</p> <p>Efficient and effective use of land and buildings is of paramount importance, and this policy is inadequate in that regard.</p> <p>We support the first paragraph, but the second paragraph provides weak and unsustainable position on housing density. There is ample evidence that net densities of 45-60dpha are the minimum that will sustain viable public transport services and other amenities, and create walkable neighbourhoods that contribute to good public health. Therefore net densities below 45dpha will generally be unsustainable, even if they are accessibly located. Furthermore, in many settlements where recent developments have lowered the average density there is a need to</p>

	<p>develop at higher densities to raise the average, in order to make the settlement more sustainable; and higher densities also correspond to the need for smaller, more accessible dwellings that better meet the needs of smaller and older households.</p> <p>Many people understandably worry that higher densities produce crowded local environments and create traffic and parking problems. Our view is that these problems can almost always be resolved by good design.</p> <p>The policy sets 30dpha as a minimum, and the vast majority of the sites to which we have objected are at 30dpha. In our view, this is woefully inadequate, and if those sites are not deemed suitable for densities of 45dpha or more then they should not be allocated in any case.</p>
DLP7	<p>Object.</p> <p>We fully support the principle of Kirklees having a strong place-shaping agenda, but this policy and its supporting material merely identify existing characteristics of the sub-areas, without giving any sense of how they are to be enhanced as places through specific planning interventions. As such, this is a non-policy that will not be implemented.</p> <p>For each sub-area, the lists of strengths/opportunities and challenges should be transformed into a set of clear actions, with planning policies attached. This would then give some confidence to developers and communities as to the types and locations of built development and open space/public realm interventions that are expected for each sub-area.</p>
Section 7.1	<p>Object: not justified by the evidence.</p> <p>Please refer to our Appendix 1 for further detail on this matter. The housing target is not deliverable and sets up a land supply scenario that will simply shift development away from areas in need of regeneration, towards greenfield and Green Belt sites. Evidence of delivery rates that can be realistically achieved has not been given adequate consideration, and a numerical pursuit of objectively assessed need will compromise the genuine delivery of sustainable housing.</p>
Table 5 (para 7.19)	<p>Object: not consistent with the Spatial Development Strategy</p> <p>This proposed distribution is significantly weighted towards Kirklees Rural and does not adequately reflect the emphasis on Huddersfield and the other main towns. The district's settlement pattern hinges around the towns of Huddersfield, Dewsbury and Batley, which is also where we would expect to see higher densities. This in turn would reduce the allocation for Kirklees Rural.</p>
7.24	<p>Object: Not effective</p> <p>This is not a housing trajectory. No evidence is provided here of how</p>

	<p>completions are envisaged to accelerate in order to deliver the strategy. There is ample national evidence of a large surplus of planning permissions, not resulting in any marked increase in completions. The extraordinary gap between the number of completions in 2013/14 and the number of permissions in 2014/15 simply serves to highlight the risk to the plan arising from a surplus of permissions, in particular the triggering of ‘persistent under-delivery’ as per para 7.26; and there is no indication of how quickly permissions will be brought forward on the remaining allocations. It is plain to see that completions need to rise rapidly and consistently compared to the 2013/14 figure if the Local Plan requirement is to be met; and there is no market evidence to suggest this is possible.</p>
7.28	<p>Object: Not effective</p> <p>These are all activities that should be taking place all the time and should not be predicated on absence of a five-year supply. The activities should also be specifically focused on bringing forward previously developed sites.</p>
Option Housing Strategy 7.1.1	<p>In the sense that we have proposed a lower housing requirement, we support this option.</p> <p>More specifically, the Plan is not required to allocate all the land to meet its housing requirement. Rather it must allocate sufficient sites to provide a 5-year supply plus the relevant buffer, and identify broad locations for development beyond that time. Taking such an approach would be beneficial in terms of increasing the potential contribution of windfall sites to the land supply. Therefore we propose that the Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>! Allocates sufficient sites for 6 year’s supply (phase 1);</li> <li>! Identifies broad locations for later development (phase 2) including areas of search for windfall sites consistent with the Spatial Development Strategy;</li> <li>! Sets out the process by which windfall sites and other brownfield sites not currently available will be sought out and brought forward for development;</li> <li>! Identifies safeguarded locations (phase 3) where residual development needs can be met if insufficient sites are found in phase 2.</li> </ul>
DLP11	<p>Object: Not effective or justified by the evidence</p> <p>Historically only 5% to 15% of annual completions in Kirklees have been in affordable sectors, so it is hard to see how the 20% requirement will be implemented. NPPG requires that Council’s seek to meet their OAN for both market and affordable housing, and the crucial issue is</p>

	<p>therefore that to meet market housing need but not affordable need would be contrary to national guidance.</p> <p>This policy is not robust enough to produce any meaningful increase in the supply of affordable homes. In our view, the granting of permissions for open market housing should be predicated on the rate of completions of affordable housing, to ensure that land supply is not used up without adequate delivery of affordables.</p> <p>There is also nothing in this policy to secure a mix of housing types and tenures that is relevant to the needs of the households identified in the SHMA as accounting for much of the housing growth - namely older people and those on lower household incomes. Whilst the wording of the policy recognises these needs to a degree there is no meaningful implementation mechanism, and the reality is that new housebuilding will be dominated by 3 bedroomed open market dwellings at higher price points. Consequently planning permissions will be granted and sites will be developed, but the specific needs of those who require housing will remain unmet.</p> <p>For these reasons, the Plan should break down the housing requirement by type and tenure, and ensure that the right proportions of each are being delivered.</p> <p>None of the policy options for DLP11 are adequate in this regard.</p>
DLP 25	<p>Object: Not effective</p> <p>Good design is crucially important to all development and we support the principles outlined in this policy. However, the words “...where applicable. Where appropriate and in agreement with the developer...” opens up a huge loophole that means this policy is very weak in its ability to be implemented. In practice it will depend mainly on the attitude of the developer as to whether or not good design is achieved. These words should therefore be deleted.</p>
DLP 31	<p>Object: May not be legally compliant in relation to Habitats Regulations</p> <p>As the Council may be aware, the issue of avoidance and mitigation of impacts on the South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC has been a major reason for proposed main modifications to the Bradford Core Strategy. In particular, MM28 of that Strategy establishes an up-to-date zoning approach that is deemed to be compliant with the Habitats Regulations.</p> <p>By contrast, DLP31 is generalised and only makes passing reference to the Habitats Directive. Considering the importance of the South Pennine Moors to the biodiversity and landscape assets of Kirklees, we do not consider this to be a robust approach, and suggest that a more prescriptive policy be added along the lines of Bradford’s MM28. We</p>

	<p>have supplied a pdf copy of MM28 for your reference.</p>
DLP 32	<p>Support, with a site-specific objection to SGI2115</p> <p>CPRE strongly supports the principle of Green Infrastructure Networks, and we welcome this policy, which is clear, unequivocal and implementable.</p> <p>It is especially important that opportunities arising from previously developed sites and mineral restoration sites are harnessed for their Green Infrastructure potential.</p> <p>We note that possible proposals for a recreational Country Park at Farnley Tyas have not been referred to in the policy, but do feature as Strategic Green Infrastructure on the Proposals Map as SG12115. The Council will be well aware that the Farnley Tyas proposals include a substantial element of residential development, and we support the Council's position, inferred from DLP 32, that such a scheme would not be appropriate. Simply, if the proposals require significant residential development in the Green Belt and not contiguous to existing built-up areas, then that development is inappropriate. Identifying a strategic green infrastructure initiative whose implementation is dependent on an inappropriate development in the Green Belt would clearly conflict with other local plan policies - so DLP 32 would rightly prevent it. In the light of this we would argue against including SGI2115 as Strategic Green Infrastructure on the proposals map, as it creates a possible conflict with DLP 32. In any case, being distinctly separate from urban areas it does not appear qualify as a multi-functional, connected greenspace in the way that other proposed SGI sites do.</p>
DLP 37	<p>Object: Inconsistency with proposed sites, not effective</p> <p>The policy itself appears comprehensive and worthy of support. However, we are deeply concerned that the significant number of proposed new minerals sites in the draft Plan conflict with this policy, meaning that the sites may not be workable without contravening the policy.</p> <p>Considering the timescales over which mineral extractions operate, it is often the case that restoration programmes may not be implemented for more than a generation. It is especially unclear from the proposed site allocations what timescales, intensity and phasing of workings is anticipated; and without this information it is not possible to comment meaningfully on the proposed sites.</p> <p>In the absence of more detailed information we have no option but to object to all the significant new minerals sites in the Plan. DLP 37 and its supporting text need to present a much clearer understanding of the programme of mineral workings that is envisaged, and how the intensity and phasing of extraction and phased restorations will be managed in order to keep the impacts on the landscape and on communities within</p>

	acceptable limits.
DLP 48 and DLP 51	<p>Support, but may conflict with other policies</p> <p>Public health is a crucial issue, and we welcome these policies. However we are concerned that the dispersal of housing and employment growth, towards locations that are less walkable and more likely to increase car-dependency and associated air pollution, will directly conflict with this policy. A particular example is the proposed residential allocation at Bradley Golf Course, which is not in a walkable location and has added health risk in reducing levels of activity by displacing the public golf course.</p> <p>Other policies and proposed allocations must be carefully considered against their impact on the delivery of these essential policies.</p>
DLP 55	Support.
DLP 61	<p>Support.</p> <p>On the issue of Storthes Hall Woods we defer to the representation being submitted by the Friends of Storthes Hall Woods.</p>
DLP 63 and DLP 64	Support.
DLP 65	<p>Object: Not effective</p> <p>New open space is essential to complement development and we support the intention of this policy. However there are two problems with it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The phrase <i>“unless the developer clearly demonstrates that it is not financially viable”</i> provides an unacceptable let-out clause in the policy that will render it ineffective in practice.</li> <li>2) The approach to new green space is not strategic. Many Local Plans provide a target for hectares of green space per new dwelling. Such an approach has merit, although less so if the new green space is only provided on-site: in many cases it may be much better to use housing growth in an area to deliver targeted green space that benefits the wider community, and also enables developments to achieve higher densities.</li> </ol> <p>To remedy these problems, the viability let-out clause should be deleted, and the policy should set out clear policies for the amounts and general locations of new green spaces to which new developments will be expected to contribute.</p>

## Site Objections

Having visited a large number of the proposed site allocations and discussed them with a range of local community groups, we wish to comment specifically on the sites shown in the table below. In most cases we object to their allocation, although in a few cases we believe that modifications to the plan might resolve our objection.

Site Reference	Address	CPRE Opinion	CPRE Comments
E1831	Land between Whitechapel Road and Whitehall Road, Cleckheaton	Modify	Well-screened and low contribution to Green Belt. Adjacent farmland to west very important for breathing space between Scholes, M62 and Cleckheaton, so any impact on this needs to be avoided.
E1832	Site of the former Cooper Bridge Waste Water Treatment Works and land to the west and north of the Three Nuns Pub, Leeds Road, Mirfield	Object	Greenfield element north of road is major intrusion into countryside and reduces openness in local landscape. That segment of the proposed allocation should therefore be deleted. We understand that the water treatment works site may be useful for flood risk alleviation, so it should be safeguarded for that purpose at least until that possibility has been fully investigated.
E1985	Former North Bierley Waste Water Treatment Works, Cliff Hollins Lane, Cleckheaton	Object	Providing openness along M606 corridor between Euroway Industrial Estate and Cleckheaton. Adjacent Green Belt within Bradford is also earmarked for development, so high risk of cumulative impact.
E2333	Land to the north and south of Wakefield Road, Clayton West, Huddersfield	Object	Substantial extension of employment zone into open country. Existing adjacent employment site is well screened by trees, less so in winter. Northern half of site is on higher ground so potentially much more prominent.
H101	Land north of Jackroyd Lane, Newsome, Huddersfield	Object	Land is leased by Stirley Community Farm and its development would negatively impact their activities, which contribute to the environmental and social capital of the area.
H102	Land to the west of Netherton Moor Road, Netherton, Huddersfield	Object	Along with H660. Encroaches over crest of hill into open countryside and valuable landscape.
H129	Land to the east of Woodhouse Road, Brockholes, Holmfirth	Object	Strongly object. Site provides very significant landscape openness along heavily developed road corridor.
H1679	Land north of Fenay lane, Almondbury, Huddersfield	Modify	Considering site constraints and sustainability challenge of a peripheral location on a busy road, scale of proposed development appears inappropriate, although affordable and GI opportunities might be worth closer consideration.

H1747	Land north of Bradley Road, Bradley, Huddersfield	Object	A very large development site in the Green Belt. Previously restored quarry site. Not highly visible from most vantage points, but raises major concerns about sustainability of location - more than 30 minute walk to nearest railway station in an area close to Leeds for commuting. Also requiring an alternative site for a public golf course, so rather self-defeating in open space terms.
H29	Land north of Pilling Lane, Skelmanthorpe, Huddersfield	Object	Difficult site with access constraints and severe impact on junction with main road. Local landscape impact. Pilling Lane forms a clear edge between urban character of settlement and rural character of landscape beyond.
H31	Land to the north west of Woodsome Drive, Fenay Bridge, Huddersfield	Object	Provides much-needed openness along the valley bottom. Will add to traffic problems on Penistone Road.
H32	Land south of Woodsome Drive, Fenay Bridge, Huddersfield	Object	Provides much-needed openness along the valley bottom. Will add to traffic problems on Penistone Road.
H334	Land to the south east of Hermitage Park, Lepton, Huddersfield	Object	Substantial extension of low density suburban housing estate, encroaching into countryside. Wider landscape impact low, but not a sustainable location or development type, and impacting on very busy junction onto main road.
H455	Land to the south east of Hermitage Park, Lepton, Huddersfield	Object	Substantial extension of low density suburban housing estate, encroaching into countryside. Wider landscape impact low, but not a sustainable location or development type, and impacting on very busy junction onto main road.
H502	Land south of Huddersfield Road, Skelmanthorpe, Huddersfield	Modify	Locality already characterised by new-build, additional landscape impact limited, though the site does breach into open country when viewed from the main road: this could be mitigated by not developing the southern strip of the site (ie use the strip for the access road only). Reduce number of dwellings?
H52	Land to the west of Hebble Mount, Meltham, Holmfirth	Object	Looks like a difficult site and would impact on local green space.
H659	Land east of Beldon Brooked Green, Lepton, Huddersfield	Object	Substantial extension of low density suburban housing estate, encroaching into countryside. Wider landscape impact low, but not a sustainable location or development type, and

			impacting on very busy junction onto main road.
H660	Land to east of Netherton Moor Road, Netherton, Huddersfield	Object	Encroaches over crest of hill into open countryside towards valuable landscape. Places pressure on another site to west of the road.
H684	Land west of Oak Tree Road, Fenay Bridge, Huddersfield	Object	Difficult site to develop, hard to access and with right of way / open space impact.
ME1970 and ME1971 and ME 1972	Seventy Acre Farm, Meltham Road, Honley	Object	Broad, open landscape would make this new quarry a highly visible (not least from Castle Hill), major landscape change affecting the openness and purpose of the Green Belt.
MX1905	Land east of 923-1110 Leeds Road, Shaw Cross/Woodkirk, Dewsbury.	Object	Very high impact. The site is visible for miles around, and significantly reduces gaps between Chidswell, Soothill and Tingley. Considering Tingley has a number allocations in the Leeds Plan there is also a high risk of cumulative impact across the authority boundary. The site also has a wide range of constraints identified. It is not possible to fully assess the merits and implications of this proposal based on a red-line allocation - a full masterplan is needed before such assessment is possible. Without that, the possible outcomes for the site are too vague, and we must object.