

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
TO REPRESENTATIONS
ON THE MODIFICATIONS**

**Wakefield Metropolitan District
Unitary Development Plan
Review 2001 – 2006**

Don Rankin
Chief Officer for Development and Regeneration
Development Department
Newton Bar
Wakefield
WF1 2TX

COUNCIL’S RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS ON THE MODIFICATIONS

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	
1. The Purpose of this Document	2
2. The Unitary Development Plan Review	2
3. Revised Deposit Alterations - Key Changes	3
4. Public Inquiry 2001	4
5. Inspector’s Recommendations – Key Modifications	4
6. Modifications	5
7. Adoption of UDP Review	5
POLICY AND POLICY REASONED JUSTIFICATION	6
NORTHERN AREA PROPOSALS	9
SOUTH EAST AREA PROPOSALS	13
WESTERN AREA PROPOSALS	15
MODIFICATIONS DOCUMENTS	
Council’s Response to Representations on the Modifications	
SUPPORTING AND RELATED DOCUMENTS	
Council’s Response to the Inspector’s Report	
Modifications Report	
Modifications Procedure and Guidance Notes	
Inspector’s Report	
Public Inquiry Documents	
Revised Deposit Alterations Documents 1 - 5	
Procedure and Guidance Notes	
Housing Land Technical Paper	
Schedule of Representations	
Composite Schedule of Alterations	
Initial Deposit Alterations Documents 1 - 9	
Wakefield Metropolitan District Unitary Development Plan	

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Purpose of this Document

1.1.1 This document outlines the Council's decision on each of the representations received about the modifications to the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Review Revised Deposit Alterations, proposed by the Council as a result of its decisions about the Inspector's Report of the public inquiry into objections to the UDP Review. Other supporting and related documents that provide summary information or details about specific aspects of the review process are listed on the contents page. The other documents do not contain any of the Council's decisions on the representations themselves.

1.1.2 This document has four main sections that contain the Council's decisions on the representations about the Policies and Policy Reasoned Justification, Northern, South East and Western Area Proposals sections of the UDP respectively, in the same sequence as the adopted UDP. The Council has considered each of the objections received and does not propose any further modifications to the UDP Review. All the material matters raised in the objections have already been considered by the Inspector and dealt with in his report, there are no new issues and the Council does not consider it necessary to hold a further public inquiry.

1.2 The Unitary Development Plan Review

1.2.1 The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) is the statutory development plan for the District. It identifies land suitable for housing, industry, retail, or other uses, and sets out the policies which the Council applies when assessing development proposals. The current UDP was adopted in December 1994.

1.2.2 In February 1998, the Council's Policy and Resources Committee gave approval for the UDP Review.

1.2.3 The Unitary Development Plan Review consists of a limited series of alterations to the adopted plan, considered necessary in the light of current Government guidance, rather than an entirely new planning framework. Large parts of the UDP will remain intact, carrying forward the core regeneration development strategy, aims and objectives and many of the existing policies and proposals, as well as the sub-division into three Plan Areas. It is proposed that the UDP be rolled forward to 2006.

1.2.4 The review includes the following alterations:

- improvements to some policies to bring them in line with current Government guidance, particularly relating to sustainable development;
- realignment of the UDP regeneration policies to support the Council's emerging Community Strategy and identification of a small number of new regeneration development sites, to meet a specific need or where a current land use allocation is no longer relevant e.g. a colliery closure since the UDP was adopted;
- policies and proposals to improve the vitality and viability of town centres;
- land allocations to meet the need for new housing, making use of previously developed 'brownfield' land;

- In respect of the Green Belt, only minimal alterations are proposed, in exceptional circumstances. Provision is made for additional housing up to 2006 without the use of Green Belt land.

1.2.5 On 17 November 1999, the Council endorsed the publication of the UDP Review Initial Deposit Alterations documents for formal public consultation. The documents were made available for inspection on 25 November and placed 'on deposit' for a statutory six week period commencing on Thursday 16 December 1999 and finishing on Wednesday 26 January 2000.

1.2.6 The Council received 2,270 representations about the UDP Review Initial Deposit Alterations. A brief description of each representation and the Council's response, indicating whether a change was proposed in the Revised Deposit Alterations, is included in the Schedule of Representations supporting document. The Schedule of Representations did not form part of the alterations to the adopted plan.

1.3 Revised Deposit Alterations - Key Changes

1.3.1 In response to new town and country planning legislation, several revised Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) and the representations received about the UDP Review Initial Deposit Alterations, the Council prepared a revised set of alterations.

1.3.2 The revised alterations were limited in scope and included:

- alterations to reflect the reduced housing need based on draft Regional Planning Guidance; essentially reinstating Protected Areas of Search for Long Term Development which have been proposed for housing in the Initial Deposit Alterations, and incorporating several new previously-developed sites in the urban area for housing which have been identified through the consultation process and planning applications;
- new housing policies to assess planning applications based on the criteria in PPG3 paragraph 31; on housing densities based on paragraphs 57 and 58; and to phase the release of housing land, in accordance with the priorities in paragraphs 30 and 32;
- other new and amended policies to address revised Government policy guidance;
- alterations to reflect new information regarding washlands and cycle routes;
- alterations relating to a small number of new or amended development sites.

1.3.3 On 18 October 2000, the Council endorsed the publication of the UDP Review Revised Deposit Alterations documents for formal public consultation. The documents were placed 'on deposit' for a statutory six week period commencing on Thursday 26 October 2000 and finishing on Wednesday 6 December 2000.

1.3.4 The Council received 437 representations about the UDP Review Revised Deposit Alterations. A brief description of each representation is included in the Schedule of Revised Deposit Representations, Public Inquiry Core Document 65.

1.4 Public Inquiry 2001

- 1.4.1 An Inspector, appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport, Local Government and the Regions, held a public inquiry into objections to the UDP Review Revised Deposit Alterations between the 19 June 2001 and 6 November 2001.
- 1.4.2 Out of the total 2,707 representations received by the Council, 457 representations were withdrawn before the inquiry and 226 were invalid. The Inspector considered 2,024 representations, 311 relating to policy matters and 1,713 relating to site-specific matters, through the public inquiry.
- 1.4.3 The Council received the Inspector's Report on 7 March 2002. The report has been available for information and public inspection on the Council's internet site since 19 March and has been available at the Council's main offices and public libraries, where the UDP Review documents were placed on deposit, since 4 April 2002.

1.5 Inspector's Recommendations – Key Modifications

- 1.5.1 The Inspector endorsed the Council's Revised Deposit Alterations and in most cases either proposed that no change be made to the UDP as a result of objections or that only a minor change was necessary. Most of the Inspector's recommendations that required the UDP to be modified did not affect the substance of the Council's proposals. In only a limited number of cases did the Inspector recommend a change that materially affected the content of the plan and required the Council to consider a significant modification. The key modifications recommended by the Inspector are highlighted below:

Housing:

- Reduce the amount of housing at Ackton Pastures, Castleford by 9 ha or 270 dwellings;
- Allocate three additional brownfield sites for housing:
 - Kimberley Street/Pretoria Street, Featherstone;
 - Womersley Road Quarry, Knottingley;
 - Denby Dale Road West, Calder Grove.
- Delete five existing greenfield housing allocations:
 - FTH 7 George Street/Whinney Lane, Streethouse;
 - KNT 8 West Ings Lane, Knottingley;
 - KNT 10 Gander Haven Farm, Knottingley;
 - EMS 13 Tom Wood Ash Lane, Upton;
 - NWS 25 (part) North Avenue, Newton Hill, Wakefield.
- Amalgamate Annexes B1 (Brownfield sites) and B2 (Greenfield sites) to form a new annex of New Sites Allocated for Housing in the Review;
- Drop the provisions relating to "phasing" housing development, including Policy H2 and the supporting text.

Other:

- Drop proposals to expand the Normanton Industrial Estate into the Green Belt;
- Add Ackworth Colliery to the list of Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt;
- Drop the requirement for an urban forest at Snowhill and leave open the determination of the future use of the land previously earmarked for playing fields/sports facilities;
- Drop the proposed Special Policy Area at Sharlston Colliery;
- At Woolley Colliery, reflect the decision of the Secretary of State in respect of the call-in application for residential and mixed-use development.

1.6 Modifications

- 1.6.1 Having considered the Inspector's Report, his reasoning and conclusions the Council accepted all his recommendations and proposed modifications based on its decisions about the Inspector's recommendations. The Council's decision on each of the Inspector's recommendations and the proposed modifications were incorporated in the UDP Review Modifications documents; the Council's Response to the Inspector's Report and the Modifications Report.
- 1.6.2 On 11 September 2002, the Council endorsed the publication of the UDP Review Modifications documents for formal public consultation. The documents were placed 'on deposit' for a statutory six week period commencing on Thursday 19 September 2002 and finishing on Wednesday 30 October 2002.
- 1.6.3 The Council has received a total of 340 representations, including 321 objections, 18 representations in support and 1 general comment. The objections only relate to a small number of the proposed modifications in the Council's UDP Review Modifications Report, with 312 relating to a single site at Denby Dale Road West, Calder Grove. All the objections relate to site-specific matters. None of the objections raise material matters that have not already been considered by the Inspector and dealt with in his report. A brief description of each representation and the Council's response is incorporated in this document.

1.7 Adoption of UDP Review

- 1.7.1 On 11 December 2002, the Council resolved to give 28 days notice of its intention to adopt the UDP Review proposals as modified. The Council further resolved to adopt the UDP Review proposals, as modified, on the expiry of the 28 days notice, unless directed by the Secretary of State not to adopt the proposals.

Wakefield Metropolitan District
Unitary Development Plan
Review 2001 – 2006

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO
REPRESENTATIONS ON THE MODIFICATIONS
Volume 2 – Policies and Policy Reasoned Justification**

Volume 2
Policies and Policy Reasoned Justification

MODIFICATION NUMBER	UDP REFERENCE	REP. NO.	OBJECTOR	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
Transport					
P5	Transport and New Development	MG00002	Highways Agency	Supports the modification as it provides for testing of developments against impact on the motorway and trunk road network.	Welcomes the support.
-	Transport	MG00003	Strategic Rail Authority	General comments, not specific to Wakefield, on the relationship between land use planning and the rail network, relevant to initial plan preparation rather than the modifications stage of the UDP Review.	No response required.
Housing					
P19	Annex B	MG00001	Barnsley MBC	<p>Paragraph 6.4.27(b) inappropriately excludes the Woolley Colliery site from Annex B and from the Wakefield total housing supply and misleadingly attributes them to the Barnsley housing market.</p> <p>The site should be added to Annex B – the schedule of Housing Allocations in the Review - with a note describing the circumstances and explaining that the site will serve a wider M1 corridor housing market via Junction 38.</p>	<p>The Inquiry Inspector considered the Woolley Colliery site in volume 5 of his report, paragraph 6.1.4. He recommended that the Plan be modified to reflect the outcome of the call-in application for residential and mixed use development proposals.</p> <p>The Secretary of State's reason for allowing the call-in application was because of the regeneration benefits which will accrue to Woolley Colliery village, which is situated in Barnsley District, not because the development is necessary to meet the requirement for new housing in Wakefield. The Council agrees with the Secretary of State. Further, the application permitted by the Secretary of State is only in outline. Because of the scale and complexity of the development it is not known how long approval of details will take. In addition, site restoration needs to be completed. It is therefore unclear how many, if any, houses will be built on the site within the period of the Wakefield UDP Review i.e. by mid-2006.</p> <p>The Inquiry Inspector gave clear and specific advice about the sites to be included in Annex B to meet the requirement for new housing in Wakefield.</p> <p>For all these reasons the Council determined that it was inappropriate to include the site in the schedule of Housing Allocations in the Review – Annex B.</p> <p>It seems likely, given the location of the Woolley Colliery site and the Secretary of State's intention in permitting development, that new housing on the site will have the greatest impact on Barnsley District, though no doubt</p>

Volume 2
Policies and Policy Reasoned Justification

MODIFICATION NUMBER	UDP REFERENCE	REP. NO.	OBJECTOR	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
					<p>people will be attracted from the wider M1 corridor. The statement in paragraph 6.4.27(b) is considered to be accurate and does not say or imply that the new housing should be included in Barnsley's supply.</p> <p>For these reasons the Council is not proposing any further modification in response to this objection. The next review of the Plan will consider whether changes are needed to references to the Woolley Colliery site for the period beyond 2006.</p> <p>NO FURTHER MODIFICATION to the Plan.</p>
Open Land					
P35	The Green Belt Boundary	MN00005	P K Fieldhouse & Son	Holding objection following on from the objection to the modification of the Green Belt Boundary at Norwood, Carleton, Pontefract (ref. MN00004) (see Modification N12)	See Council's response to objection to Modification N12.

Wakefield Metropolitan District
Unitary Development Plan
Review 2001 – 2006

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO
REPRESENTATIONS ON THE MODIFICATIONS
Volume 3 – Northern Area**

MODIFICATION NUMBER	UDP REFERENCE	REP. NO.	OBJECTOR	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
Featherstone Community Area Proposals					
N9	Housing Site – Land at George Street/Whinney Lane, Streethouse	MN00001 MN00002	Featherstone Town Council Streethouse Village Community Group	The land should remain as a housing allocation in the UDP. Deletion of the housing allocation will affect the regeneration of Streethouse and prevent improvement of a deprived area.	<p>The Inquiry Inspector considered the suitability of this and similar sites for housing in volume 2 of his report, paragraphs 9.2.9-9.2.17. He concludes that this is a greenfield extension site with a lower order of priority for housing than other allocations in the plan, based on the sequential approach to identifying housing sites in PPG3, and recommends that the site should not be allocated for housing.</p> <p>The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions and recommendations and is proposing to modify the Plan accordingly.</p> <p>The Council also recognises the need to regenerate Streethouse village and UDP policy R1 encourages sustainable development which promotes regeneration, particularly in places like Streethouse where deprivation is significantly higher than the average.</p> <p>The introduction to the UDP Policy Framework notes that planning applications for development on land which is unallocated, such as this site, will be considered on merit, having regard to the policies and supporting statements in the Plan, and established planning principles. The need for regeneration will be a material factor which must be taken into account along with housing land policy considerations when any planning application on this site is being determined.</p> <p>The UDP is taking a consistent approach to allocating housing land whilst allowing the possibility of housing development which is needed to support regeneration. Therefore, the Council is not proposing any further modification in response to this objection.</p> <p>NO FURTHER MODIFICATION to the Plan.</p>
Pontefract Community Area Proposals					
N12	Green Belt Boundary, Norwood, Carleton, Pontefract	MN00004	P K Fieldhouse & Son	The Council has misinterpreted the Inspector's view about the line the Green Belt should follow. The Inspector does not define the boundary in the way specified by the Council in the proposed	The Inquiry Inspector considered objections to the Green Belt boundary at Norwood, Carleton in volume 3 of his report, paragraphs 4.2.12-4.2.14 and set out in detail in recommendation 3/4.2/4 his proposal for the boundary of the Green Belt in this locality.

MODIFICATION NUMBER	UDP REFERENCE	REP. NO.	OBJECTOR	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
				<p>modification and the boundary remains to be determined.</p> <p>An alternative Green Belt boundary is proposed which would enable a dwelling to be constructed. This would not detract from the openness or purposes of the Green Belt and would maximize the use of previously developed land in accordance with PPG3.</p>	<p>The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions and recommendations and is proposing to modify the Plan accordingly. The proposed modification indicates a Green Belt boundary which follows exactly the line described by the Inspector. The Council considers this boundary to be clear and well defined, making use of recognised features where possible. The Council is not proposing any further modification in response to this objection.</p> <p>NO FURTHER MODIFICATION to the Plan.</p>
Knottingley Community Area Proposals					
-	Land at England Lane & Middle Lane, Knottingley	MN00003	B Paterson	<p>An additional modification should be included to recognise the Inspector's comment that the former quarry site between England Lane & Middle Lane, Knottingley should be developed ahead of other sites once the proposed housing allocation at Womersley Road (KNT H94) is developed (see Modification N20). This would allow prospective developers of the Womersley Road site to take into account the possibility of a larger site being developed in future.</p>	<p>The Inquiry Inspector considered whether this site should be allocated for housing in volume 3 of his report, paragraphs 5.2.13-5.2.15. He commented that it would be sensible to develop sites like this before greenfield land with a mature soil structure. However, he concluded that the Plan's housing requirement can be met from sites higher up the search sequence and saw no reason to allocate the site for housing. He made no recommendation to modify the plan to include a specific reference to this site or to indicate that the site should be developed before others.</p> <p>The Council agrees with the Inspector's conclusions and recommendations. It would be premature to make any reference in the current review to the possibility of allocating this site for housing in the longer term. It is anticipated that only about 50 houses on the Womersley Road site KNT H94 will be completed by 2006 out of a potential capacity of about 230, so that development will extend well beyond the period of the review. The right time to consider the need for further housing development in this part of Knottingley will be the next review of the plan. The objection site can be considered at that time along with other candidates.</p> <p>The Council is proposing to modify the plan in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations and confirms that no reference to this site should be included in the current UDP Review.</p> <p>The Inspector also noted that development of the Womersley Road site might be carried out in a way which</p>

MODIFICATION NUMBER	UDP REFERENCE	REP. NO.	OBJECTOR	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
					<p>would enable access to be taken to the objection site in future. UDP policy H8 requires that development should be carried out in such a way that does not prevent development of adjoining undeveloped land. This is a matter to be considered at the time of any planning application on the Womersley Road site.</p> <p>NO FURTHER MODIFICATION to the Plan.</p>

Wakefield Metropolitan District
Unitary Development Plan
Review 2001 – 2006

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO
REPRESENTATIONS ON THE MODIFICATIONS
Volume 4 – South East Area**

MODIFICATION NUMBER	UDP REFERENCE	REP. NO.	OBJECTOR	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
None					

Wakefield Metropolitan District
Unitary Development Plan
Review 2001 – 2006

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO
REPRESENTATIONS ON THE MODIFICATIONS
Volume 5 – Western Area**

MODIFICATION NUMBER	UDP REFERENCE	REP. NO.	OBJECTOR	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
North Wakefield and Stanley Community Area Proposals					
W5	Housing Site - NWS25 Newton Hill	MW00004	Sport England (Yorkshire)	Supports the proposed modification as it takes account of Sport England's objection to the allocation of playing fields for housing.	Welcomes the support
		MW00337	Mr J W Gravett	Supports the modification to exclude land to the south of the proposed A61-A642 link road from the housing application.	Welcomes the support
W6	Snow Hill Special Policy Area	MW00003	Sport England (Yorkshire)	Supports the proposed modification.	Welcomes the support
		MW00335	Mr J W Gravett	Supports the fact that land to the east of the A650, north and south of Red Hall Lane is not proposed for housing.	Welcomes the support
		MW00336	Mr J W Gravett	Objects to the deletion of the proposed urban forest and wishes to see it reinstated in the Plan.	<p>The Inquiry Inspector considered objections to the Snow Hill Special Policy Area in volume 5 of his report, paragraphs 2.11.6-2.11.34. He did not consider that there is a sustainable case for using 22 hectares of strategically important land for urban forest purposes, though he could see smaller areas of woodland at Snow Hill contributing to the overall urban forest concept. He concluded that the future of this important area should not be determined at this stage and that the wording of the text of the Special Policy Area should be amended in order to safeguard the land from development for the time being.</p> <p>The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions and recommendations and is proposing to modify the Plan accordingly. The Council agrees with the Inspector that the long term use of this area should be considered in the next review of the Plan taking account of the demand for land for new development in the longer term, the need for open space provision in the locality, including the possibility of contributing to the concept of an urban forest, and the need to protect the amenity of local residents. Therefore, the Council is not proposing any further modification in response to this objection.</p> <p>NO FURTHER MODIFICATION to the Plan.</p>

MODIFICATION NUMBER	UDP REFERENCE	REP. NO.	OBJECTOR	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
South & East Wakefield Community Area Proposals					
W12	Housing Site – SEW H27 Denby Dale Road West, Calder Grove	See Appendix 1	See Appendix 1	<p>312 objections to allocation for housing on grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Calder Grove area is overdeveloped the Inspector is incorrect in his analysis of the site as brownfield; loss of open/green space; provision of recreational area; loss of views, visual amenity and open landscape; inadequate highways and access; increase in traffic and congestion; pedestrian and road safety; insufficient public transport; loss of ecology; loss of wildlife habitat; former mineworkings, unstable land, mean site is unsafe; danger of flooding, lack of drainage; increase in pollution; increase in noise and loss of privacy lack of school places insufficient health/doctor facilities; any more housing in this small area will put extra strain on an already overburdened area. detrimental to village - loss of amenity in quiet village, insufficient local facilities to accommodate further development; loss of community spirit; loss of open space for dog walking area, and do not want tall buildings behind bungalow. <p>One representation supports allocation of the land for residential purposes and</p>	<p>The Inquiry Inspector considered objections to the site at Denby Dale Road West, Calder Grove in volume 5 of his report, paragraphs 4.2.18-4.2.21. Based on evidence put before him at the Inquiry, his inspection of the site and the definition set out in Annex C of PPG3, the Inspector concludes that the site should be treated as brownfield land, i.e. a first priority for housing in terms of the sequential approach, and therefore recommends that the site be allocated for housing in the UDP Review.</p> <p>The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions and recommendations and is proposing to modify the Plan accordingly.</p> <p>The site at Denby Dale Road is designated 'Protected Area of Search for Long Term Development' (PAS) in the adopted UDP and was proposed for housing by the Council in the Initial Deposit Alterations of the Review. The Inspector having considered reasons identified by objectors for not re-using the site, including technical evidence about access, traffic and pollution concluded there are no clear reasons for rejecting the housing allocation. The Council is satisfied that the site is suitable in principle for housing development.</p> <p>The Inspector proposes that the site could accommodate 63 dwellings The Council considers that the site lies within the urban area and that development on this scale, at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare (dph), would not constitute over-development, bearing in mind the guidance in PPG3 to make best use of available land in urban areas and to avoid densities below 30 dph.</p> <p>It is a matter of judgement whether the site is brownfield. Initially, the Council held the view that it was greenfield but accepts the Inspector's reasoning and conclusion that it is previously developed. A number of objectors refer to the presence of former mineworkings, lending weight to the evidence of former activity.</p> <p>The Inspector recognises that it is an area of open space appreciated by local residents but considers that this is not a clear reason for rejecting a housing allocation. He states</p>

MODIFICATION NUMBER	UDP REFERENCE	REP. NO.	OBJECTOR	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
				<p>considers that all the issues raised by the objectors were addressed by the Inspector at the public inquiry.</p> <p>One representation supports the modification as it provides for testing of developments against impact on the motorway and trunk road network.</p>	<p>that it is not a large tract of land preserving the identities of distinct and separate communities, and thus qualify as open land within a built-up area, nor would it fulfil the purposes of including land in Green Belts. The Council agrees with the Inspector's reasoning and conclusions. The site is in private ownership and whilst it undoubtedly has an amenity value to local residents the public has no right of access apart from the public footpath crossing the southern part of the site. The text supporting the proposed housing allocation states that provision of open space for local use should be a part of the development. The provision of open space and the design and layout of the development to protect the amenity of neighbouring residents are matters to be considered at planning application stage but do not prejudice the principle of housing development.</p> <p>The Inspector recognises the concerns of local residents about access and traffic but considers that these are not clear reasons for rejecting a housing allocation. There are no highway or access concerns which would lead the Council to oppose development. The text supporting the proposed housing allocation states that a Traffic Impact Assessment on the motorway and trunk road network will be required as part of any development proposal. Access within the site is a matter to be considered at planning application stage. The Council agrees with the Inspector that none of these are matters to prejudice the principle of housing development.</p> <p>The Inspector recognises the concerns of local residents about loss of habitats but notes that an ecological survey indicates that there are no overriding matters of nature conservation interest and concludes that this is not a clear reason for rejecting a housing allocation. The Council agrees with the Inspector's conclusions.</p> <p>The Inspector was aware of the presence of former mining activity within the site. The Council normally consults the Coal Authority on development proposals at the planning application stage and can place conditions on planning approvals to deal with the presence of former coal workings. However, it is a developer's responsibility to</p>

MODIFICATION NUMBER	UDP REFERENCE	REP. NO.	OBJECTOR	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
					<p>ensure the stability and safety of his development. Again the Council considers that the presence of former coal working is not a clear reason for rejecting a housing allocation.</p> <p>The site does not lie within a flood plain on the 1 in 100 year frequency Indicative Flood Plain Map issued by the Environment Agency in 2001. A developer will be required to submit a flood risk assessment to accompany any planning application. The Council is satisfied there are no over-riding foul sewerage or surface water drainage problems. Drainage and sewerage are matters to be considered at planning application stage but do not prejudice the principle of housing development.</p> <p>The Council believes that none of the other material issues raised by the objectors provides a clear reason for rejecting a housing allocation on this site and are matters which should be addressed at planning application stage. The Council does not propose to further modify the Plan in response to these objections.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the two representations in support of the modification.</p> <p>NO FURTHER MODIFICATION to the Plan.</p>
Walton/Crofton/Sharlston Community Area Proposals					
W18	Sharlston Colliery Special Policy Area	MW00001	UK Coal Mining Ltd	<p>Objects to the removal of the Special Policy area from the Plan.</p> <p>The Plan should address the planning issues of the site and the Council needs to clarify its position having supported development at an earlier stage of the Review.</p> <p>The Inspector accepts that the site presents a negative image and is harmful to the visual appearance of the countryside. He accepts that a reclamation and restoration strategy is required and does not reject the option of a mineral recovery based reclamation scheme. He accepts that reclamation together with new development and</p>	<p>The Inquiry Inspector considered objections to Sharlston Colliery in volume 5 of his report, paragraphs 5.4.1-5.4.29.</p> <p>He considers the need to create new employment opportunities, the need to raise the attractiveness of New Sharlston for housing investment, the need for new local facilities and open space but considers that these do not justify regenerative initiatives involving significant loss of Green Belt. He perceives the site to be an encroachment into open countryside in the open Green Belt gap south of Normanton. There are no exceptional circumstances in his view which justify taking Sharlston Colliery out of the Green Belt and its development in accordance with the Special Policy Area proposals. He recommends that references to the regeneration of Sharlston Colliery as a Special Policy Area be deleted from the Plan.</p> <p>The Council accepts the Inspector's conclusions and</p>

MODIFICATION NUMBER	UDP REFERENCE	REP. NO.	OBJECTOR	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
				<p>related facilities would raise the attractiveness of New Sharlston for housing investment.</p> <p>UK coal remain committed to reclaiming Sharlston Colliery and believe that whilst the location is generally rural it lies on the fringe of Normanton and has good transport links. Mineral recovery will offset a proportion of the costs of reclamation but without some form of development, comprehensive reclamation would not be economic for UK Coal to undertake.</p> <p>Following discussions with interested local parties UK Coal propose a substantially smaller area of development with the remainder of the site restored to farmland and nature conservation areas. The scheme includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 hectares of housing creating a sustainable community comprising a mix of house types to meet local demand from 2006 onwards. • New community facilities. • Small business units. • Restoration of remaining 50 hectares for pasture, woodland & wetland. • Increase in public rights of way to allow safer use of the area. <p>UK Coal consider the site is not playing the sort of positive role envisaged in the Green Belt. By not encroaching on the countryside or reducing openness of the Green Belt to the same extent as previously the smaller scheme takes account of the Inspector's concerns whilst generating funds for the environmental and economic benefits needed in the locality.</p>	<p>recommendations and is proposing to modify the Plan accordingly.</p> <p>The Inspector recognises that the site presents a negative image and that improving its appearance would bring regenerative benefits but considers that non-development ways of reclaiming the site and its retention in the Green Belt have not been explored adequately. In terms of sustainability he said that in his view regeneration efforts would be better directed towards recycling urban land. The Council agrees with the Inspector.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that the revised scheme submitted by UK Coal might assist reclamation of Sharlston Colliery with a reduced developed area removed from the Green Belt. However, the Council does not consider that it is appropriate to consider this scheme at this late stage of the current UDP Review for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme does not provide any clear new evidence of exceptional circumstances which justify taking land out of the Green Belt, predominantly for new housing development. • In the light of the Inspector's conclusions the possibility of reclamation without the need for any new development or loss of Green Belt needs to be fully explored. • It is not clear whether the revised scheme has local support. A number of representations have been received which support the modification to delete all reference to the Special policy Area. The Council wishes to ensure that any new development proposals put forward have the support of the local community. • The proposed housing is stated to be to meet local needs beyond 2006. It will be necessary to consider the suitability of this location for new housing after 2006 in the context of the overall District requirement during the next review of the Plan, bearing in mind the Inspector's comments about the need for regeneration and sustainability in this locality. <p>Therefore, the Council does not propose to further modify the Plan in response to this objection.</p>

MODIFICATION NUMBER	UDP REFERENCE	REP. NO.	OBJECTOR	SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS	COUNCIL'S RESPONSE
					NO FURTHER MODIFICATION to the Plan.
		MW00325	Mr & Mrs Bucknall	}	
		MW00326	P Emmett, T Holmes	}	
		MW00327	M Appleyard	}	
		MW00328	J M Appleyard	}	
		MW00329	P Bucknall	}	
		MW00330	Mr & Mrs Cole	}	
		MW00331	L Richardson	}	
		MW00332	A W Ripley	}	
		MW00333	K Richardson	}	
		MW00334	C Fogo	}	
		MW00339	Mr & Mrs Rhodes	}	
				} Support the Inspector's recommendation concerning the Sharlston Colliery site and the Council's decision to accept his recommendation.	Welcomes the support.

Appendix 1 - SEW H27 Denby Dale Road West, Calder Grove

Representation No	Name	Representation No	Name
Objections		Objections	
MW00002	The Clerk to Crigglestone Parish Council	MW00054	Mr & Mrs Woolley
MW00005	J P & J Crompton	MW00055	Mr & Mrs Woolley
MW00006	J P & J Crompton	MW00056	L J Mason
MW00007	J P Hall & A Watson	MW00057	J & M Forde
MW00008	J P Hall & A Watson	MW00058	J & M Forde
MW00009	Mrs S M Perry	MW00059	Mrs Bell
MW00010	M F & A Price	MW00060	Mr & Mrs A Highley
MW00011	M F & A Price	MW00061	Mr & Mrs A Highley
MW00012	C Cape & J C Porter	MW00062	Mr & Mrs Osborne
MW00013	C Cape & J C Porter	MW00063	Mr & Mrs Osborne
MW00014	J Beaumont	MW00064	Mrs A G Goddard
MW00015	A De Courcy Bower	MW00065	N & K Markwell
MW00016	Neville Reeve	MW00066	N & K Markwell
MW00017	Mrs M Ward	MW00067	Mr & Mrs Paton
MW00018	C & M Batty	MW00068	I McDowell
MW00019	C & M Batty	MW00069	N & H McCall
MW00020	D & M Jones & M Walker	MW00070	N & H McCall
MW00021	D & M Jones & M Walker	MW00071	E Lawson
MW00022	D & M Jones & M Walker	MW00072	Mr & Mrs C Hudson
MW00023	I Meekle	MW00073	Mr & Mrs C Hudson
MW00024	A & M Walker	MW00074	Mr & Mrs C Hudson
MW00025	A & M Walker	MW00075	Mr & Mrs C Hudson
MW00026	M & L Platts	MW00076	Mr & Mrs Bayliss
MW00027	M & L Platts	MW00077	Mr & Mrs Bayliss
MW00028	M & L Platts	MW00078	Mr & Mrs J Yates
MW00029	D Edwards & J Price	MW00079	Mr & Mrs J Yates
MW00030	D Edwards & J Price	MW00080	A Shield
MW00031	C Jarvis	MW00081	Mr & Mrs Waddington
MW00032	W & H Bradley	MW00082	Mr & Mrs Waddington
MW00033	W & H Bradley	MW00083	P & W White
MW00034	Mr N Whitworth	MW00084	P & W White
MW00035	Mrs P Hollinworth	MW00085	Mr & Mrs Raper
MW00036	B & D Vigrass	MW00086	Mr & Mrs Raper
MW00037	B & D Vigrass	MW00087	Mr & Mrs Bolland
MW00038	B & D Vigrass	MW00089	P & B Lillis
MW00039	Mr & Mrs Calton	MW00090	P & B Lillis
MW00040	Mr & Mrs Calton	MW00091	Mr J Blanes
MW00041	Mr & Mrs J Leith	MW00092	Mr & Mrs Lillis & M Riley
MW00042	Mr & Mrs J Leith	MW00093	Mr & Mrs Lillis & M Riley
MW00043	Mr & Mrs Place	MW00094	Mr & Mrs Lillis & M Riley
MW00044	Mr & Mrs Place	MW00095	J & H Talbot
MW00045	J & S Tyers	MW00096	J & H Talbot
MW00046	J & S Tyers	MW00097	J Kennedy & J Camplejohn
MW00047	P & A Mason	MW00098	J Kennedy & J Camplejohn
MW00048	P & S Mason	MW00099	B Rawden
MW00049	J Horsfield	MW00100	MM & C Wheeler
MW00050	Mr & Mrs Shaw	MW00101	M & C Wheeler
MW00051	Mr & Mrs Shaw	MW00102	D Gedman
MW00052	J Laurent & C Gornall	MW00103	S Kayser
MW00053	Mr & Mrs Woolley	MW00104	Mr T Carlisle
		MW00105	Mr & Mrs I Henshaw

**Volume 5
Western Area**

Representation No	Name	Representation No	Name
Objections		Objections	
MW00106	Mr & Mrs I Henshaw	MW00161	Mr & Mrs N Wilkinson
MW00107	Mr & Mrs Ellis	MW00162	J Herbert
MW00108	Mr & Mrs Ellis	MW00163	Andy Womack
MW00109	S Drury & J Senior	MW00164	R Cobb
MW00110	S Drury & J Senior	MW00165	Mr & Mrs McDonald
MW00111	Mr & Mrs G Townend	MW00166	M & I Dawson
MW00112	Mr & Mrs G Townend	MW00167	M & I Dawson
MW00113	Mr & Mrs Cadden & J Baker	MW00168	J Laurent & C Gornall
MW00114	Mr & Mrs Cadden & J Baker	MW00169	Mr & Mrs Nottingham
MW00115	Mr & Mrs Cadden & J Baker	MW00170	Mr & Mrs Nottingham
MW00116	Mrs G Rushforth	MW00171	M Prince
MW00117	Mr & Mrs Potter	MW00172	Mrs S Fell
MW00118	Mr & Mrs Potter	MW00173	Mr & Mrs J Lethley
MW00119	Mrs S Gerrard	MW00174	Mr & Mrs J Lethley
MW00120	Carol Smith	MW00175	Mr & Mrs Coe
MW00121	R & J Tomlinson	MW00176	Mr & Mrs Coe
MW00122	R & J Tomlinson	MW00177	Mr A Tillett
MW00123	Mrs M Freeth	MW00178	Mr & Mrs Berry
MW00124	Mrs D Poole	MW00179	Mr & Mrs Berry
MW00125	J Jackson	MW00180	Mr & Mrs Berry
MW00126	Mr & Mrs R Morris	MW00181	Mr & Mrs Berry
MW00127	Mr & Mrs R Morris	MW00182	N Beck
MW00129	Mrs M Pilbrow	MW00183	C Tunningley & J Porter
MW00130	Mr & Mrs Platts	MW00184	C Tunningley & J Porter
MW00131	Mr & Mrs Platts	MW00185	P & G Rhodes
MW00132	Mr & Mrs Platts	MW00186	P & G Rhodes
MW00133	Mr F Palmer	MW00187	A & T Moorby
MW00134	Anne Dixon	MW00188	A & T Moorby
MW00135	Mr & Mrs Mellor	MW00189	GH & I Collins
MW00136	Mr & Mrs Mellor	MW00190	S & R Sowdon
MW00137	Mr & Mrs Leather	MW00191	S & R Sowden
MW00138	Mr & Mrs Leather	MW00192	K & A Harder
MW00139	Mr & Mrs Roche	MW00193	K & A Harder
MW00140	Mr & Mrs Roche	MW00194	Mr & Mrs Still
MW00141	L Purcell & J Smith	MW00195	Mr & Mrs Still
MW00142	Lorna Lee & Edward Howson	MW00196	J Ashton
MW00143	Mrs C Henshaw	MW00197	G & S Holliday
MW00144	Mr N Bentley	MW00198	Mr & Mrs Porter
MW00145	B Edgar	MW00199	Mr & Mrs Porter
MW00146	Mr & Mrs Bateman	MW00200	L Purcell & J Smith
MW00147	Mr & Mrs Bateman	MW00201	D Pimm & K Boucher
MW00148	Mrs B Tunnicliffe	MW00202	D Pimm & K Boucher
MW00149	D Bond & K Walker	MW00203	Mrs M Shaw
MW00150	D Bond & K Walker	MW00204	J Caulfield
MW00151	Mr & Mrs Batty	MW00205	Mr & Mrs Wild
MW00152	Mr & Mrs J Butel	MW00206	Mr & Mrs Wild
MW00153	Mr & Mrs J Butel	MW00207	M W O'Toole
MW00154	Mrs B Walsh	MW00208	K Bland & I Davies
MW00155	Mr & Mrs Rushforth	MW00209	K Bland & I Davies
MW00156	Mr & Mrs Rushforth	MW00210	M Mercer
MW00157	Mr & Mrs Jackson	MW00211	A Craven & J Haag
MW00158	Mr & Mrs Jackson	MW00212	A Craven & J Haag
MW00159	Mr & Mrs McDonald	MW00213	T Hillkirk
MW00160	Mr & Mrs N Wilkinson	MW00214	G D Terry

**Volume 5
Western Area**

Representation No	Name	Representation No	Name
Objections		Objections	
MW00215	Mr Jowitt	MW00279	Mr & Mrs Lloyd
MW00216	Mr & Mrs Marshall	MW00280	Mr & Mrs Lloyd
MW00217	Mr & Mrs Marshall	MW00281	R & E & L Jacques
MW00218	S & C Clark	MW00282	R & E & L Jacques
MW00219	S & C Clark	MW00283	R & E & L Jacques
MW00230	L O'Hare	MW00284	Mr & Mrs Shield
MW00231	Mr Tinsley	MW00285	Mr & Mrs Shield
MW00232	S Masters	MW00286	Mr & Mrs Beckwith
MW00233	D Exley	MW00287	Mr & Mrs Beckwith
MW00234	I & M Wood	MW00288	Mr & Mrs Stevenson
MW00235	I & M Wood	MW00289	Mr & Mrs Stevenson
MW00236	R Armstrong	MW00290	A Gott
MW00237	Mr & Mrs Holroyd	MW00291	G J Matthews & M Johnson
MW00238	B & J Chambers	MW00292	G J Matthews & M Johnson
MW00239	B & J Chambers	MW00293	Mr & Mrs Hindley
MW00240	L Etherington	MW00294	Mr & Mrs Hindley
MW00241	M Schorah	MW00295	E Shepherd
MW00242	Mr & Mrs Gunter	MW00296	Mr & Mrs Docherty
MW00243	Mr & Mrs Gunter	MW00297	Mr & Mrs Docherty
MW00244	Mr & Mrs P Horner	MW00298	R F & N C Wilcock
MW00245	Mr & Mrs P Horner	MW00299	R F & N C Wilcock
MW00246	S Banks	MW00300	Anne Gill
MW00247	Mrs J Broadhead	MW00301	P & A Mackie
MW00248	Lorna Lee & Edward Howden	MW00302	P & A Mackie
MW00249	T & D Faulkner	MW00303	A M Shearman
MW00250	T & D Faulkner	MW00304	Donald James
MW00251	Helen Kilgallon	MW00305	Jacqueline Jones
MW00252	C & A Boffey	MW00306	Mrs A Howden
MW00253	C & A Boffey	MW00307	S & C Whiting
MW00254	S Dransfield & A Auton	MW00308	S & C Whiting
MW00255	S Dransfield & A Auton	MW00309	J Power & H Brooks
MW00256	H & W Covell	MW00310	J Power & H Brooks
MW00257	H & W Covell	MW00311	J & K Purser
MW00258	A & M Burnell	MW00312	J & K Purser
MW00259	A & M Burnell	MW00313	Mrs J Gascoigne
MW00260	Mrs V Brook	MW00314	R Hicken & D Issatt
MW00261	Mrs S O'Keeffe	MW00315	R Hicken & D Issatt
MW00262	T & C Mitchell	MW00316	Richard Marsden
MW00263	T & C Mitchell	MW00317	A & M Benson
MW00264	M Lawless & M Macdonald	MW00318	A & M Benson
MW00265	M Lawless & M Macdonald	MW00319	R Whittaker & E Clark
MW00266	A Fletcher	MW00320	R Whittaker & E Clark
MW00267	Mr & Mrs D Jones	MW00321	P & Y Hoskin
MW00268	Mr & Mrs D Jones	MW00322	P & Y Hoskin
MW00269	L Newsome	MW00323	B S Murgatroyd
MW00270	L Newsome	MW00324	M P & C A Smith
MW00271	Mr & Mrs Priestley	MW00338	Mr & Mrs F Parkinson
MW00272	Mr & Mrs Priestley	MW00340	Mr & Mrs E Toon
MW00273	J Criffin & S O'Mara	MW00341	Mr & Mrs E Toon
MW00274	J Criffin & S O'Mara	Support	
MW00275	G & S Maguinness	MW00343	Highways Agency
MW00276	G & S Maguinness	MW00342	I C Cameron
MW00277	H & J Glover		
MW00278	H & J Glover		