
City of Wakefield Metropolitan District
Unitary Development Plan Review 2001-2006
Inspector's Report

Volume 5, Western Area Proposals

March 2002

CONTENTS

INSPECTOR'S NOTE ON HOUSING NEED

1. WESTERN AREA STRATEGY

- 1.1 REGENERATION
- 1.2 HOUSING
- 1.3 EMPLOYMENT
- 1.4 WAKEFIELD CITY CENTRE

2. NORTH WAKEFIELD & STANLEY COMMUNITY AREA PROPOSALS

- 2.1 INTRODUCTION
- 2.2 EMPLOYMENT ZONES
- 2.3 HOUSING SITES
- 2.4 HEALTH SERVICE
- 2.5 TRANSPORT PROPOSALS
- 2.6 GREEN BELT SETTLEMENTS
- 2.7 PROTECTED AREAS OF SEARCH FOR LONG TERM DEVELOPMENT
- 2.8 LAND RECLAMATION
- 2.9 PUBLIC LOCAL AMENITY OPEN SPACE
- 2.10 COMMUNITY USE OF LEISURE FACILITIES
- 2.11 SPECIAL POLICY AREAS

3. OSSETT / HORBURY COMMUNITY AREA PROPOSALS

- 3.1 EMPLOYMENT PROPOSALS

3.2 HOUSING SITES

4. SOUTH & EAST WAKEFIELD COMMUNITY AREA PROPOSALS

4.1 EMPLOYMENT ZONES

4.2 HOUSING SITES

4.3 HISTORIC PARK / GARDEN / BATTLE SITE

4.4 GREEN BELT SETTLEMENTS

4.5 WASHLANDS

5. WALTON / CROFTON / SHARLSTON COMMUNITY AREA PROPOSALS

5.1 MINERAL EXTRACTION INDUSTRIES

5.2 HOUSING SITES

5.3 LAND RECLAMATION

5.4 SPECIAL POLICY AREAS

6. SOUTH WAKEFIELD RURAL COMMUNITY AREA PROPOSALS

6.1 HOUSING SITES

6.2 GREEN BELT

6.3 GREEN BELT SETTLEMENTS

7. WAKEFIELD CITY CENTRE PROPOSALS

7.1 OUTER AREAS: HOUSING

7.2 RETAILING

7.3 KEY DEVELOPMENT AREAS

7.4 SPECIAL POLICY AREAS

INSPECTOR'S NOTE ON HOUSING NEED

In selecting sites that I consider should contribute to the District's housing needs, I have identified a search sequence (Volume 2, Section 9.1). That search sequence is based on the advice in PPG 3; on Policy H2 of Regional Planning Guidance; and on (unchanged) Policy OL4/Paragraph 10.5.27 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan.

In the light of the above, and in relation to the many objection sites, the main elements of the search sequence that I have identified are:

- 1. Previously developed land within urban areas.*
- 2. Other infill within urban areas (with priority to previously allocated sites).*
- 3. Extensions to the urban area of Wakefield using previously developed land.*
- 4. Extensions to the urban area of Wakefield using greenfield land (including Protected Areas of Search of this nature).*
- 5. Extensions to market and coalfield towns using previously developed land.*
- 6. Extensions to market and coalfield towns using greenfield land (including Protected Areas of Search of this nature).*
- 7. Sites where development would support the regional spatial strategy and which would have good public transport and non-car links to a wide range of employment and services (including Protected Areas of Search in this category).*
- 8. Any other Protected Areas of Search.*
- 9. Green Belt land.*

In rural areas, the provision of housing should be to meet local needs and/or support local services.

I have had regard to other factors referred to in PPG 3 (such as the criteria in Paragraph 31) and in Policy H2 (such as achieving appropriate standards of urban greenspace). I have also taken into account any potentially overriding considerations that might lead to the "promotion" of a particular site or exceptional circumstances that might warrant the release of Green Belt land.

In accordance with the advice in Paragraph 30 of PPG 3, I have not extended the search further than required to provide sufficient capacity to meet the housing requirement.

As a consequence of the above, and notwithstanding the absence of an urban capacity study, I have concluded that the housing needs of the District can be met by previously developed land (Category 1) and reconfirmed allocations falling within Category 2. Having paid regard to any potentially overriding factors, I find that there is no need for the allocation of any Protected Area of Search or Green Belt land for housing purposes.

1. western area strategy

1.1 Regeneration – section 1.2

The Objections

871/W00605/Western Area Strategy/STRAT1	- Kevin Swift
911/W00728/Western Area Strategy/STRAT1	- Dr D Jones
911/W00729/Western Area Strategy/STRAT1	- Dr D Jones
953/W00764/Western Area Strategy/STRAT1	- H Wood
953/W00765/Western Area Strategy/STRAT1	- H Wood
1508/W01423/Western Area/BRAD	- Bradwell & Co

Summary of Objections

- The ward based approach distorts the statistics and undermines the optimum economic regeneration response.
- Standard reasons of objection.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- I appreciate that simple reference to ward unemployment will not give a full picture of the causes and effects of economic change. However, to my mind, Section 1.2 simply gives an overview of the situation by saying that regeneration is as important in the Western Area as in other parts of the District. It then flags up what are considered to be two key regenerative proposals. In my opinion, no further details are called for in this part of the document.
- The objections of Dr Jones, H Wood and Bradwell & Co list several standard reasons of objection. However, none are specific to regeneration or of any obvious relevance to Section 1.2. I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.

RECOMMENDATION

5/1.1/1 That no modification be made in response to the objections.

1.2 housing – section 1.3

The Objections

911/W00730/Western Area Strategy/STRAT2	- Dr D Jones
911/W00731/Western Area Strategy/STRAT2	- Dr D Jones
953/W00766/Western Area Strategy/STRAT2	- H Wood
953/W00767/Western Area Strategy/STRAT2	- H Wood

Summary of Objections

- Standard reasons of objection.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- The objections of Dr Jones and H Wood list several standard reasons of objection. However, none are specific to the housing strategy or of any obvious relevance to Section 1.3. I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.

RECOMMENDATION

5/1.2/1 That no modification be made in response to the objections.

1.3 employment - section 1.4

The Objections

871/W00606/Western Area Strategy/STRAT3	- Kevin Swift
911/W00732/Western Area Strategy/STRAT3	- Dr D Jones
911/W00733/Western Area Strategy/STRAT3	- Dr D Jones
953/W00768/Western Area Strategy/STRAT3	- H Wood
953/W00769/Western Area Strategy/STRAT3	- H Wood
1710/RW00257/Western Area Strategy/RETAIL1	- North Wakefield Community - Group

Summary of Objections

- The sites mentioned (except M1 Junction 40) have limited extra job potential.
- Reference should be made to employment sites at M1 Junction 39 and at Snowhill.
- Standard reasons of objection.
- The priority of residents' needs has been sacrificed to the need for jobs.
- It is not clear that detailed job/skills/training analyses of the resident population have been undertaken.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- Paragraph 1.4.3 refers to five sites that comprise the Wakefield Strategic Sites portfolio. The Council's evidence indicates that approximately 4,500 jobs would be accommodated on these sites, a net increase of 2,000 jobs. In my opinion, with an increase of this size, the extra job potential would not be "limited".
- With regard to land at M1 Junction 39 and at Snowhill, the Council is suggesting a change that would refer to these sites. As such, the related objection would be met.
- The objections of Dr Jones and H Wood list several standard reasons of objection. However, none are specific to the employment strategy or of any obvious relevance to Section 1.4. I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.

- In terms of the needs of residents, it appears to me that, in relation to new employment opportunities, Paragraph 1.4.1 is seeking to balance the needs of residents in the Western Area with those of residents in areas where the need for economic regeneration is acute. That is not to say that residents' amenities are unimportant. However, these are dealt with in other sections of the Plan, not under the heading of employment. As far as analyses of detailed jobs/skills/training are concerned, I consider that these and related matters are outside the scope of the development plan process.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5/1.3/1 That the Plan be modified in accordance with the Council's proposed change THE STRATEGY PC/1.

5/1.3/2 That no other modification be made in response to the objections.

1.4 wakefield city centre – section 1.5

The Objections

911/W00734/Western Area Strategy/STRAT5	- Dr D Jones
911/W00735/Western Area Strategy/STRAT5	- Dr D Jones
953/W00770/Western Area Strategy/STRAT5	- H Wood
953/W00771/Western Area Strategy/STRAT5	- H Wood

Summary of Objections

- Standard reasons of objection.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- The objections of Dr Jones and H Wood list several standard reasons of objection. However, none are specific to Wakefield City Centre or of any obvious relevance to Section 1.5. I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.

RECOMMENDATION

5/1.4/1 That no modification be made in response to the objections.

2. north wakefield & stanley community area proposals

2.1 introduction - paragraph 2.1.1

The Objections

871/W00607/North Wakefield & Stanley/STRAT3 - Kevin Swift
911/W00737/North Wakefield & Stanley/STRAT3 - Dr D Jones
953/W00772/North Wakefield & Stanley/STRAT3 - H Wood

Summary of Objections

- Reliance on B1 uses is inappropriate.
- Standard reasons of objection.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- Paragraph 2.1.1 indicates that emphasis will be placed on attracting B1 uses to North Wakefield & Stanley. However, employment in other use classes would not be precluded and I do not consider that the Council would be relying unduly or unreasonably on B1 uses as a means of relieving unemployment. Although it was asserted that B1 uses would “encourage commuting by car” and that there is “probably not enough demand”, I consider that there is no substantive evidence to this effect.
- The objections of Dr Jones and H Wood list several standard reasons of objection. However, none are specific to employment proposals in North Wakefield & Stanley or of any obvious relevance to Paragraph 2.1.1. I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.

RECOMMENDATION

5/2.1/1 That no modification be made in response to the objections.

2.2 employment zones - paragraph 2.1.2: land north of castlegate, lee moor; land off park view, lofthouse gate; land off aberford road, stanley

The Objections

780/W00415/North Wakefield & Stanley/EP2 - PPG Land Ltd
780/G00135/North Wakefield & Stanley/EP2 - PPG Land Ltd
220/W00002/North Wakefield & Stanley/EP3 - Peter Duffy Ltd
220/G00001/North Wakefield & Stanley/EP3 - Peter Duffy Ltd
1050/W00634/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP28 - Simon Elliott Associates

Summary of Objections

- Land north of Castlegate, Lee Moor should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for employment uses.
- Land off Lofthouse Gate should be allocated as an Employment Zone and removed from the Green Belt.
- Land off Aberford Road, Stanley should be taken out of the Green Belt and allocated for mixed-use (leisure and commercial) purposes.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- The objection site at Castlegate, Lee Moor comprises a number of parcels of land between the road and the motorway embankment. For the purposes of my report, I have considered firstly that part of the site that lies directly north of the Castlegate Employment Zone (NWS 6). I then consider the objection site as a whole including small areas of land at either end of the objection site.
- A preliminary point at issue is the status of the land north of the existing employment zone. The Council indicates that this land is part of the adopted Green Belt. The objector refers to a cartographic error. For my part, I note that this is part of an area of land that was formerly within the administrative area of Leeds but has now been transferred to Wakefield. I have no doubt that the intention was for this land to be Green Belt. That is the designation shown on the draft Proposals Map for Leeds. However, it does not appear to me that those intentions were followed through into practice.
- Although the proposed land uses in this area are described on the relevant schedule as “Green Belt – with the exception of the small industrial site of Castle Gate (Waddington) which is proposed as an industrial zone”, the defining plan clearly includes land on the north side of Castlegate as falling within the industrial zone. In my opinion, a reasonable interpretation of the deposited documents would be that the land north of the Castlegate employment area is in fact part of the industrial zone and is not adopted Green Belt. This is despite the fact that this part of the objection site is shown as Green Belt on the Proposals Map that forms part of the adopted UDP.
- Notwithstanding the above interpretation, I have considered what should be the status of the whole of the objection site. My unequivocal answer is that it should be Green Belt. It is an area of countryside outside any settlement or built-up area. Designation or continued designation as Green Belt would assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Green Belt designation would also assist in urban regeneration by encouraging employment development to take place on derelict or other urban land. With nearly 535 ha of employment land available at the end of 2000, and with take-up rates averaging 24 ha a year, I consider that there is no shortage of employment land and no necessity to take any land out of the Green Belt in this area.
- In addition, exceptional circumstances exist for including the land immediately north of the industrial zone within the Green Belt. In my opinion, it was always intended that this area should be Green Belt and that the enjoyment of any alternative status is simply the result of administrative error. As identified above, the objection site fulfils important Green Belt purposes. I have concluded that the boundary of the employment land should be drawn so as to exclude land north of Castlegate. All the land north of Castlegate should be confirmed as Green Belt.
- With regard to land off Lofthouse Gate, the objector indicates that the site is needed as a contribution to a sustainable portfolio of employment sites that includes land for B2 and B8 uses.

It is argued that, over the Plan period, 150 ha of new land would be needed. For my part, I note that, at the end of 2000, nearly 535 ha of employment land were available across the District. Of this total, I am aware that a significant proportion would be available for B2 and B8 purposes.

- I would expect any locational disparities to be investigated and resolved at the time of the full review. However, in addition to provision on existing and proposed sites within the Western Area, I note that employment sites in the Northern Area would be as accessible to some of the residents of the Wakefield urban area as a site at Lofthouse Gate.
- Notwithstanding the availability of existing and proposed employment land, I would expect any new provision to be located, as a first preference, within the built-up area and to avoid the need to amend what are meant to be enduring Green Belt boundaries. In this case, the objection site is on the fringe of, but outside, the urban area. In this location, I believe that the Green Belt assists urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land and assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. In my opinion, designation of the land as an employment zone would compromise those purposes.
- In conclusion, I find that there is no overriding need to meet future employment needs by allocating the objection site as an employment zone. There are no exceptional circumstances that would warrant the exclusion of this site from the Green Belt.
- Turning to the land off Aberford Road, PPG 6 indicates that a sequential approach to the identification of sites for major leisure uses should be adopted. This means that first preference should be for town centres followed by district and local centres and only then for out-of-centre sites such as the objection site. Developers should be able to demonstrate that all potential town centre options have been assessed before less central sites are considered. No such assessment is available in this case. Even where out-of-centre options are identified, I would expect Green Belt considerations to be paramount.
- With regard to commercial uses, I note that, at the end of 2000, nearly 535 ha of employment land were available. With take-up rates averaging about 24 ha a year, I find that there is no overriding need for land for further commercial or other employment uses.
- I appreciate that the objection site is seen as an accessible prime development location and that there may be well known end users who are not willing to locate on other sites; also that there could be considerable economic benefits. However, one of the purposes of the planning system is to direct potential development to preferred locations. In this location, the Green Belt assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and helps in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. I do not consider that there are any exceptional circumstances such as to justify taking the objection site out of the Green Belt and allocating it for mixed-use development.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5/2.2/1 That the boundary of the Castlegate Employment Zone (NWS 6) be drawn so as to exclude land north of Castlegate. All the land north of Castlegate be confirmed as Green Belt.

5/2.2/2 That no other modification be made in response to the objections.

- 2.3 housing sites - paragraph 2.2.2: nws 25 north avenue, newton hill; nws h21 lofthouse colliery, lofthouse gate; nws H23 north of ruskin avenue, wrenthorpe; nws h64 victoria way, newton hill; nws h81 land at leeds road, snowhill; nws w14 alverthorpe mills, flanshaw lane; nws w15 moorhouse avenue, stanley; nws w16 aberford road, stanley; nws 2 land west of brick street, flanshaw; land south of brandy carr road, kirkhamgate; land to rear of 11 ouchthorpe lane, outwood; land at lindale lane, wrenthorpe; land at wrenthorpe lane, wrenthorpe; land off wrenthorpe road, wrenthorpe; land at jerry clay lane, wrenthorpe; land north of lindale lane, wrenthorpe; land at lingwell gate lane, lofthouse; land at newmarket house, castle gate; land adjacent junction 41 M1; playing fields, balne lane; land off mount road, stanley; stanley grange, ouchthorpe road; land between 122-132 rocks nest road, outwood; land off bradford road, carr gate; land off lingwell nook lane, stanley; land between aberford road and ferry lane, stanley; land at red hall lane, newton hill; land at silcoates lane, wrenthorpe; nws 44 land at bradford road, wrenthorpe

The Objections

438/W00229/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP1	- Nicholas Shields
814/W00487/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP1	- Lynda Milsom
823/W00511/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP1	- Sport England (Yorkshire)
872/W00587/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP1	- Miss A Johnson
871/W00609/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP1	- Kevin Swift
911/W00738/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP1	- Dr D Jones
953/W00775/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP1	- H Wood
1078/W00806/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP1	- Fiona Law
786/W00365/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP4	- Mr J W Gravett
790/W00383/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP4	- Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd
871/W00491/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP4	- Kevin Swift
911/W00758/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP4	- Dr D Jones
953/W00776/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP4	- H Wood
1541/RW00006/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Tay Homes (Northern) Ltd
161/RW00019/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mrs M D & Mr D Harrison
1064/RW00231/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Dennis Macaulay
254/W00028/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mr & Mrs Allerton
272/W00052/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mr & Mrs J Hargreaves
273/W00053/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mr & Mrs I Senior
408/W00192/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Nancy Smith
486/W00242/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mr K Lodge
529/W00295/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mr W J Foster
557/W00317/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mr D Matthews
566/W00324/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mr & Mrs J A Ludvigsen
570/W00332/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Stephen & Margaret Hirst
526/W00348/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mrs D Johnson
786/W00366/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mr J W Gravett
790/W00384/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd
161/W00413/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mrs M D & Mr D Harrison
695/W00429/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- L Crofts
691/W00437/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Steve & Kirsten Beresford

800/W00508/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mr & Mrs V Copley
1540/W00542/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- R Dews
873/W00591/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mr Noble
871/W00608/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Kevin Swift
888/W00618/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mr & Mrs R Burman
866/W00625/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Mr L J Whittaker
1111/W00696/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- G L McGarroch
911/W00759/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Dr D Jones
953/W00777/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- H Wood
949/W01338/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP5	- Kenneth Bostock
758/RW00001/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP6	- Taywood Projects
786/W00367/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP6	- Mr J W Gravett
790/W00385/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP6	- Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd
758/W00468/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP6	- Taywood Projects
871/W00490/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP6	- Kevin Swift
887/W00640/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP6	- Christine Sharman
911/W00760/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP6	- Dr D Jones
953/W00778/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP6	- H Wood
786/W00368/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP7	- Mr J W Gravett
790/W00386/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP7	- Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd
871/W00492/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP7	- Kevin Swift
872/W00584/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP7	- Miss Ann Johnson
1115/W00707/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP7	- Mr & Mrs R A Cooper
1114/W00708/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP7	- Mr J A Cousins
1113/W00709/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP7	- Mrs Jean Johnson
1070/W00712/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP7	- Mr & Mrs F C Smith
911/W00761/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP7	- Dr D Jones
953/W00779/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP7	- H Wood
1078/W00807/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP7	- Fiona Law
911/W00762/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP8	- Dr D Jones
953/W00780/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP8	- H Wood
911/W00763/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP9	- Dr D Jones
953/W00781/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP9	- H Wood
911/W00757/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP10	- Dr D Jones
953/W00782/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP10	- H Wood
750/W00363/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP11	- Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd
750/W00362/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP11	- Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd
889/W00590/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP13	- Mr M Staszewsky
889/G00190/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP13	- Mr M Staszewsky
889/G00192/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP13	- Mr M Staszewsky
283/W00060/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP14	- Mr & Mrs J Brighton
1510/W00547/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP15	- Mrs O Sykes
1060/W00719/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP15	- Orion Homes
420/G00065/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP16	- Mr & Mrs N R Andrews
418/G00068/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP17	- Mr A Audsley
512/W00350/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP18	- Mr N & Mrs E Newton
515/W00509/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP19	- Mr C Brook
528/W00170/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP20	- Mr & Mrs Cartwright
514/W00353/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP20	- Mrs Oliver

424/G00062/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP21	- Mr A Wilson
423/G00063/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP22	- Mrs R Tree
757/W00802/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP23	- Persimmon Homes (WY) Ltd
757/G00271/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP23	- Persimmon Homes (WY) Ltd
857/G00184/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP24	- Mr W R & Mrs E Hodson
1068/W01345/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP25	- Sharphouse Holdings Ltd
388/G00079/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP26	- Mr B Dawson
1704/W00214/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP27	- Diocese of Wakefield
758/G00152/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP29	- Taywood Projects
758/G00150/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP29	- Taywood Projects
513/W00351/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP30	- Mr H Rainbow
516/W00354/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP31	- Mr M Hammond
757/W00391/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP32	- Persimmon Homes (WY) Ltd
1059/G00240/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP33	- H & J Asquith
1059/W00723/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP33	- H & J Asquith
1059/G00237/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP33	- H & J Asquith

Summary of Objections

- Land at North Avenue, Newton Hill should revert to its existing use and be allocated as such. Playing fields and footpaths should not be destroyed. The balance of the site without planning permission should be deleted as a residential allocation.
- Development on the playing fields at North Avenue, Newton Hill should be prevented unless appropriate replacement provision is made.
- At North Avenue, Newton Hill, there should be wide footpaths and access for horse riders, keeping the site as rural as possible.
- Standard reasons of objection.
- The Lofthouse Colliery site should not be allocated for housing.
- Land north of Ruskin Avenue, Wrenthorpe should be included as a housing allocation.
- Land north of Ruskin Avenue, Wrenthorpe should not be used for housing.
- There should be no development on land north of Ruskin Avenue, Wrenthorpe, temporary or otherwise.
- Because of access rights, land north of Ruskin Avenue, Wrenthorpe is not genuinely available.
- Land at Victoria Way, Newton Hill should be allocated for housing (Annex B1 or, alternatively, Annex B2/unallocated). The precise number of dwelling should be determined through a Transport Impact Assessment.
- Land at Victoria Way, Newton Hill should not be allocated for housing. It should be left as agricultural land or open space.
- Land at Leeds Road/A650 Snowhill should not be allocated for housing.
- Land west of Brick Street, Flanshaw should be removed from the employment zone NWS 2 Flanshaw and allocated for housing purposes.

- The Green Belt boundary should be amended to exclude land south of Brandy Carr Road, Kirkhamgate.
- Green Belt land behind 11 Ouchthorpe Lane, Outwood should be a building plot.
- Land at Lindale Lane, Wrenthorpe should be removed from the Green Belt and reserved for long-term development/housing.
- All or some of a site at Wrenthorpe Lane, Wrenthorpe should be allocated for housing or as a Protected Area of Search. Removal of the site from the Green Belt would be appropriate.
- All or some of a site at Wrenthorpe Road, Wrenthorpe should be allocated for housing or as a Protected Area of Search. The site does not merit inclusion as urban open land.
- Land at Jerry Clay Lane, Wrenthorpe should be allocated for housing development.
- Land north of Lindale Lane, Wrenthorpe will provide a solution to the demand for housing.
- Land at Lingwell Gate Lane, Lofthouse could be used for housing or industry.
- Land at both Newmarket House, Castle Gate and adjacent to M1 Junction 41 would be suitable for re-allocation for a variety of purposes including housing, industry, mixed uses and long-term development.
- The Balne Lane playing fields site should be allocated for housing purposes.
- Green Belt land at Mount Road, Stanley should be changed to infill suitable for future residential development.
- Land at Stanley Grange, Ouchthorpe Lane should be taken out of the Green Belt and allocated for residential development.
- Land between 122 and 132 Rooks Nest Road, Outwood should be used for residential infill.
- Land off Bradford Road, Carr Gate should be allocated for residential purposes.
- Land off Lingwell Nook Lane, Outwood should be released from the Green Belt and allocated for Housing to meet the requirements of Policy H1.
- Land between Aberford Road and Ferry Lane, Stanley should be allocated for housing development.
- Land at Red Hall Lane, Newton Hill should be taken out of the Snowhill Special Policy Area.
- Land off Silcoates Lane, Wrenthorpe should be allocated for housing development.
- Land at Bradford Road, Wrenthorpe should be excluded from the Green Belt and allocated for housing or as a Protected Area of Search.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- Under the Council's proposals, the whole of site NWS 25 North Avenue, Newton Hill would be shown as a housing allocation. However, in reality, the Council envisages that land north of the proposed A61 – A642 Link Road would be developed for residential purposes pursuant to a recent planning permission; and that the land to the south would remain as playing fields/open space save for a small triangle of land.

- It appears to me that the provisions of the Plan should match the situation that is envisaged. In recognition of a detailed residential planning permission, I consider that the land north of the proposed link should continue to be allocated for housing purposes. However, in my view, the remainder of the site should be deleted from the NWS 25 allocation. With the deletion of the residential allocation, the playing fields and open space would enjoy the protection of policies such as L3 and further specific safeguarding would be unnecessary.
- The triangle of land between the link road and the playing fields, although on a greenfield site, could be regarded as infill within an urban area and thus fairly high up in the sequential approach. However, unless seen in the context of housing to the north, the new link road and possibly development on the proposed Special Policy Area to the east, I consider that development here would appear as isolated and incongruous in its open setting. In reality, I cannot see adjacent built development proceeding at a pace that would enable housing completions, in an appropriate context, to be achieved within the Plan period. As such, I do not consider that this triangle of land should be allocated for housing purposes.
- In terms of other matters, I would expect public access to have been considered as part of the planning application for the land north of the link road. Elsewhere, rights of way should remain unchanged with the open land remaining as “rural” as possible.
- The objections of Dr Jones and H Wood list several standard reasons of objection. However, none are specific to the land at North Avenue, Newton Hill or of any obvious relevance to Paragraph 2.2.2 or any of the housing sites. I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.
- With regard to the heading and text in the Revised Deposit Alterations, I consider that the area of the site should be amended to 19.5 ha. Beyond this, I see no need to refer to anything other than the planning permission for the residential development north of the link road. The related paragraph should be updated to refer to the full planning permission (or reserved matters approval).
- Turning to the Lofthouse Colliery site, this was put forward as a housing site at the stage of the Initial Deposit Alterations. However, under the Revised Deposit Alterations, the site would be reinstated as a Protected Area of Search. As such, I consider that the various objections are met and that there is no need to modify the Plan as now proposed.
- Land north of Ruskin Avenue, Wrenthorpe was also put forward as a housing site at the Initial Deposit Stage. Given that, under the Revised Deposit Alterations, the site would remain as a Protected Area of Search, I consider that objections relating to housing use and availability have been negated.
- Those promoting the allocation of the land north of Ruskin Avenue for housing purposes consider that the Council has under-estimated the overall requirement for housing land and that additional greenfield development would be necessary. My own conclusion is that sufficient sites have already been identified by the Council. These are urban brownfield site and reconfirmed allocations of a higher order of priority. Notwithstanding any locational advantages that could be attributed to the objection site, and compatibility with aspects of PPG 3, I consider that no modification of the Plan is necessary.
- I envisage that the site would remain as a Protected Area of Search. That is its present status. Any future development would be restricted to that necessary for the operation of existing uses together with such temporary uses as would not prejudice the possibility of long term development. Any significant change of use or operational development would be subject to

planning control. Thus, the amenities of local residents could be protected without prejudicing the long-term future of the site.

- In terms of the site at Victoria Way, Newton Hill, the Council accepted that at least part of the site could be used for housing; also that, in principle, the site was capable of accommodating more than 25 dwellings. However, it was argued that the site would not be needed within the Plan period. For my part, I agree that there is no need to allocate sites such as this. As indicated in Volume 2 of my report, the housing needs of the District can be met by appropriate brownfield sites and other reconfirmed allocations. In my opinion, there are no overriding considerations in this case.
- As to whether the Victoria Way site should be reinstated as part of the Special Policy Area NWS 65, I appreciate that only a limited set of alterations are contemplated in the Review. It is intended to preserve the integrity of the adopted Plan unless or until change becomes necessary. Nevertheless, to my mind, the objection site is a discrete area. Provided that a landscaped buffer is established along the A650 corridor, I see no reason why the objection site should be subject to a special policy area regime. In my opinion, the site should be deleted from the NWS 65 area and remain unallocated. Any future material change of use or operational development would be the subject of normal planning control.
- The objections relating to the land at Leeds Road/A650 Snowhill were all made at the Initial Deposit stage and stemmed from the housing allocation then proposed. However, the Council is now proposing that the site should be reinstated as part of the existing Snowhill Special Policy Area NWS 65. As such, those particular objections have been negated. Given that there are no objections to the proposed reinstatement as part of the Special Policy Area, no modifications are necessary or appropriate.
- With regard to land at Brick Street, Flanshaw, the objector relies on the need for additional housing to justify the allocation of the site for housing. I appreciate that it would be difficult to provide separate access to this site for industrial purposes; also that this is a site in an urban area surrounded by development. However, as indicated in Volume 2 of my report, the housing needs of the District can be met by appropriate brownfield sites and other reconfirmed allocations. In my opinion, there are no overriding considerations in this case.
- In terms of the land south of Brandy Carr Lane, Kirkhamgate, the main purpose of the objection appears to be the removal of the land from the Green Belt. The implied justification is the difficulty of interpreting the Green Belt boundary. The Council understands that the preferred use of the site would be housing. Indeed, the objector cites the proposed use for housing of Green Belt land at Charlston Colliery in support of his case.
- Irrespective of whether the site would be used for housing purposes, I find that the Green Belt boundaries in this locality are clear and well defined following as they do the garden boundaries of existing houses. There is no difficulty of interpretation and no exceptional circumstances that would warrant changing the boundary.
- The next site to be considered is land behind 11 Ouchthorpe Lane, Outwood. The objector has secured planning permission for a house on adjoining land and would like to build another property on the objection site. For my part, I note that the land with planning permission is outside the Green Belt whereas the objection site is within the Green Belt. Any change in Green Belt boundary would have to be justified by exceptional circumstances. In my opinion, there are no such circumstances in this case and no modification to the Plan should be made.

- Land at Lindale Lane, Wrenthorpe is also in the Green Belt. However, it is stated that the District will require a significant amount of new housing and this site would make a valuable contribution to housing figures. Attention is drawn to the nature of built development in the area, the availability of public transport and good access to major centres of employment. Irrespective of the built development in the area, and any locational advantages of the site, I find that there are no exceptional circumstances that would support taking this land out of the Green Belt. In particular, the District's housing requirement can be met on urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. In terms of the sequential approach, a considerable number of sites would take precedence over land such as this.
- I have reached similar conclusions in respect of land at Wrenthorpe Lane, Wrenthorpe. To my mind, the Green Belt in this area checks the unrestricted sprawl of the built-up area and prevents the merger of Wrenthorpe and Kirkhamgate as well as assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Irrespective of whether this area has, in the past, been considered as suitable for additional housing, and notwithstanding any advantages with regard to public transport, highway capacity or the built form and character of the settlement, I find that there are no exceptional circumstances. The housing needs of Wakefield in both the Plan period and the longer term can be met by sites higher up the search sequence.
- Land at Wrenthorpe Road, Wrenthorpe is slightly different in that it falls within an area designated as open land within the built-up area rather than as Green Belt. Nevertheless, a restrictive policy similar to Green Belt policy is intended to apply. I appreciate that this is a location that could be attractive to the private sector; also that the objection site may be close to facilities. I am also aware that the site can be distinguished from the wider area of open land to the south. However, allocation of this site for housing would be a failure to protect the open land from development and from urban encroachment. To my mind, the character and function of the land would be significantly harmed in circumstances where sufficient higher order sites have been identified for both short and longer-term housing needs.
- In terms of land at Jerry Clay Lane, Wrenthorpe, I acknowledge that the objection land is directly adjoining long-standing residential areas. Nevertheless, the land is in the Green Belt. Irrespective of the absence of any access or servicing problems, there are no exceptional circumstances that would warrant a change of designation. In particular, the housing needs of the District, signalled in Regional Planning Guidance, can be met without developing greenfield extension sites or any Green Belt land.
- Land north of Lindale Lane, Wrenthorpe is another Green Belt site. I appreciate that uses for the site are limited; also that the site is surrounded by housing on two of its sides. However, the housing needs of the District and the Western Area would be met on non-Green Belt sites identified by the Council. There are no exceptional circumstances in support of this site.
- Turning to land at Lingwell Gate Lane, Lofthouse, it is indicated that such land does not fulfil Green Belt purposes. I do not agree. I am aware that nearby "countryside" has, in the past, been developed and further development may take place at some stage in the future. However, the continuing Green Belt status of the objection sites should assist in safeguarding this part of the countryside from encroachment. Further, by protecting Green Belt land and hence encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land, continued designation assists in urban regeneration.
- The absence of a need for housing on sites other than those identified by the Council has been demonstrated in Volume 2 of this report. With regard to industrial use, I have concluded that, with nearly 535 ha of employment land available at the end of 2000, and with take-up rates

averaging about 24 ha a year, there is no need for any additional allocation. In short, there are no exceptional circumstances that would warrant taking this land out of the Green Belt for either housing or employment purposes.

- In terms of land at Newmarket House, Castle Gate and adjacent to M1 Junction 41, it is asserted that the requirement for housing land has been underestimated and that the Council has not provided sufficient development land to maintain and enhance the economic viability of the District. However, no detailed evidence has been submitted nor are there any appropriate submissions regarding the merits of excluding these sites from the Green Belt. To my mind, the assertions regarding need are not supported by other evidence that is before me. Irrespective of any locational advantages that the sites may have, I find that there are no exceptional circumstances that would support taking such land out of the Green Belt and its allocation for housing, industry, mixed uses or long-term development.
- With regard to the Balne Lane playing fields site, I consider that the first question to be answered is whether this is a greenfield site or a brownfield site. For the objector, it is argued that the site is brownfield having been extensively tipped and subject to mineral extraction prior to tipping. However, I note that the site has been restored. I saw that, in the main, the site comprises flat grassed areas. There is no significant evidence of previous development. Bearing in mind the definitions in Annex C of PPG 3, and notwithstanding the suitability or otherwise of the site for playing fields, I consider that the objection land falls into the greenfield category.
- In Volume 2 of my report, I have concluded that the housing needs of the District can be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. I appreciate that the objection site has certain locational advantages, that the requirement for playing fields here is debatable and that the overall amenity value of the site is limited. Nevertheless, to my mind, there are no overriding considerations. In particular, there is no need for the objection site to be allocated for housing purposes.
- So far as the land at Mount Road, Stanley is concerned, the objector has drawn attention to development that has taken place along the Mount Road frontage over the years. The objection site was then split off from such land but has never been part of the open agricultural land to the northeast. Be that as it may, I saw that the objection site, notwithstanding a limited number of structures, is essentially open in character. To my mind, continued Green Belt designation would assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. In addition, by resisting development here and encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land, urban regeneration would be assisted.
- I appreciate that, in the past, development may have taken place on Green Belt and former Green Belt land. However, the boundaries of the Green Belt were comprehensively reviewed at the time the current Unitary Development Plan was adopted. Under the current review, the needs of the District can be met without altering Green Belt boundaries. All in all, there are no exceptional circumstances that would justify changing the Green Belt boundary in the present case.
- I now turn to land at Stanley Grange, Ouchthorpe Lane. Here it is argued that it is not necessary to retain this land within the Green Belt. For my part, I take an opposite view, namely that there is no need to take this land out of the Green Belt. The housing needs of the District can be met on urban brownfield sites and on reconfirmed allocations. In addition, I find that the Green Belt in this location continues to serve several purposes. It helps safeguard this area of countryside from encroachment including the sprawl of the Wakefield built-up area. Further, by

resisting the development of an open greenfield site such as this, and encouraging the recycling of derelict and other land within the urban area, urban regeneration will be assisted.

- I recognise that the objection site comprises a relatively narrow wedge of land extending between existing built development. Nevertheless, it continues to have an important function. Irrespective of any locational advantages, I consider that there are no exceptional circumstances in support of the removal of this land from the Green Belt.
- Land between 122 and 132 Rooks Nest Road, Outwood is another Green Belt site. Here, one bungalow for the personal use of the objector is envisaged. In support of the proposal, it is stated that the land is subject to vandalism and tipping. However, such circumstances are by no means exceptional. In my opinion, there are no significant arguments in favour of the removal of the site from the Green Belt and a residential allocation.
- With regard to land off Bradford Road, Carr Gate, I appreciate that the character of the area has changed and may change further in the future. However, I consider that the Green Belt in this area continues to satisfy several important functions. To my mind, the objection site forms part of the countryside outside the built-up area. The continued designation of the site as Green Belt helps safeguard that countryside and maintain openness. In addition, and notwithstanding any strong demand for housing in this area and the presence of public transport, it is important to direct development to derelict and other urban sites and so assist regeneration and other sustainability objectives. In this regard, the housing needs of the District can be met on urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations.
- The main argument in support of land off Lingwell Nook Lane, Outwood is a perceived need for additional new housing allocations. It is indicated that sustainable Green Belt extensions to the main urban areas should be evaluated and allocated if they perform more highly. In this regard, I have concluded in Volume 2 of my report that the housing needs of Wakefield can be met from urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. I would add that, irrespective of any locational advantages of the objection site, there are a considerable number of potential infill sites within the urban area that I would place higher than the Lingwell Nook Lane land.
- I have noted the conclusion that, in its current condition, the site is not capable of supporting agricultural activity. Nevertheless, I saw that the objection site is part of an extensive open area. Openness is the most important attribute of Green Belts. It may be that, in visual terms, the site is well separated from settlements on the fringe of the administrative area of Leeds. Nevertheless, to my mind, the Green Belt is safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assisting regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. I see no need to change one set of robust and defensible boundaries for another. All in all, there are no exceptional circumstances that would justify altering the Green Belt boundary or overriding considerations with respect to the sequential allocation of housing land.
- In respect of land between Aberford Road and Ferry Lane, Stanley, it is indicated that further sites will need to be allocated for housing development. However, in Volume 2 of this report, the housing needs of the District have been assessed taking into account Regional Planning Guidance. No additional allocations are required.
- I have taken into account access and servicing considerations; also the fact that the objection site is located directly adjoining long-standing residential development. However, in these and all other respects, I find that there are no exceptional circumstances that would warrant taking the objection site out of the Green Belt.

- The objector to the Council’s proposals for land at Red Hall Lane, Newton Hill indicates that the boundary of the Snowhill Special Policy Area cuts through the middle of a residential curtilage. It is suggested that the boundary should be repositioned so as to exclude all of the objection site. The objection site would then be unallocated. For my part, I saw that the objection site is a discrete parcel of land. I see no need to reposition the boundary particularly as the objection site forms part of a band of essentially undeveloped land between the A650 and the rear of frontage development along the A61 Leeds Road.
- With regard to the future use of the land, it is argued that the “open land” objections should not apply given the Council’s intention to allocate other land east of the A650 for housing purposes. However, I note that these proposals formed part of the Initial Deposit Alterations but do not represent the present intention of maintaining the status quo. In the circumstances, I see no justification for a change in the proposed use.
- Land off Silcoates Lane, Wrenthorpe falls within the Wrenthorpe Valley, designated as open land in the built-up area under Proposal NWS 44 of the adopted UDP. A reading of the text supporting Proposal NWS 44 suggests to me that the Wrenthorpe Valley is intended to be protected from development; a restrictive policy (OL3) similar to Green Belt policy is to be applied; and the valley will be protected on the same basis as Green Belt policy. Similarly, the supporting text to Policy OL3 indicates that the Wrenthorpe Valley is a large tract of open land worthy of protection; and that the role of the policy is to safeguard open land from urban encroachment and preserve the identities of distinct and separate settlements.
- At the Inquiry, it was argued that the objection site is essentially enclosed. It is generally screened from public viewpoints and, as such, makes no significant contribution to the open character of the valley as a whole. However, as with Green Belt land, I do not consider that a site needs to be visible in order to contribute to the openness of an area. To my mind, development on the site would reduce openness. The Wrenthorpe Valley would not be protected from development but would be subjected to urban encroachment contrary to the related intention of Policy OL3.
- In terms of any need for additional or substitute housing sites, I have already concluded that the District’s requirements can be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. Even if the objection site was seen as a potential substitute for one of the reconfirmed allocations, I consider that the protection afforded by the open land designation would be an overriding consideration.
- The case for the allocation of land at Bradford Road, Wrenthorpe is based on perceived housing needs within Wakefield in both the immediate and longer term, needs that would have to be met in part by Green Belt releases. However, as set out in Volume 2 of my report, the housing requirement can be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. The long-term needs of the District will be considered at the time of the full review, along with Green Belt boundaries. There is nothing that suggests to me that the objection site now needs to be excluded from the Green Belt to meet short or long-term needs. Notwithstanding any locational or other advantages of the objection site, there are no exceptional circumstances in this regard.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5/2.3/1 That under the heading NWS 25 NORTH AVENUE, NEWTON HILL, WAKEFIELD, the site area be amended to “19.5 Hectares/48 acres approx.” The following two paragraphs of text be deleted. The third paragraph be updated to refer to the grant of full planning permission

(or reserved matters approval). On the Proposals Map, the housing allocation be limited to the land north of the A61 – A642 Link Road. The remainder of the site be unallocated.

5/2.3/2 That site NWS H64, Victoria Way, Newton Hill, be taken out of the NWS 65 Snowhill Special Policy Area and remain unallocated.

5/2.3/3 That no other modification be made in response to the objections.

2.4 HEALTH SERVICE - paragraph 2.3.2: nws 32 land TO west of existing pinderfields complex

The Objections

911/W00756/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP3 - Dr D Jones
953/W00783/North Wakefield & Stanley/HP3 - H Wood

Summary of Objections

- Standard reasons of objection.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- The objections of Dr Jones and H Wood list several standard reasons of objection. However, none are specific to community facilities or of any obvious relevance to Paragraph 2.3.2. I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.

RECOMMENDATION

5/2.4/1 That no modification be made in response to the objections.

2.5 transport proposals – introduction paragraph 2.4.1 and public transport paragraph 2.4.3

The Objections

911/W00753/North Wakefield & Stanley/TP1 - Dr D Jones
953/W00786/North Wakefield & Stanley/TP1 - H Wood
911/W00755/North Wakefield & Stanley/TP1 - Dr D Jones
953/W00784/North Wakefield & Stanley/TP1 - H Wood

Summary of Objections

- Standard reasons of objection.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- The objections of Dr Jones and H Wood list several standard reasons of objection. However, none are specific to transport or of any obvious relevance to Paragraphs 2.4.1 or 2.4.3. I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.

RECOMMENDATION

5/2.5/1 That no modification be made in response to the objections.

2.6 Green Belt Settlements - paragraph 2.5.5(A): NWS GBS1 carr gate

The Objections

911/W00747/North Wakefield & Stanley/GBS1	- Dr D Jones
911/W00748/North Wakefield & Stanley/GBS1	- Dr D Jones
953/W00791/North Wakefield & Stanley/GBS1	- H Wood
953/W00792/North Wakefield & Stanley/GBS1	- H Wood

Summary of Objections

- Standard reasons of objection.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- The objections of Dr Jones and H Wood list several standard reasons of objection. However, none are specific to Green Belt settlements or of any obvious relevance to Paragraph 2.5.5(a). I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.

RECOMMENDATION

5/2.6/1 That no modification be made in response to the objections.

2.7 Protected areas of search for long term development - paragraph 2.5.7

The Objections

911/W00746/North Wakefield & Stanley/PAS1	- Dr D Jones
953/W00793/North Wakefield & Stanley/PAS1	- H Wood

Summary of Objections

- Standard reasons of objection.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- The objections of Dr Jones and H Wood list several standard reasons of objection. However, none are specific to Protected Areas of Search or of any obvious relevance to Paragraph 2.5.7. I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.

RECOMMENDATION

5/2.7/1 That no modification be made in response to the objections.

2.8 land reclamation - paragraph 2.5.8

The Objection

871/W00610/North Wakefield & Stanley/LREC1 - Kevin Swift

Summary of Objection

- In Paragraph 2.5.8, there should be reference to the need for the physical and environmental restoration of the northern flank of the Welbeck land reclamation area.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- I appreciate that the visual appearance of the Welbeck area may not be entirely satisfactory. However, it appears to me that, with the exception of the former Warmfield land where there are no planning conditions or obligations, the works are regulated by a planning permission and are also subject to on-going maintenance. As such, they are implementation matters rather than matters that should be the subject of development plan proposals. I consider that no modification of the Plan would be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION

5/2.8/1 That no modification be made in response to the objection.

2.9 public local amenity open space – paragraph 2.6.2: nws 55 baker lane, stanley

The Objections

911/W00744/North Wakefield & Stanley/STRAT4 - Dr D Jones
953/W00795/North Wakefield & Stanley/STRAT4 - H Wood

Summary of Objections

- Standard reasons of objection.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- The objections of Dr Jones and H Wood list several standard reasons of objection. However, none are specific to public local amenity open space or of any obvious relevance to Paragraph 2.6.2. I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.

RECOMMENDATION

5/2.9/1 That no modification be made in response to the objections.

2.10 Community Use of Leisure Facilities – paragraph 2.6.5: nws 59 thornes park comprehensive school

The Objection

823/W00512/North Wakefield & Stanley/COM1 - Sport England (Yorkshire)

Summary of Objection

- The deletion of Thornes Park Comprehensive School from the list of establishments to be considered for extended community use is questioned.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- I note that the establishments now listed for potential community use are all schools. However, the former Thornes Park Comprehensive School is no longer a school. It forms part of Wakefield College and is outside the ownership of the Council as education authority. As such, I agree that the listing of the former school in the section on community use of leisure facilities would be inappropriate.

RECOMMENDATION

5/2.10/1 That no modification be made in response to the objection.

2.11 special policy areas - paragraph 2.8.2: nws 64 junction 40, dewsbury road; nws 65 (D54) LAND AT snowhill; nws 66 stanley royd hospital; nws d53 pinderfields hospital; former newmarket colliery, bottom boat

The Objections

1086/G00322/All/SPAS

785/G00112/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA1

785/G00174/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA1

785/W00379/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA1

785/W00566/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA1

259/W00382/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA1

939/W00662/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA1

932/G00215/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

932/G00216/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

932/RG00075/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

932/RG00076/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

932/W00664/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

932/RW00235/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

161/RW00018/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

844/G00175/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

844/W00580/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

844/RW00241/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

844/RW00242/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

844/RW00243/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

1086/RW00246/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

788/W00373/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2

- GOYH

- New Chelmsford Estates Ltd

- New Chelmsford Estates Ltd

- New Chelmsford Estates Ltd

- New Chelmsford Estates Ltd

- Barratt Leeds

- St James's Investment &

- Property Company Limited

- Yorkcourt Properties Ltd

- Yorkcourt Properties Ltd

- Yorkcourt Properties Ltd

- Yorkcourt Properties Ltd

- Yorkcourt Properties Ltd

- Yorkcourt Properties Ltd

- Mrs M D Harrison

- LPA Receivers

- LPA Receivers

- LPA Receivers

- LPA Receivers

- LPA Receivers

- GOYH

- Mr C P Haigh

872/W00588/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2	- Miss A Johnson
880/W00598/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2	- Anne Parkin
911/W00742/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2	- Dr D Jones
953/W00797/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2	- H Wood
1078/W00808/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA2	- Fiona Law
935/G00225/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA3	- Secretary of State for Health
935/G00226/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA3	- Secretary of State for Health
935/W00672/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA3	- Secretary of State for Health
1086/RW00247/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA3	- GOYH
823/W00515/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA3	- Sport England (Yorkshire)
871/W00611/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA3	- Kevin Swift
911/W00741/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA3	- Dr D Jones
953/W00798/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA3	- H Wood
1078/W00809/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA3	- Fiona Law
1086/RW00248/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA4	- GOYH
438/W00230/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA4	- Nicholas Shields
814/W00488/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA4	- John Milsom
871/W00493/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA4	- Kevin Swift
823/W00516/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA4	- Sport England (Yorkshire)
872/W00589/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA4	- Miss Ann Johnson
911/W00736/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA4	- Dr D Jones
953/W00799/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA4	- H Wood
1078/W00810/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA4	- Fiona Law
896/G00284/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA5	- Oulton Estates (Canada) Ltd and - Langtree Group Plc
896/G00282/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA5	- Oulton Estates (Canada) Ltd and - Langtree Group Plc
896/G00283/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA5	- Oulton Estates (Canada) Ltd and - Langtree Group Plc
940/W00667/North Wakefield & Stanley/SPA5	- J Walkden

Summary of Objections

- Land to the west of Junction 40, Dewsbury Road should be removed from the Green Belt and added to the Special Policy Area.
- An element of housing should be allowed for at Junction 40, Dewsbury Road.
- The whole of the Snowhill area west of the A650 should be allocated for development by mixed uses with predominant emphasis on B1 but including provision for housing.
- The urban forest requirement at Snowhill should be removed.
- Small-scale retail development should be permitted at Snowhill.
- Provision should be made for leisure activities at Snowhill.
- There are traffic and pedestrian safety problems arising from development at Snowhill.
- There should be no development to the south of Ruskin Avenue. This land should be excluded from the Special Policy Area.
- There should be appropriate levels of parking at Snowhill.

- Pubs and restaurants should not be discouraged at Snowhill.
- The designation of Snowhill, Stanley Royd Hospital and Pinderfields Hospital as Special Policy Areas is not acceptable.
- Land between the A650 and the A61 Leeds Road should be allocated for housing purposes.
- There would be loss of recreational land, countryside, flora, fauna and a green corridor to building; loss of the separate identity of communities; and pressure on schools.
- Standard reasons of objection.
- There is the lack of a comprehensive overview to the development of Snowhill, Stanley Royd Hospital and Pinderfields Hospital.
- At Stanley Royd Hospital, account must be taken of high site development costs when an appropriate proportion of affordable housing is negotiated.
- The housing capacity of the Stanley Royd Hospital site has been significantly underestimated.
- The retention or replacement of playing fields at Stanley Royd and Pinderfields hospitals should be required.
- The Stanley Royd and Pinderfields hospital sites should be considered together.
- The Stanley Road and Pinderfields hospital sites should be treated as part of the Victorian and Edwardian suburbs to the south.
- The Pinderfields Hospital Special Policy Area should exclude the proposed A61 to A642 Link Road.
- Green fields and open space at the Pinderfields Hospital site should not be built on.
- Mature trees and hedgerows at the Pinderfields Hospital site would be lost.
- The Pinderfields Hospital area should not be saturated by dense housing estates. The area is likely to become over-developed.
- The Pinderfields Hospital allocation is too vague.
- Land at the former Newmarket Colliery, Bottom Boat should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated as a Special Policy Area for mixed-use development.
- Mixed development of housing and industry is essential on land adjacent to the Moorhouse Estate, Bottom Boat.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Junction 40, Dewsbury Road

- Starting with the Junction 40, Dewsbury Road Special Policy Area, I can appreciate that employers, developers and investors would see the area of Green Belt land to the west as a natural extension to the SPA. However, I note that, at the end of 2000, nearly 535 ha of employment land were available. To my mind, any “pressing and continuing demand for employment uses” should be directed towards existing sites. Such sites would not all enjoy close proximity to a motorway junction and other benefits. Nevertheless, they form part of a portfolio that meets the Council’s broader strategic aims.

- I would add that, to my mind, the objection site serves a number of important purposes. As identified by the Council, it checks the unrestricted sprawl of the built-up area; assists in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; prevents the merger of neighbouring towns; and assists in urban regeneration. I recognise that other features, such as the motorway or the golf course, could be used to check urban sprawl; but they would only do so by setting a new boundary to further sprawl. I have concluded that there are no exceptional circumstances that would warrant taking this land out of the Green Belt and its allocation as part of the Special Policy Area.
- With regard to the inclusion of an element of housing within the existing SPA, it is stated that additional housing allocations are necessary to meet the requirements of Regional Planning Guidance. However, I have not found this to be the case. As stated in Volume 2 of my report, the housing needs of the District can be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations.
- I am aware that Government policy is supportive of mixed-use developments in appropriate circumstances. I would expect supportable schemes to have been carefully conceived and planned. They might include schemes where housing is introduced and adds vitality to town centre locations where a variety of uses and good public transport already exists. Alternatively, in other sustainable locations, a successful mixed-use development might be characterised by a balance of housing, employment, leisure and community facilities in an attractive setting.
- In the present case, I do not consider that the objector's proposals can be commended. Development of the majority of the site is proceeding in accordance with the UDP allocation, a development brief and an overall planning permission. Any significant changes could have important implications for the Council's strategy. In addition, although put forward as "reallocation of the whole site for mixed use development", it is clear that the housing element would be located in the southeast corner. To my mind, the end result would be part business park, part housing rather than an integrated whole with an appropriate range of uses. All in all, I find that there is no justification for a mixed-use or housing allocation.

Land at Snowhill

- The main part of this discussion concerns that part of the Snowhill Special Policy Area west of the A650. The land between the A650 and the A61 Leeds Road is considered towards the end of this sub-section.

"Openness" as a Determining Factor

- At the Inquiry, the Council emphasised the importance of "openness" at Snowhill and the view that openness should be a paramount influence in determining the type and nature of land uses. In this regard, support was drawn from the report of the Inspector hearing objections into what is now the adopted Unitary Development Plan. I have taken into account the conclusions of the previous Inspector (Core Document 52, Volume 4, Paragraphs 10.36 to 10.57). However, I do not place the same emphasis as the Council upon openness.
- In terms of the Inspector's conclusions, I would summarise what I consider to be the relevant points as follows:
 - At the time of his deliberations, the previous Inspector agreed that, as recognised in the Western Local Plan, the Snowhill area was an environmentally valuable area of structural open land.

- The economic arguments for a business park were sufficiently strong to override such considerations.
- A low density, carefully landscaped business park would be, in any event, as sympathetic to the retention of a relatively open area as it is possible for business/industry to be.
- There is no explicit reference in his report to the importance of the re-located playing fields in terms of openness although he recognised that buffer landscaping plus the sports facilities would ensure the continuation of a good environment for residents.
- He saw no reason to resist the sports facilities.
- He placed considerable importance on maintaining a structural element of open land along the A650 approach to the City. This was important both as a way of retaining as much of a break as possible between separate communities and providing a contrast between the approach to the City and the City proper.
- In the light of the above points, other evidence presented to me and my own observations on site, I have drawn my own conclusions concerning the future of the site:
 - The original idea of Snowhill as a structural piece of open land within the built-up area has been overtaken by events.
 - To maintain a good environment for residents is of continuing importance; but this could be achieved in a number of ways.
 - Density of development and a high standard of landscaping are factors in achieving a quality environment.
 - The objectives of separating communities and achieving a distinct approach to the City are still relevant. These can be achieved by retaining the playing fields at the northern end of the site; implementing planning conditions that require landscaping between the business park and the A650; and maintaining policies that protect the eastern fringe of the A650 corridor.
 - The Snowhill land is a major and still largely undeveloped tract of urban land in a very important location relative to the City centre and the M1 motorway. The principles of sustainability lead me to conclude that the importance of this asset for built development should be fully recognised.
- I would add that, in its present state, the site could not realistically be described as an “open recreational area”, significant “urban countryside” or an important “green corridor”. In my opinion, certainly when seen from the A650, the site is flat and uninteresting. There are unrelieved views across land that is still in agricultural use to the south of Red Hall Lane. To the north, site preparation works have scarred the landscape. Only a limited amount of business park development has taken place and the landscaping is not yet established.

The Urban Forest Proposal

- From the above discussion, it follows that I do not see openness as of paramount importance. I appreciate that an urban forest could be seen as a natural substitute for playing fields. However, I see no need to perpetuate the openness that would have been provided by the re-located playing fields particularly when the area under discussion amounts to 22 ha of well-located urban land.
- I would not decry the Council’s support for the White Rose Forest or attempts to take natural opportunities where they exist. However, where any sizeable allocations are concerned, I would

expect them to be in accordance with a sound policy background and plan for implementation. In the present case, although Policies E5 and E10 are supportive of additional woodland planting, they make no reference to a concept as important as a sub-regional urban forest. In addition, I do not consider that the playing field land is in a location central to the strategic aims of the White Rose Forest.

- In short, although I can see smaller areas of woodland at Snowhill contributing to the overall urban forest concept, I do not consider that there is a sustainable case for using such a large area of strategically important land for urban forest purposes.

The Case for More B1 Floorspace

- The supporters of the case for more B1 floorspace point to what they consider to be the unique advantages of the Snowhill location and the absence of any real alternatives. Be that as it may, I note that planning permission exists for a business park of some 46,500 sq m of floorspace but that only one relatively small building has so far been built and occupied. There may be good reasons for a “slow” start to the implementation of the project; but the fact remains that, in the context of a review plan extending up to 2006, the majority of the site is undeveloped. I was told that there was a “possibility” of the allocation being taken up by the end of the Plan period. However, in the light of all the above factors, my own judgement is that there is sufficient land at Snowhill to meet the on-going needs of the business community.
- The need for land for business park development is to be considered as part of the regional employment land survey to be carried out under Policy E3 of Regional Planning Guidance. Any shortage of B1 land in the District beyond 2006 would be considered at the time of the full review of the UDP; also whether Snowhill is the best location in which to meet any part of that demand. For the time being, I am satisfied that sufficient land has been allocated.

The Need for Housing

- The proposals presented on behalf of Yorkcourt Properties Ltd illustrate some 6.7 ha of housing land. It was stated that there is a clear need for sites alternative to those identified in the Revised Deposit Alterations. At the Inquiry, Snowhill was put forward as a priority site in terms of the search sequence in PPG 3 although it was acknowledged, in cross-examination, that the site did not fall within the definition of previously developed land as set out in Annex C of the guidance. For my part, I agree that Snowhill should not be treated as a brownfield site.
- I have determined that the housing needs of the District, over the Plan period, can be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. The case for a mixed-use development is discussed below. However, in this and all other respects, I have concluded that there are no considerations that would justify the residential component envisaged.

The Case for an Extended Range of Uses

- For Yorkcourt Properties Ltd, it is contended that the range of uses on the site should be extended to include a far more comprehensive form of development. The uses put forward are financial and professional services; business; food and drink; hotels; residential institutions; non-residential institutions; assembly and leisure; leisure uses; housing; and education use, including a training centre. In addition, the evidence for LPA Receivers argues that pubs and restaurants should not be discouraged.
- For my part, I note that, with the main exception of housing that I have discussed separately, there is a degree of acceptance to most of these uses either in the planning permission for the business park or in the text of the Revised Deposit Alterations. One additional exception is

residential institutions other than as a residential school, college or training centre. Another is assembly and leisure uses which, under the terms of the planning permission, would exclude cinemas, concert halls, bingo halls, casinos or dance halls. In addition, the text states that any retail or leisure uses would be restricted in line with the UDP and PPG 6. For example, pubs and restaurants should be encouraged to locate in existing and proposed local centres.

- In my opinion, and as indicated in the Revised Deposit Alterations, the guiding principle should be that any non-business use should complement the main role of the Special Policy Area as a business park. To do otherwise could lead to Snowhill becoming a destination for non-business uses in its own right, potentially undermining the retail and leisure hierarchy as well as leading to additional traffic movements and other undesirable consequences. In the circumstances, I see no need to change the guidance set out in the reasoned justification or add to the range of uses identified by the Council. No change to Policy L2 would be appropriate. In addition, as recognised at the Inquiry, there would be no need to amend Policy S3.

The Concept of a Mixed Use Development

- The proposals of Yorkcourt Properties Ltd have been put forward as a sustainable mixed use development. To my mind, however, the scheme would be dominated by business uses. The residential component would comprise 6.7 ha out of a total site area of 73.3 ha. In my opinion, the proposals put forward would not amount to the sort of balanced mixed use development that is envisaged in Paragraphs 8 to 12 of PPG 1.

- I have already concluded that there is no justification, at this point in time, for residential development at Snowhill. However, I have also recognised that Snowhill is an important asset representing as it does a major area of largely undeveloped land relatively close to the centre of Wakefield. With sufficient flexibility in the implementation of proposals up to 2006, I can see that there would be scope for truly mixed-use development proposals to come forward as part of the full review of the UDP. Whether or not such a vision is taken forward would in large measure depend on the aspirations of the Council and the developers of the site.

The Appropriateness of the Special Policy Area Procedure

- The Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber has stated that the designation of special policy areas is not acceptable. More certainty about the nature, mix and extent of the type of development likely to be acceptable is needed. More specific and robust proposals should be included and regard paid to prevailing guidance.

- For my part, I feel that making further reference to the need to pay regard to Government guidance would strengthen the text. However, I appreciate the appropriateness of a mix of land uses and an element of flexibility. This is recognised in the extant planning permission. Bearing in mind also proposals for revised Supplementary Planning Guidance, I have concluded that continuation of the special policy area approach would be a satisfactory mechanism for encouraging related development.

The Extent of the Special Policy Area

- It is not envisaged that land used by or acquired for the Outwood Grange School playing fields would be affected by the Snowhill development. As such, I consider that such land should be excluded from the Special Policy Area in line with the Council's proposed change North Wakefield and Stanley PC/1. On the other hand, land southeast of Ruskin Avenue could have a useful role to play, notably in protecting residents' amenities. In my opinion, this land, although it can be distinguished from the main area of Snowhill, should remain as part of the Special

Policy Area. Land at Victoria Way, Newton Hill (NWS H64) is considered elsewhere in my report.

Other Matters

- There remain a number of other matters. These include standard reasons of objection; matters relating to traffic and pedestrian safety; and parking standards. In addition, reference has been made to the importance of flora and fauna although there is no evidence that suggests to me that any special measures need to be taken in this regard.
- The objections of Dr Jones and H Wood list several standard reasons of objection. However, none are specific to special policy areas or of any obvious relevance to Paragraph 2.8.2 or Snowhill. Similar comments apply to the Stanley Royd and Pinderfields hospital sites. I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.
- In terms of pedestrian safety, I am aware that matters of detail are being investigated by the Council. Given the broad-brush nature of the Unitary Development Plan, specific mention in the Review would be inappropriate. On the wider question of the adequacy of the highway network to cope with additional demands, any significant development would need to be the subject of a Transport Assessment. However, on the basis of the technical evidence before me, I am satisfied that there would be no fundamental problems in this regard. Similar comments apply to other types of infrastructure and facilities.
- On behalf of LPA Receivers, it is argued that parking levels should be appropriate to the location and operational requirements; also be sufficient to encourage inward investment. For my part, I consider that the Council's approach is in line with Government policy and that there is inadequate justification for departing from the proposed District-wide standards.

Land East of the A650

- With regard to the main area of land east of the A650 and south of Red Hall Lane, the objector considers that, in line with parcels of land to the north, the site should be allocated for housing purposes. However, this objection was made at the stage of the Initial Deposit Alterations. Under the Revised Deposit Alterations, there is no intention on the part of the Council to allocate land to the north for housing purposes. As such, the context for the objection has materially changed. Given that the housing needs of the District can be met by urban brownfield land and reconfirmed allocations, I consider that there is no justification for a residential allocation. I have had regard to several matters of detail raised on behalf of the objector but, in my opinion, there are no overriding considerations.

Overview of the Snowhill Special Policy Area

- My conclusions on the Snowhill Special Area relate to four distinct areas. The first area is that part of the SPA east of the A650. Here, I concur with the text of the Revised Deposit Alterations. I envisage that the land bordering the A650 will fulfil a distinct role, helping to provide a contrast between the approach to the City along the A650 and the entry to the City proper. A similar role would be played by the second distinct area, immediately west of the A650. Here, the retained playing fields and "a substantial depth of structure planting/landscaping along the A650 boundary" would help provide a break between separate communities.
- The third distinct area is that represented by the eastern part of the Snowhill area proper, that is, the area where built development would take place pursuant to the planning permission for the business park. Here, I again consider that the text of the Revised Deposit Alterations provides an appropriate context for progressing the development. The final area is the western part of the Snowhill area proper. This includes the 22 ha of land originally conceived as the location for the relocated playing fields and, in the current scheme of things, the area for planting

as part of the White Rose Forest. My conclusion is that none of the proposals – forest, housing or extended business park- would be justified.

- There remains the question of how this fourth area should be treated in the Plan. One suggestion emanating from the Inquiry was that it should become a Protected Area of Search for Long-Term Development. For my part, I agree that the future of this strategically important land should not be determined at this stage. However, the land can be safeguarded through appropriate wording as part of the supporting text to the Special Policy Area rather than as a Protected Area of Search in its own right.
- In conclusion, I envisage that, in due course, the whole of the Snowhill Special Policy Area would be developed albeit to high standards protecting residents' amenities. Some would describe this as unacceptable loss of more land to building or denigration of the environment. However, to my mind, it is important that strategically placed urban land is used in an effective way. In this case, Snowhill no longer has the role of a structural piece of open land. In large part, the area is already committed to development. In a comprehensive overview, it is important to influence the course of on-going development whilst at the same time safeguarding legitimate options for the future.

Stanley Royd Hospital

- With regard to the appropriate proportion of affordable housing, I note that, under Policy H4, unusual costs are a relevant consideration. As part of any planning application, a prospective developer could argue a detailed case. Given that the proposed text refers to “an element” of affordable housing “in accordance with UDP policy H4”, I see no need for any more specific reference.
- In terms of housing capacity, the figure has been revised upwards in the Revised Deposit Alterations from 125 units to 200 units. As such, the original objection has been overtaken by events. In my opinion, taking into account the parkland nature of the site, 200 units is a reasonable estimate. However, I agree with the Council that this figure could be increased if a higher figure can be achieved without detriment to the character of the site and local amenity.
- The objection of the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber to the designation of Stanley Royd Hospital as a Special Policy Area is in terms similar to that noted above under the heading of Snowhill. For my part, I support continuation of the Special Policy Area designation. Bearing in mind the presence of extant Supplementary Planning Guidance in the form of a development strategy, I consider that the special policy area approach will allow appropriate consideration of a range of uses together with an element of flexibility. However, I am of the opinion that making further reference to the need to pay regard to Government guidance would strengthen the text.
- On the matter of playing fields, the Council states that the importance of open space is recognised in the Plan text. In addition, it is considered that various Plan policies together with Government guidance would be sufficient to secure the necessary protection. However, in my opinion, a reading of the text does not give the impression that playing fields should be safeguarded. I would expect the cricket ground on the site to be protected unless it can be demonstrated that provision meets the needs of the population. I consider that the Plan should be modified accordingly.
- Concerning the question of whether the Stanley Royd and Pinderfields hospital sites should be treated together, I note that the Stanley Royd site has been sold subject to planning permission. In addition, it is progressing as a separate development project and to a time-scale

different from the Pinderfields site. To my mind it makes sense for the sites to be subject to separate special policy areas. That is not to say that the projects would proceed in isolation. Matters of common interest, such as access, will need to be resolved and reflected in Supplementary Planning Guidance. In addition, I would also expect the planning applications to be determined in the context of what is happening on surrounding land. All in all, there would be an adequate context for considering these and other developments in north Wakefield.

- Similar considerations would apply in respect of architectural and historic matters. I appreciate that parts of both sites are of such interest; also the Victorian and Edwardian suburban area stretching back to the City centre. However, taking into account my own observations in the area, I do not consider that there are any special qualities deserving of mention in the Plan.
- Nor do I consider that specific mention needs to be made of making better use of Long Causeway. I am aware that the Council wishes to see full use of Long Causeway; also that there are issues relating to lighting and security. However, in my opinion, these are matters best dealt with at the level of the development brief.

Pinderfields Hospital

- Notwithstanding the objections of the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber, I support the designation of Pinderfields Hospital as a Special Policy Area for reasons similar to those stated in the cases of Stanley Royd Hospital and Snowhill. I note that, in addition to the advice in the text, Supplementary Planning Guidance is to be prepared. In these circumstances, I do not consider that the allocation would be too vague. In my opinion, there would be an adequate context for considering future development proposals in this part of Wakefield. However, I recognise that making further reference to the need to pay regard to Government guidance would strengthen the text.
- The objector to the A61 to A642 Link Road states that the scheme is ill considered. It would serve as a ring road and even an M1 bypass. Be that as it may, I am aware that the principle of this highway scheme has already been accepted. It is the subject of a proposal, NWS 34, that is not being changed under the Review Plan. Since the alignment runs through the Pinderfields Hospital site, and the road would serve this development, I consider that the reference in the Pinderfields Hospital section of the Plan is entirely appropriate. I note, however, that the Council is developing a traffic model. The implications of building the link road are to be tested before the scheme is progressed.
- With regard to the playing fields at Pinderfields Hospital, the Plan specifically indicates that playing fields will be important elements in any future redevelopment scheme. In my view, no modification is needed in this regard. All in all, I am of the opinion that the Plan would provide the basis for a development that would avoid the unacceptable loss of green fields or open space as well as any significant mature trees and hedgerows. Given all the safeguards, I have no reason to believe that the area would be over-developed or saturated with dense housing estates.

Former Newmarket Colliery, Bottom Boat

- With regard to land at Bottom Boat, one of the principal arguments is that there is a need to identify more new housing allocations. However, as can be seen from the conclusions drawn in Volume 2 of my report, the housing needs of the District over the Plan period can be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. In any event, considerable areas of infill land within urban areas, land of a higher priority in the sequential approach, would be available.
- It is further argued that additional well-located employment land is required to replace current allocations that have no realistic prospect of coming forward. In this respect, I note that,

at the end of 2000, nearly 535 ha of employment land were available within the District in circumstances where the take-up has averaged about 24 ha a year. I appreciate that many of the sites may be unsuitable for one reason or another; also that the take-up rates do not reflect the true picture. However, I find it difficult to believe the stock of employment land will not meet reasonable demands over the Plan period.

- In particular, the Council has highlighted availability at Wakefield Europort, albeit limited; Normanton Industrial Estate extension; M1 Junction 40; the former Glasshoughton Colliery site; Whitwood Common; M1 Junction 39 Special Policy Area; Snowhill; and Green Lane, Featherstone. In my opinion, irrespective of the genuine availability of the objection site for early development, sites such as these would meet the on-going needs of residents of the western area of Wakefield and elsewhere.
- In terms of the regeneration case, attention is drawn to the relatively high levels of unemployment particularly in the northern, central and eastern wards of Wakefield. I recognise that employment opportunities along the Aberford Road corridor are limited. Nevertheless, many of the employment areas identified above are readily accessible to residents in the wards mentioned. In addition, the provisions of the Review Plan are likely to yield opportunities, additional to existing opportunities, in the non-manufacturing and non-warehousing sectors.
- All in all, I consider that there are no arguments with regard to housing, employment, regeneration or other matters that would override the provisions of the Review Plan. There is no necessity to take land at Bottom Boat out of the Green Belt and no exceptional circumstances in this regard.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5/2.11/1 That the extent of the Snowhill Special Policy Area be modified in accordance with the Council's proposed change NORTH WAKEFIELD & STANLEY PC/1.

5/2.11/2 That the four paragraphs starting at the phrase "There is no longer a relocation requirement for 55 acres of playing fields..." be deleted from the Plan.

5/2.11/3 That the following words be added at the end of the paragraph before the heading West of A61/East of A650: "All development will be progressed in line with prevailing Government guidance."

5/2.11/4 That following the above insertion, a new paragraph be added stating: "There is no longer a requirement to relocate 22 ha of playing fields. The most appropriate use for the land previously earmarked for playing fields/sports facilities has not yet been determined. For the time being, therefore, development will be restricted to that which is necessary for the operation of existing uses together with such temporary uses as would not prejudice the possibility of long-term development."

5/2.11/5 That in the first paragraph under the heading Stanley Royd Hospital, the following new sentence be substituted for the words shown in bold type: "The development will be progressed in line with prevailing Government guidance including PPG 6."

5/2.11/6 That the following sentence be added at the end of the same paragraph: "The existing cricket ground shall be retained or replaced unless it can be shown that provision meets the needs of the population."

5/2.11/7 That the following sentences be substituted for the final sentence of the first paragraph under the heading NWS D53 Pinderfields Hospital: "The development will be progressed in line with prevailing Government guidance including PPG 6."

5/2.11/8 That no other modification be made in response to the objections.

3. Ossett/horbury community area proposals

3.1 employment PROPOSALS - section 3.1: land at hawkingcroft road, horbury bridge

The Objection

751/G00141/Ossett / Horbury/EP1 - Hirst Bros

Summary of Objection

- Land at Hawkingcroft Road, Horbury Bridge should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for industrial use.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- In terms of land at Hawkingcroft Road, Horbury Bridge, the objection indicates that the Plan should properly reflect the historic form, function, use and nature of the land. It is stated that the relocation of the site to the Green Belt was an error resulting in an anomalous situation. The opportunity should be taken to rectify the position. In this regard, there are clear difference of emphasis between the written representations of the Council and those of the objector. However, I have noted that:
 - The site has been in the Green Belt since the time of the 1986 Local Plan. There is no evidence of any challenge to this status during adoption of the Local Plan or the subsequent Unitary Development Plan.
 - Until cleared for unauthorised uses in the 1990's, the site consisted of regenerating woodland.
 - The industrial building adjoining the objection site used to be a railway wagon repair works with some sidings along the southern boundary. The larger portion of the land remained undeveloped.
 - When the works closed and were converted to other industrial and business uses, the objection site remained unoccupied.
 - Enforcement action relating to unauthorised storage and distribution activities was taken in 1993.
 - An application for a Certificate of Lawful Use for storage and other activities was refused in 1999.
 - Enforcement action relating to stockpiling and other activities was taken in 2000. A related appeal was withdrawn.
- The weight of evidence suggests to me that any industrial activities have been fairly recent. The site was quite properly included in the Green Belt in the 1980's. Further, there is no evidence of any error in this regard. In addition, from what I saw on site, I would say that the objection site serves several important Green Belt purposes. It checks the sprawl of the built-up area of Horbury; prevents the merger of Horbury and Ossett; and assists in safeguarding from

encroachment the countryside that lies beyond the settlement. I also saw that the Green Belt in this area can be readily identified.

- With regard to urban regeneration, I appreciate that removal of this site from the Green Belt would facilitate expansion and modernisation of the adjoining premises. However, in the interests of the proper planning of the area, it is important that employment is distributed in accordance with the identified strategy and proposals including the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Far from assisting in regeneration, I consider that implementation of the objection proposal could undermine wider regeneration objectives. All in all, I have concluded that there are no exceptional circumstances such as to justify the removal of this land from the Green Belt and its allocation for industrial purposes.

RECOMMENDATION

5/3.1/1 That no modification be made in response to the objection.

- 3.2 housing sites - paragraph 3.2.2: oh h24 storrs hill, ossett; land at paleside, SWITHENBANK, ossett; oh h70 storrs hill road, horbury bridge; oh h73 quarry hill, horbury bridge; oh w13 benton park, wakefield road, horbury; wakefield road, ossett; land off wakefield road, gawthorpe; land at green lane, horbury junction; land off dudfleet lane, horbury; wakefield road, horbury; gawthorpe nurseries, gawthorpe

The Objections

1065/RW00244/Ossett / Horbury/HP2	- Moorfield Developments Ltd
907/W00801/Ossett / Horbury/HP2	- Keyland Developments Ltd
219/W00001/Ossett / Horbury/HP4	- Jesus College, Cambridge
230/W00304/Ossett / Horbury/HP4	- Gawthorpe Maypole Committee
790/W00387/Ossett / Horbury/HP5	- Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd
790/W00388/Ossett / Horbury/HP6	- Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd
1106/W00690/Ossett / Horbury/HP6	- Save Horbury Heritage Group
884/W00599/Ossett / Horbury/HP7	- Steven Kay
896/W01325/Ossett / Horbury/HP8	- Langtree Group plc
894/G00263/Ossett / Horbury/HP9	- Beazer Homes Limited
894/G00264/Ossett / Horbury/HP9	- Beazer Homes Limited
751/G00138/Ossett / Horbury/HP10	- Hirst Bros
898/G00280/Ossett / Horbury/HP11	- Robert S Hanson
898/G00279/Ossett / Horbury/HP11	- Robert S Hanson
1060/W00720/Ossett / Horbury/HP12	- Orion Homes
787/W00374/Ossett / Horbury/HP13	- Mrs S Marsden

Summary of Objections

- Land at Storrs Hill, Ossett should be allocated for housing purposes to meet requirements under Policy H1. Alternatively, the site should be included in Annex B2.
- Land at Storrs Hill, Ossett should not be released for development. Other brownfield opportunities exist.

- The entirety of land at Paleside, Swithenbank, Ossett should be zoned for housing with provision for an element of open space.
- Some 40% of the land owned by the Gawthorpe Maypole Committee at Paleside, Swithenbank, Ossett should be allocated for housing.
- Land at Storrs Hill Road, Horbury Bridge is unsuitable for housing development.
- The feasibility of housing development on land at Quarry Hill, Horbury Bridge is questioned given the ground conditions.
- Land at Quarry Hill, Horbury Bridge should be promoted as public local amenity open space.
- Land at Benton Park, Wakefield Road, Horbury would be better retained as an open space.
- The allocation for housing purposes of land at Wakefield Road, Ossett is proposed.
- The southern part of land off Wakefield Road, Gawthorpe should be excluded from the Green Belt and designated as a housing allocation.
- Land at Green Lane, Horbury Junction should be allocated for residential development.
- Land off Dudfleet Lane, Horbury should be considered for housing purposes with the river as the Green Belt boundary.
- Land off Wakefield Road, Horbury should be taken out of the Green Belt and allocated for housing purposes.
- Land at Gawthorpe Nurseries, Ossett should be re-designated from Green Belt to housing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- Starting with land at Storrs Hill, Ossett, it is stated on behalf of Moorfield Developments Ltd that the issue is confined to whether there is a need for the release of a site such as this, a site that should be seen as a leading contender. For my part, I have concluded in Volume 2 of my report that the housing needs of the District over the Plan period can be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. I appreciate that the objection site has certain locational advantages, that there are no known constraints and that development would be seen against the backdrop of existing built development; also that the level of local opposition was only nominal. However, in my opinion, there are no overriding considerations.
- Turning to land at Paleside, Swithenbank, Ossett, this is presented as an obvious and straightforward residential development site with the current amenity area being utilised only occasionally. However, as noted above, the housing needs of the District can be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. There is no need to consider sites lower down in the search sequence. I do not consider that there are any overriding considerations in this regard. As such, the residential allocation of this land, either in full or in part, would not be justified.
- The objector to the allocation of land at Storrs Hill Road, Horbury Bridge states that the site is unsuitable for housing development. Attention is drawn to the adjacent railway and marshalling yard; also to potential problems regarding ground conditions. For my part, I note that this is previously developed land within an urban area and is therefore at the top of the search sequence. I also note that a planning application for residential development was recently submitted by a volume housebuilder. I take this as an indication of the suitability and viability of the site for residential purposes. I consider that the allocation should be supported.

- Land at Quarry Hill, Horbury Bridge is another urban brownfield site and, as such, the type of site to be considered first in the sequential approach. The alternative use that has been put forward is public local amenity open space. I appreciate that this is the allocation in the adopted Unitary Development Plan. However, the public has no legal right of access to the site. In addition, I consider that the potential of the site for open space purposes is very limited. In my opinion, the site should be considered for housing purposes.
- I am aware that local highway improvements would be necessary; also that the ground conditions are likely to give rise to additional costs. However, I consider that there are no overriding constraints. Bearing in mind also that developer interest has been shown recently through the renewal of an outline planning permission, I support the housing allocation.
- With regard to land at Benton Park, Wakefield Road, Horbury, I saw that, at the time of my site visit, residential development was nearing completion. Retention as open space is not now a realistic option. The residential allocation should be confirmed.
- The site at Wakefield Road, Ossett lies within the Green Belt. There is existing development to the southeast; and the objection site itself, now overgrown, used to be occupied by a substantial dwelling. I appreciate that the urban edge could be redrawn to embrace this land but I see no necessity so to do. Green Belt boundaries should not be altered merely because land has become overgrown. Further, the housing needs of the District can be met on sites of greater priority. All in all, there are no exceptional circumstances that would justify taking this land out of the Green Belt.
- With regard to land off Wakefield Road, Gawthorpe, it is stated that the site is capable of making a useful contribution if Green Belt revisions are necessary in order to make provision for further development. However, the housing needs of the District can be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. There is no need to draw on greenfield Green Belt sites that lie outside the urban area. There are no exceptional circumstances that support the objector's proposal.
- Land at Green Lane, Horbury Junction can be considered in two main parts. At the eastern end of the site, there are a number of existing industrial buildings that I saw to be used, in the main, as small workshops. This part of the site falls within a green corridor but is otherwise unallocated. The western part of the site is in the Green Belt. It appears to be occupied by a large house in a substantial curtilage although there is an area of land, also within the Green Belt, that adjoins the workshop site. This area is used for open site storage of stone, masonry and what appeared to be road planings and the like.
- On behalf of the objector, the industrial part of the site is described as unsightly, unattractive and wholly unsuitable for continued use. Reference is made to a history of conflict and highway safety issues. For my part, I perceived the buildings and uses to be largely innocuous. I appreciate that access is taken through a residential area but I saw nothing, and have read nothing, to make me believe that cessation of the industrial use should be encouraged by allocating the site for residential purposes.
- With regard to the remainder of the site, it is stated that this serves no Green Belt function. I do not agree. To my mind, the Green Belt boundary has been correctly drawn along the clearly identifiable rear boundaries of properties in Green Lane and at The Sycamores. In this way, the dense built-up area to the south and west is distinguished from the more open area extending to the north and east. The Green Belt designation serves to check the extension of Horbury and assists in safeguarding the countryside, outside the boundary of the built-up area, from

encroachment. Further, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land, the continued designation assists urban regeneration.

- In addition to the above arguments, it is stated that the total housing allocation for the District falls short of what is required to meet predicted housing needs. However, as demonstrated in Volume 2 of my report, this is not the case. In this and all other respects, there are no exceptional circumstances that would justify taking land at Green Lane, Horbury Junction out of the Green Belt or other reasons why any of the land should be allocated for residential development.
- Land off Dudfleet Lane, Horbury is expressed as a logical extension of the urban area. To my mind, any extension of Horbury south of the railway would be totally anomalous; but irrespective of this point, there is no demonstrable necessity to revise the Green Belt boundary. In particular, the housing needs of the District can be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations.
- In respect of Green Belt land off Wakefield Road, Horbury, it is argued that the District will require a significant amount of new housing and that it will be necessary to allocate some greenfield housing sites as well as bring forward brownfield land and Protected Areas of Search. However, those greenfield sites that have been identified as suitable components of the District's housing land supply are infill sites within urban areas and are much higher up the search sequence. In short, irrespective of the extent to which the objection site contributes to the purposes of the Green Belt, there are no exceptional circumstances that would necessitate alteration of the boundaries and allocation of the land for housing purposes.
- The final potential housing site to be considered is land at Gawthorpe Nurseries, Ossett. Here it is argued that all the available housing sites at Gawthorpe village have been developed. Additional land is needed to meet housing and open space requirements and bring social and economic stability. For my part, I did not gain the impression that the area was lacking in open space. More particularly, I would expect housing needs, including those emanating locally, to be met on sites sustainable in nature and location. In this respect, the housing needs of the District can be met on previously developed land within urban areas and reconfirmed allocations rather than on greenfield extensions to villages.
- In addition, I do not consider that the population of Gawthorpe needs to be boosted in order to support local services. Residents already look outside the village for most of their employment and shopping needs as well as secondary education. In my opinion, an increase in the village's population, such as would be occasioned by the objection proposals, would be likely to give rise to an undesirable increase in travel, especially by car. Notwithstanding any beneficial effect on the long-term viability of the Gawthorpe Nurseries, I have concluded that there are no exceptional circumstances that would necessitate revision of the Green Belt boundary.

RECOMMENDATION

5/3.2/1 That no modification be made in response to the objections.

4. south & east wakefield community area proposals

4.1 employment zones - paragraph 4.1.2: sew 2 portobello / fall ings

The Objections

952/G00329/South & East Wakefield/EP1 - G L White Property
952/W01342/South & East Wakefield/EP1 - G L White Property

Summary of Objections

- Land at the former Wakefield Power Station should be allocated for mixed-use purposes including industrial, office and residential uses as well as ancillary retail development if necessary.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- I appreciate that Government policy is supportive of mixed-use developments in appropriate circumstances. However, it appears to me that revised Policy I5 goes a long way towards meeting the objections. Policy I5 would cover industrial and office development and, in conjunction with Policy S4, ancillary retail development as well. The main question remaining is the extent to which residential development should be promoted at the former power station.
- In this regard, I note that important matters relating to health and safety, flooding and access need to be overcome. Given such issues, it would be inappropriate to give specific encouragement to residential development through a special policy area or mixed-use allocation. However, I agree that Supplementary Planning Guidance should be updated to recognise the potential for residential development should current uncertainties be resolved. The text should be modified accordingly.

RECOMMENDATION

5/4.1/1 That the final sentence of the first paragraph under the heading SEW 2 Portobello/Fall Ings be replaced by the following: "Should on-going consultations and negotiation indicate that a significant element of residential development could be appropriate on the site of the former power station, existing Supplementary Planning Guidance in the form of a Development Brief will be revised."

5/4.1/2 That no other modification be made in response to the objections.

4.2 housing sites - paragraph 4.2.2: sew 5 walton lane, sandal; sew h25 & sew 34 durkar lane, crigglestone; sew h27 denby dale road west, calder grove; hollingthorpe hall farm, hollingthorpe lane, crigglestone; land at sandal grange farm, walton lane, sandal; sew 35 land north of hollingthorpe estate, hall green

The Objections

284/W00061/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs E Anderson
284/W00062/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr G C Anderson
285/W00063/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mike & Anne Oldham
320/W00083/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr P Robertshaw
320/W00084/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs A Robertshaw
321/W00085/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- R P Foster
322/W00086/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr I Rowland
322/W00087/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs S Rowland
323/W00088/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs K Williams
324/W00089/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mark Napper
325/W00090/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- R J Slatter
326/W00091/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs K Parry
327/W00092/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- David Wolff
328/W00093/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs L Bartlett
328/W00094/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr R Bartlett
329/W00095/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr J O Malley
330/W00096/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr C Harrison
330/W00097/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- John Ayton
331/W00098/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr P J Turney
333/W00100/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs C Eccles
334/W00101/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- V Wigglesworth
335/W00102/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- A I Chapman
335/W00103/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- S A Chapman
337/W00105/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Pauline Vollands
338/W00106/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- F & M Burgess
339/W00107/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr P Jaworski
340/W00108/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Jon Riddle
341/W00109/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- J A Roberts
342/W00110/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- S M C Fenster
343/W00111/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mark Doyle
344/W00112/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Eddie Needham
345/W00113/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- C A Thuley
343/W00114/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Judith Schoch
343/W00115/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Lillian Bogg
346/W00116/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs K A Barnsley
347/W00117/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr D Taylor
349/W00118/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- P I Allen
347/W00119/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs P Taylor
348/W00120/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs I F Smith
350/W00121/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- J Wood
351/W00122/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr & Mrs R Timothy
352/W00123/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr M J Tobin
353/W00124/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Janet Hull
353/W00125/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Geoffrey Hull
354/W00126/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr G Littledyke
355/W00127/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- M A Ogley
356/W00128/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs E Exall
357/W00129/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- C Burnett
358/W00130/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr N Dowling

358/W00131/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs E Dowling
359/W00132/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr A C Swann
360/W00133/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr L Shotton
361/W00134/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- G Vernon
361/W00135/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- L Vernon
362/W00136/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- David Hargreaves
363/W00137/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- T Aston
364/W00138/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr R Stonehouse
365/W00139/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs N Tibble
366/W00140/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr A Crabtree
367/W00141/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- John-Paul Mount
368/W00142/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Ian Woods
368/W00143/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- M Woods
370/W00145/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr & Mrs W Lill
371/W00146/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs J Ives
372/W00147/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Ruth Parkinson
349/W00148/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- B E Allen
373/W00149/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs K Hirst
373/W00150/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- T E Hirst
374/W00151/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Diane Naylor
375/W00152/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs P Barnes
376/W00153/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr R Horsfall
378/W00154/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr P Kay
379/W00155/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- C Newland
380/W00156/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr M Bashir
381/W00157/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Harry Knighting
407/W00191/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs P A Parry
346/W00205/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Philip Barnsley
377/W00206/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs Evans
440/W00251/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr & Mrs Maw
441/W00252/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs R Lee
442/W00253/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- E M Bannister
443/W00254/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr D M Littlewood
444/W00255/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs I M Harandon
445/W00256/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Margaret Sutcliffe
446/W00257/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs B Firth
449/W00260/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Gladys Hickman
450/W00261/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Stephanie Haw
452/W00263/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- R C Whitehouse
453/W00264/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- T Hollands
454/W00265/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- J S Driver
455/W00266/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Charles & Muriel Jackson
456/W00267/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr A D Leading
457/W00268/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Roger King
458/W00269/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- J Edwards
459/W00270/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs M Michie
460/W00271/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Maureen Nuttall
461/W00272/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- John Goodall
461/W00273/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Ruth Goodall

462/W00274/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- V Buckley
464/W00276/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr P Morton
465/W00277/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Dr K Kerr
466/W00278/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Andrea North
467/W00279/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs U G Cunliffe
469/W00281/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Peter Richmond
470/W00282/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Angie Goddard
471/W00283/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs V Haigh
472/W00284/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs C Wilkinson
473/W00285/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Paul Dodd
474/W00286/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- E Margot Cutt
475/W00287/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Jill Buckley
473/W00288/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Christopher Dodd
473/W00289/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Felicite Dodd
476/W00290/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Jack & Marta Smith
477/W00291/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- E & G Phillips
478/W00292/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- A Cottrell
479/W00293/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs E Smith
480/W00294/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Doreen O Connell
541/W00329/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- A L Cokill
587/W00355/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Betty Littlewood
777/W00407/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr M A Lipp
700/W00424/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr T Butterworth
698/W00426/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Jim Currin
692/W00435/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Ian Dobson
692/W00436/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Ann Dobson
687/W00441/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr G Marshall
687/W00442/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs S Marshall
688/W00443/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr D Bowles
688/W00444/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs H E Bowles
676/W00460/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs C Waddle
818/W00482/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs B Phildrick
817/W00483/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- D Tweddle
816/W00484/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- J Oakley
815/W00485/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- F Lund
809/W00500/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- M E Dyson
808/W00501/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- D I & J H Parkin
806/W00503/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs D Glendenning
805/W00504/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs L Hampshire
803/W00506/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- R Sleight
823/W00520/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Sport England (Yorkshire)
1532/W00533/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- David Shaw
1532/W00534/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Phyllis Shaw
853/W00560/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr M P Chamberlain
856/W00561/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- R I Shaw
848/W00564/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- C McCartney
847/W00565/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- M E Jepson
885/W00601/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- S J Fairbrass
886/W00602/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr & Mrs J R Barrows

839/W00603/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- West Yorkshire Sports & Social Club
871/W00612/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Kevin Swift
1123/W00642/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs J Shidlow
1124/W00643/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr H Lawton
1125/W00644/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr & Mrs A G Lancaster
1126/W00645/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr R A Break
1119/W00646/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs A Sharpe
1084/W00674/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- E I Smith
1127/W00676/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr R G Corby
1128/W00677/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr & Mrs G O Young
1129/W00678/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Revd R Martin
1130/W00679/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs M Johnson
1131/W00680/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Graham Mead
1130/W00681/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- A S Johnson
1132/W00682/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs C A Francos
1133/W00683/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- D M Basu
1134/W00684/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- G H Parsons
1135/W00685/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr J G Saville
1120/W00686/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Alison Edwards
1087/W00687/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr F Taylor OBE
994/W00688/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mrs P Peel
1121/W00694/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- J R D Foxtton
1052/W00702/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Susan Chatterton
1052/W00703/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Terrance Chatterton
1122/W00704/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Mr S J Minney
1063/W00716/South & East Wakefield/HP1	- Cllr N Hazell
29/G00119/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr D Clamp
29/W00380/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr D Clamp
29/W00381/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr D Clamp
29/RW00237/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr D Clamp
29/RW00238/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr D Clamp
411/RW00256/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Bernard Shillitoe
256/W00030/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M McLauchlan
257/W00031/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- B McDonald
258/W00032/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Tattersall
260/W00033/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs A Thorpe
261/W00034/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A G & S E Burton
262/W00035/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P Chapple
263/W00036/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs M Ward
264/W00037/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs B Turton
265/W00038/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs S Walker
266/W00039/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Sibbeson
288/W00072/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S Struger
289/W00073/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Helen Kilgallon
290/W00074/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs W Bannister
291/W00075/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Karen Bedlington
292/W00076/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- N E Heaton
293/W00077/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A Hemingway
294/W00078/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A Lloyd & H Collingwood

295/W00079/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Gaynor & John Godwin
296/W00080/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Nigel Sanderson
297/W00081/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- N Owen
298/W00082/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs M Bedford
391/W00173/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs J Clarke
392/W00174/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- C Cardus
393/W00175/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J S Sainers
394/W00176/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P M Brook
395/W00177/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S Emmerson
396/W00178/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Small
397/W00179/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S M Spencer
399/W00181/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Michael B Butterworth
400/W00182/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- E E Collings
401/W00183/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Crossley
402/W00184/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Marion Walke
403/W00185/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Jenifer & Robert Zapart
404/W00186/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P Hirst
202/W00210/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Crigglestone Parish Council
497/W00244/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P Marshall
495/W00246/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr J M Harrow
494/W00247/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S & N Lowell
493/W00248/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Haghghi
491/W00250/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D J Swan
540/W00307/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P Elkington
541/W00308/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A L Cokill
545/W00311/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- F Gomersall
521/W00320/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A D Mikay
582/W00341/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- L Taylor
583/W00343/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Mahanty
764/W00398/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P Smith
763/W00399/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A A Tanish
776/W00408/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Cosgrove
774/W00411/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- L C Fox
773/W00412/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Sheila Padget
781/W00417/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A Carr
784/W00418/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Roy Allen
701/W00423/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr S A Kirk
697/W00427/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Jenny Wrigglesworth
694/W00432/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs I Henshaw
681/W00450/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Lee
678/W00457/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- B Lynne
1533/W00535/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D & K Spirrett
1534/W00536/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs D Kirlic
1535/W00537/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S Harding
1536/W00538/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- G H & I Collins
1537/W00539/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- H Bettle
1538/W00540/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- G Bowes & J Wree
1539/W00541/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M B Hamell
437/W00631/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- CPRE West Yorkshire

1075/W00636/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Carol Smith
910/W00721/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Alfred McAlpine Homes
1507/W00841/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R Constable
1506/W00842/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs C Soper
1505/W00843/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs K Furch
1504/W00844/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs M Greening
1503/W00845/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs T Swift
1502/W00846/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Revd J Trafford
1501/W00847/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A Bailey
1500/W00848/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Ronald Clarke
1499/W00849/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- David Battye
1498/W00850/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs V Crossland
1497/W00851/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Calvert
1496/W00852/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M A Beaumont
1495/W00853/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Harry Clayton
1494/W00854/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs B Firth
1493/W00855/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Jack Hook
1492/W00856/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P Connolly
1491/W00857/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Dargan
1490/W00858/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- K Dickens
1489/W00859/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs B Beck
1488/W00860/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Glynis Young
1487/W00861/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Alvin Hill
1486/W00862/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Steven Dowle
1485/W00863/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- C Preston
1484/W00864/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Paul & Lesley Stead
1483/W00865/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Peter G Clarke
1482/W00866/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs R Norris
1481/W00867/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Harry Box
1480/W00868/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr Sanderson
1479/W00869/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S J Gomersell
1478/W00870/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs J K Young
1477/W00871/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- L Mook
1476/W00872/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Gillian Astley
1475/W00873/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs E Parker
1474/W00874/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs E Marsden
1473/W00875/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Kittrick
1472/W00876/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Magor
1471/W00877/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs White
1470/W00878/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs N Saxby
1469/W00879/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs A E Morewood
1468/W00880/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs A E Wright
1467/W00881/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A Shepherd
1466/W00882/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs Melitta Webster
1465/W00883/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- C Dixon
1464/W00884/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Beverley Woodward
1463/W00885/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr P Turton
1462/W00886/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs D Craven
1461/W00887/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J E Talbot

1460/W00888/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M & E Alton
1459/W00889/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs E Newton
1458/W00890/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- B K Houlton
1457/W00891/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs M Whiting
1456/W00892/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Joan Gay
1455/W00893/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M I Lonsdale
1454/W00894/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs B Cooke
1453/W00895/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs R Newton
1452/W00896/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Brian Lloyd
1451/W00897/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Elizabeth A Exley
1450/W00898/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S A Box
1149/W00899/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P & H Jenkinson
1448/W00900/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Claire Richardson
1447/W00901/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J & B R Dunstan
1446/W00902/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- David Slater
1445/W00903/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Barry Haigh
1444/W00904/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- David E Wainwright
1443/W00905/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Gillian Clayton
1442/W00906/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Frudd
1441/W00907/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs P Robinson
1440/W00908/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Lorna Lea & Edward Howson
1439/W00909/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs Annie Heaton
1438/W00910/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Frank & Helen Roche
1437/W00911/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Brian Draper
1436/W00912/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs Mallinson
1435/W00913/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs A M Newby
1434/W00914/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr J Johnson
1433/W00915/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Jean Morton
1432/W00916/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs S Jenkins
1430/W00918/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs C Rys
1429/W00919/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Lesley Beckwith
1428/W00920/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Jowitt
1427/W00921/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- G F & D Addy
1426/W00922/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Karen Trickett
1425/W00923/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- H & M Myer
1424/W00924/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs J Harrison
1423/W00925/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Susan Barker
1422/W00926/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- W Swaine
1421/W00927/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Buck
1420/W00928/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs C M Sunderland
1419/W00929/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Gordon Gerrard
1418/W00930/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs G Rushforth
1416/W00932/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Tracy Woodfield
1415/W00933/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs J A Mayou
1414/W00934/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs D North
1413/W00935/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P Everett
1412/W00936/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R Barker
1411/W00937/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Orange
1410/W00938/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M A Wright

1409/W00939/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Barnett
1408/W00940/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Rushton
1407/W00941/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M Morgan
1406/W00942/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs J Hyman
1405/W00943/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Harry Stephenson
1404/W00944/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs G Cluderay
1403/W00945/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs T Senior
1401/W00947/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs G M Crossley
1400/W00948/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs W Greensmith
1399/W00949/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M J & D A Cullen
1398/W00950/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- G E Lee
1397/W00951/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S Pell
1396/W00952/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs P Dixon
1395/W00953/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- W Balmforth
1394/W00954/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- John Woodward
1393/W00955/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs M Cousins
1392/W00956/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M W Lendhill
1391/W00957/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs M Sellars
1390/W00958/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs S A Jones
1389/W00959/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs P Day
1388/W00960/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- L & R M Harvey
1387/W00961/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Steven Grainger
1386/W00962/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S Rhodes
1385/W00963/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Dennis Wilcock
1384/W00964/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Carter
1383/W00965/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- I Collins
1382/W00966/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R Clifton
1071/W00967/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs R Grant
1381/W00968/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P O Daniels
1380/W00969/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- B S Tomlinson
1379/W00970/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Janine Wood
1378/W00971/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- C R Scholes
1377/W00972/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs F Parkinson
1376/W00973/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- E Frank
1375/W00974/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J & A Swallow
1374/W00975/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M Smith
1373/W00976/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- B Wainwright
1372/W00977/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs R W Henshaw
1371/W00978/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Pamela Stoneley
1370/W00979/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Julie Woffendin
1369/W00980/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Argyle
1368/W00981/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Tonia Brooks
1367/W00982/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M S L Bury
1366/W00983/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- John Tweedle
1365/W00984/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs F R Martin
1364/W00985/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Debra Coulter
1363/W00986/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Duke
1362/W00987/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Parry
1361/W00988/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- G Cotton

1360/W00989/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Ward
1359/W00990/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs W Hutchinson
1358/W00991/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- B F & F M Shaw
1357/W00992/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs M J Farrow
1356/W00993/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M D Robinson
1355/W00994/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M A Pulford
1354/W00995/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs B Blackburn
1353/W00996/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs J Crompton
1351/W00998/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs G Spurr
1350/W00999/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs G M Lancaster
1349/W01000/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs J Marsh
1348/W01001/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Littlewood
1347/W01002/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs B Tudor
1346/W01003/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr H Russell
1345/W01004/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs A Page
1344/W01005/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs A Feather
1343/W01006/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs George Aubrey
1342/W01007/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs J Jennings
1341/W01008/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Marc & Helen Donnelly
1340/W01009/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Margaret Breakwell
1339/W01010/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Dr G A Brain & N Atkinson
1338/W01011/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Steven Barton
1337/W01012/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- David Wilks
1336/W01013/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Miss J Craven
1334/W01014/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- T A Wood
1333/W01015/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S Brewer
1331/W01016/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Stuart Edward Kirkbyson
1330/W01017/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- V Finnigan
1329/W01018/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- E McDonald
1328/W01019/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J L Berry
1327/W01020/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs J Long
1326/W01021/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs M Kirkby
1325/W01022/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P A Smith
1324/W01023/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Tomlinson
1323/W01024/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mollie Marsden
1322/W01025/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Scott
1321/W01026/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- K Mollart
1320/W01027/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J R Ives
1319/W01028/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R Philpott
1318/W01029/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs J Ackrill
1317/W01030/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J P Crompton
1315/W01032/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs A Holstead
1314/W01033/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs F Todd
1313/W01034/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Moulson
1312/W01035/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs A Martin
1311/W01036/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr H Lunn
1310/W01037/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- B Gearey
1309/W01038/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R T Avery
1308/W01039/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs D Duke

1307/W01040/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Keith & Susan Nichol
1306/W01041/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P & D Hand
1305/W01042/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Michael Issott
1304/W01043/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- K A Thompson
1303/W01044/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Jean & Dennis Hall
1302/W01045/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- B W Darbyshire
1301/W01046/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- E & C Austerberry
1300/W01047/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs E Clarke
1299/W01048/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Debra Parr
1298/W01049/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Simon Tennyson
1297/W01050/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr A Gough
1296/W01051/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs E Cotton
1295/W01052/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs I R Lapidge
1294/W01053/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs W Kent
1293/W01054/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs S Oldroyd
1292/W01055/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- C J & L Pickersgill
1291/W01056/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs H Pankhurst
1290/W01057/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mildred Irene Walker
1289/W01058/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs S Brear
1288/W01059/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Diane Hunt
1287/W01060/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Graham Barron
1286/W01061/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Tina Hood
1285/W01062/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Jill Burton
1284/W01063/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs H Laverick
1283/W01064/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Hodson
1282/W01065/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- L Gorton
1280/W01066/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A Hobson
1279/W01067/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- N Gibson
1278/W01068/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Pauline Smith
1277/W01069/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Slater
1276/W01070/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Janet Firth
1275/W01071/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs C Mason
1274/W01072/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs N W Porter
1273/W01073/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs N Parkin
1272/W01074/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs K James
1271/W01075/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Sidney Scott
1270/W01076/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Tinker
1269/W01077/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D M Williams
1268/W01078/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S Heaton
1267/W01079/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs S Howard
1266/W01080/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A J Marshall
1265/W01081/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Stead
1264/W01082/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Adele Cockel
1247/W01083/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P Tate
1263/W01084/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Susan Grayson
1262/W01085/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Rush
1261/W01086/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D J Rennie
1260/W01087/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs S Wood
1259/W01088/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Stanton

1258/W01089/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- V Hall & B Bennett
1257/W01090/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs Susan Hartley
1255/W01092/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs Hargreaves
1254/W01093/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- C Luford
1253/W01094/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs P Smith
1252/W01095/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Alison Wilson
1251/W01096/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs J Dunnington
1250/W01097/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs Lesley Winter
1249/W01098/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Paul Fowler
1248/W01099/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- B M Russell
1246/W01100/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs R Swift
1245/W01101/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs King
1244/W01102/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs R G Cockell
1243/W01103/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Place
1242/W01104/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs R Ward
1241/W01105/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs J Wagstaff
1281/W01106/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Brian Fish
1239/W01107/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M A Whitworth
1238/W01108/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- K H Ramsden
1237/W01109/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Huxall
1236/W01110/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S Hemingway
1235/W01111/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs C North
1234/W01112/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D S & P S Lawson
1233/W01113/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Richardson
1232/W01114/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Mosley
1231/W01115/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs J W Cranswick
1230/W01116/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Chris Imrie
1229/W01117/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Vivienne Gott
1228/W01118/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs M Kidd
1227/W01119/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Eric Gosnay
1226/W01120/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs J R Stephens
1225/W01121/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs F Potter
1224/W01122/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Fleming
1223/W01123/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs E W Morgan
1222/W01124/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs MacDonald
1221/W01125/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J & A Nichol
1220/W01126/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R T Littlewood
1219/W01127/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A Norbury
1218/W01128/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D S Barker
1217/W01129/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs S Evans
1216/W01130/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- I & M Wood
1215/W01131/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- H Scuffam
1214/W01132/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Michael Heslegrave
1213/W01133/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A Gill
1212/W01134/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Ian Ward
1211/W01135/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs G Marshall
1210/W01136/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- B & B Turton
1209/W01137/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs T Francis
1208/W01138/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- David Holroyd

1207/W01139/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs G T Chamberlain
1206/W01140/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs J Withers
1204/W01142/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R York
1203/W01143/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Graeme Smith
1202/W01144/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A Taylor & L Ainley
1201/W01145/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Pauline J Rylance
1200/W01146/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Patricia Price
1199/W01147/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Jones
1198/W01148/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Philip MacDonald
1197/W01149/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Jayne Blount
1196/W01150/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J & A Waddington
1195/W01151/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- L MacDonald
1194/W01152/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- T Smith
1192/W01154/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs A Thickett
1191/W01155/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs W Cox
1190/W01156/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Radovanovic
1189/W01157/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs M Pick
1188/W01158/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Miss S Innes
1187/W01159/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs P Reynolds
1186/W01160/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Kaye
1185/W01161/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs J Pycroft
1184/W01162/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Deighton
1183/W01163/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- David Goldthorpe
1182/W01164/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D E Blackburn
1181/W01165/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Simon Ibbotson
1180/W01166/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Robert Haines
1179/W01167/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs S S Spurr
1178/W01168/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Micklethwaite
1177/W01169/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Brian Radtke
1176/W01170/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs E J Froggett
1175/W01171/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P Wood
1174/W01172/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs T Wrigglesworth
1173/W01173/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs G Noble
1172/W01174/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Jacqueline Conway
1171/W01175/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- N Gardner
1170/W01176/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs A Kitson
1169/W01177/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- E Proctor
1168/W01178/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mary Glazzard
1167/W01179/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Lynne Hargreaves
1166/W01180/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs M Lonsdale
1165/W01181/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R & S Littlewood
1164/W01182/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs M Taylor
1163/W01183/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- E Howell
1162/W01184/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Walter Bedford
1161/W01185/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D L Day
1160/W01186/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- K Bowen
1159/W01187/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs C Hargreaves
1158/W01188/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Paul Eyre
1157/W01189/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Buckley

1156/W01190/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- David Shaw
1155/W01191/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs S Braithwaite
1154/W01192/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Reynolds
1153/W01193/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- T M Depledge
1152/W01194/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs G Jackson
1151/W01195/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- John Mellor
1150/W01196/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Michael Bubb
1149/W01197/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Nolan
1148/W01198/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S & A Marsden
1147/W01199/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A Roe
1146/W01200/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A & SE Kemplay
1145/W01201/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- HC & RP Hargreaves
1144/W01202/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs V Lisle
1143/W01203/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- V T Lisle
1076/W01204/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs E Wright
1142/W01205/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Revd John White
1049/W01206/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- David S Wilby
1049/W01207/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- David S Wilby
1048/W01208/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A Wilby
1047/W01209/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- C A Szczepanski
1046/W01210/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Stephen G Kent
1045/W01211/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J & P Williams
1044/W01212/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs S Lowe
1043/W01213/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs S L Ivin
1042/W01214/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs C Ives
1041/W01215/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Miss M Taylor
1040/W01216/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs W A Mercer
1039/W01217/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Plimmer
1038/W01218/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Gedman & I Wilkinson
1037/W01219/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P E Wainwright
1036/W01220/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- David Parton
1035/W01221/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R Dalby
1034/W01222/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Olwen Grundy
1033/W01223/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Ian Lloyd
1032/W01224/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- David Kew
1031/W01225/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A J Egarr
1030/W01226/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S Egarr
1029/W01227/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Marjorie Roe
1028/W01228/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Helen Roe
1027/W01229/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs E J Froggett
1026/W01230/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R H Goff
1025/W01231/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Jack Butel
1024/W01232/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- O M Beaumont
1023/W01233/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J E Warrender
1022/W01234/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- RE & GM Geary
1021/W01235/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs S E Bickerstaffe
1020/W01236/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Stephen Brooke
1019/W01237/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs D Crane
1017/W01239/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Ralph Oldham

1015/W01241/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Richard Mitchell
1014/W01242/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Margaret Schorah
1013/W01243/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr M Shillito
1012/W01244/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R H Simpson
1011/W01245/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R Brumby
1009/W01247/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Bennett
1008/W01248/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Palframan
1007/W01249/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Swaine
1006/W01250/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Arundel
1005/W01251/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- E Swaine
1004/W01252/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- W & RA Gaines
1003/W01253/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs H Kemplay
1002/W01254/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr D Gunter
1001/W01255/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- B Nottingham
1000/W01256/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs C Hudson
999/W01257/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R Tomlinson
998/W01258/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs B Holden
997/W01259/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs M Allen
996/W01260/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A Firth
995/W01261/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R Finnigan
994/W01262/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P Peel
993/W01263/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- B Asquith
992/W01264/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr R Stead
991/W01265/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs J Butterworth
990/W01266/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- G Berry
989/W01267/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs L McArdle
988/W01268/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Lindley
987/W01269/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Adams
986/W01270/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs D Warren
985/W01271/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs C Thompson
984/W01272/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- A M Greenfield
983/W01273/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Warren
982/W01274/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs A Cross
981/W01275/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R S Podkrajsek
980/W01276/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- H Hardwick & M Snell
979/W01277/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs S Taylor
978/W01278/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- G Foster
977/W01279/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- K J Glover
976/W01280/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- B Suggitt
975/W01281/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M Hargreaves
974/W01282/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M B O'Brien
973/W01283/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J O'Brien
972/W01284/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- H Hinton
971/W01285/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- E J Knight
970/W01286/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Miss C Wilkinson
969/W01287/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs M P Blackshaw
968/W01288/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Sunderland
967/W01289/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Christine Radcliffe
966/W01290/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J, L & A Donlon

965/W01291/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- R Gibson
964/W01292/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- L Belcher
963/W01293/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P Bromby
962/W01294/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- G North
961/W01295/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs G Dobson
960/W01296/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs A Furness
959/W01297/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Armitage
958/W01298/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S Brook
957/W01299/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs R Dennison
956/W01300/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P D Greenwood
955/W01301/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- V J Curnin
954/W01302/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Wright
526/W01303/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D Johnson
930/W01304/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J Herbert
929/W01305/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- G M Hall
928/W01306/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- P M Howdle
927/W01307/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S Beck
926/W01308/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mr & Mrs Fowley
925/W01309/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- K D Norbury
924/W01310/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- F W Britton
923/W01311/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M Whaling
922/W01312/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M Timlin
921/W01313/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- D & E Swain
920/W01314/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S Clarke
919/W01315/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- C Bunney
918/W01316/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- J C & J Masters
917/W01317/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S & M Brown
916/W01318/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- S L Redhead
915/W01319/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- RS & J Rowlands
914/W01320/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- M Marshall
913/W01321/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- E & M Whittle
912/W01322/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- L Johnson
1332/W01346/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Grainger
1335/W01347/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Mrs Tracy Wilks
1332/W01375/South & East Wakefield/HP3	- Grainger
202/W00211/South & East Wakefield/HP4	- Crigglestone Parish Council
834/W00570/South & East Wakefield/HP4	- G D Lloyd
829/W00575/South & East Wakefield/HP4	- Mrs A Gott
828/W00577/South & East Wakefield/HP4	- Vivienne Gott
437/W00632/South & East Wakefield/HP4	- CPRE West Yorkshire
1103/W00697/South & East Wakefield/HP4	- Mrs J Crompton
1103/W00698/South & East Wakefield/HP4	- J P Crompton
58/RW00021/South & East Wakefield/HP4	- Mr I C Cameron
795/G00143/South & East Wakefield/HP7	- Mr D Medforth
795/G00178/South & East Wakefield/HP7	- Mr D Medforth
795/W00563/South & East Wakefield/HP7	- Mr D Medforth
795/W00582/South & East Wakefield/HP7	- Mr D Medforth
174/W0000/South & East Wakefield/HP7	- Mrs K Shelton
174/W00004/South & East Wakefield/HP7	- Mr P A Shelton

515/W00352/South & East Wakefield/HP8	- Mr C Brook
1557/RW00017/South & East Wakefield/HP9	- William Hales
910/W00722/South & East Wakefield/HP10	- Alfred McAlpine Homes

Summary of Objections

- The allocation of land at Walton Lane, Sandal (SEW 5) as a housing site should be deleted.
- Land at Walton Lane, Sandal (SEW 5) should be re-allocated as public local amenity open space and playing fields.
- Land at Durkar Lane, Crigglestone should be allocated for housing development not as a Protected Area of Search or Special Policy Area. The number of dwelling should not be limited to 80 neither should the remainder of the site be used for outdoor leisure.
- Land at Durkar Lane, Crigglestone should not be allocated for housing development.
- Land at Durkar Lane, Crigglestone should be classified as open land within a built-up area or as Green Belt.
- Land at Denby Dale Road West should be allocated as a housing site.
- Land at Denby Dale Road West should not be allocated for housing but should be designated as a Protected Area of Search or as Green Belt/open land within the built-up area.
- Land at Hollingthorpe Hall Farm, Crigglestone should be taken out of the Green Belt and allocated as a housing site.
- Land at Sandal Grange Farm, Walton Lane, Sandal is eminently located to help satisfy the likely demand for an increase in housing land supply.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- The first site to be considered is land at Walton Lane, Sandal (SEW 5). This is a site occupied by the West Yorkshire Sports and Social Club and there have been over 170 objections to its proposed use for housing purposes. The site is already allocated as a housing site in the adopted Unitary Development Plan but there is now an opportunity to review this allocation in the light of present circumstances.
- On a preliminary point, I have considered whether the continued allocation of this site for housing purposes would be contrary to Government guidance such as that set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note No 3: Housing (Core Document 30) and Regional Planning Guidance for Yorkshire and the Humber to 2016 (Core Document 83).
- Paragraph 30 of PPG 3 indicates that, in identifying sites to be allocated for housing purposes, local planning authorities should follow a search sequence starting with the re-use of previously developed land and buildings within urban areas identified in an urban housing capacity study. This priority is reflected at the regional level in Policy H2 of Regional Planning Guidance. As a second priority comes other infill within urban areas, subject to achieving appropriate standards of greenspace and conserving (and where possible, enhancing) the character of the area.
- Leaving aside the fact that Walton Lane has already been allocated, and that no urban capacity study has yet been carried out, I have concluded that the objection site comes in this second order of priority and ahead of sites such as extensions to main urban areas or to market and coalfield towns. The site could not be regarded as previously developed land, given the

definitions in PPG 3; but, irrespective of whether there would be development to the northwest or northeast, I would regard the site as an urban infill site falling as it does within the confines of the built-up area of Wakefield.

- Notwithstanding the potential contribution of brownfield sites such as Wakefield Waterfront, the housing needs of Wakefield cannot be met on previously developed land alone. It was always envisaged that some greenfield sites would be required. It has been suggested that the Walton Lane site should be treated on a par with SEW 6, land off Hendl Lane, Kettlethorpe, and placed in a “reserve” list of housing sites. However, given the conclusions that I have reached below, I consider it reasonable to give the Walton Lane site higher priority and to treat it as a legitimate candidate when considering the housing needs of Wakefield.
- One of the main arguments against re-allocation is that excellent sporting amenities would be lost. However, I do not find that this would be the case. The development of the Walton Lane site for housing purposes would be contractually linked to the provision of replacement facilities elsewhere. I was told that the site under discussion is 0.8 km (half-a-mile) away and that the replacement would be on a like-for-like basis. There would be significant benefits including the potential for expansion of sporting activity and eligibility for funding. It would be possible to maintain the present level of membership on a permanent site. In addition, there could be enhanced general usage as well as provision for the disabled.
- Given the proposed alternative provision, I do not consider that there would be any conflict with Government advice such as that set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note No 17: Sport and Recreation (Core Document 82, Paragraph 42). Nor would the scheme be premature or set a precedent. I appreciate that, perhaps for most members of the Club and the community, the new facility would be further away. For others, it could well be closer. Be that as it may, I have concluded that the community, including local children and youths, would not be deprived of a vital and accessible sports and recreation facility. The new facility could be a central part of community life albeit slightly detached from the main built-up area.
- A related argument is that one of the last open green spaces in Sandal would be lost to housing development. I am aware many objectors feel that there is already too much development in the area including plenty of houses. However, at the same time, I perceived there to be no shortage of open space in the general locality. There are other playing fields to the northwest of the objection site as well as open Green Belt to the northeast and, only a little way away, to the southeast. On a smaller and more local scale, there is a wide central reservation with grass and trees along part of Walton Lane.
- I appreciate that not all the remaining green spaces benefit from public access or are of a scale similar to the Walton Lane playing fields. Nevertheless, I do not consider that development of the objection site would leave the area unacceptably deprived of green open space.
- A further major concern is the traffic implications of the development including access to the site, additional congestion and safety, notably at the junction of Walton Lane and Barnsley Road. For my part, I acknowledge that these are matters that would need to be considered. However, I can envisage acceptable technical solutions in this regard. There is no expert evidence to the contrary nor to the effect that conditions are materially different from those obtaining when the site was originally allocated.
- Various other technical issues have also been raised. These include drainage matters, including the water table, and the possible presence of methane gas. In my opinion, these are matters that are capable of resolution and do not indicate that, in principle, housing development

would be unacceptable. Similarly, no overriding wildlife concerns have been identified; and there is no evidence from the competent authorities that schools or other community facilities would be over-stretched.

- On a final point, I note that Supplementary Planning Guidance will be required. At present, the text erroneously indicates that a development brief has already been prepared. Subject to such a modification, I am satisfied that the land at Walton Lane, Sandal should be re-allocated as a housing site. This would make effective use of land within the urban area. At the same time, and as part of a package that is well advanced, tangible sport and recreational benefits would be secured.
- With regard to land at Durkar Lane, Crigglestone, the central issue to be determined is whether the site is needed as a contribution to the District's overall housing requirements and supply. Subject to this matter, and as set out in an agreed statement (Document GW 1), the Council has no objection in principle to allocation of the site for residential purposes.
- For my part, I note that the objection land is a greenfield site. In terms of Policy H2 of Regional Planning Guidance (Core Document 83), I would place the site within category a) ii), namely "other infill within urban areas, subject to achieving appropriate standards of urban greenspace and conserving (and where possible, enhancing) the character of the area". In the context of the sequential approach to the allocation of housing land, such sites are second in the order of priority after previously developed land and buildings within urban areas.
- However, as noted in Volume 2 of my report, the housing needs of the District can be met by urban brownfield land and reconfirmed allocations. As such, there is no need to call on sites such as the Durkar Lane site and objections to the development of the site for housing purposes would be negated.
- I have considered the alternatives of either designating the site as open land within a built-up area or as Green Belt. However, this is not a large tract of land that would preserve the identities of distinct and separate communities nor would it fulfil the purposes of including land in Green Belts. In my opinion, the appropriate course of action would be for the site to remain as a Protected Area of Search for Long-Term Development. No modification to the Plan is necessary.
- I am conscious of the tremendous amount of work carried out by the Durkar, Crigglestone and Calder Grove Residents' Association in opposing a housing allocation. Important matters of detail were raised in the representations. However, the future of the site could well be raised again at the time of the full review of the Unitary Development Plan and would need to be discussed in the light of circumstances then obtaining. It would be wrong for me to influence such discussions when the present fundamental decision is related to the matter of housing need.
- In respect of land at Denby Dale Road West, Calder Grove, I consider that the principal matter to be determined is whether the site constitutes previously developed land as defined in Annex C of PPG 3. It is clear to me that the land has been used for mineral extraction; and there is no suggestion that provision for restoration has been made through development control procedures. An outstanding question, therefore, is whether the remains of any structure or activity have blended into the landscape and there is a clear reason that could outweigh the re-use of the site.
- In this regard, I would say that the objection site has a slightly unnatural appearance that is typical of many areas affected by underground workings. It has been left undeveloped in circumstances where surrounding land has been built up; it has an uneven surface as if affected

by subsidence or tipping; and it is characterised by unmanaged grassland with areas of impenetrable bramble. To my mind, there are clear vestiges of the site's previously developed nature.

- Several objectors have advanced reasons for not re-using the site. These include damage to habitats; problems relating to access and traffic; and the on-going value of the site as a local open space. However, in my opinion, these and other points are not clear reasons for rejecting a housing allocation. For example, the ecological survey indicates that there are no overriding matters of nature conservation interest. Further, there is no technical evidence to suggest that access, traffic or pollution would be a problem.
- I am aware that the site is an area of open space appreciated by local residents. However, it is not a large tract of land that would preserve 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. In my opinion, the objection site should be treated as brownfield land that would make a valuable contribution to the District's housing needs. In terms of the sequential approach, land such as this should be treated as a first priority. I have concluded that this 2.1 ha site should be allocated as a housing site with a potential capacity for a minimum of 63 dwellings.
- Turning to land at Hollingthorpe Hall Farm, Hollingthorpe Lane, Crigglestone, it is stated that there are exceptional circumstances that would justify taking the pig farm out of the Green Belt and allocating the site for housing purposes. The principal circumstances relate to smell, noise and visual amenity.
- I am in no doubt regarding the presence of a serious problem in relation to odour emissions. However, I do not feel that I have the up-to-date picture. For example, the schedule of complaints that I have been given does not cover any date more recent than 27 March 1996. More particularly, the letter dated 8 August 1996 from the Council's Principal Environmental Health Officer indicates that the objector was in contact with a company specialising in environmental problems. A report outlining proposals regarding slurry treatment and handling was awaited. Reference is also made to the possibility of serving an abatement notice under the Environmental Protection Act 1990.
- In addition, I note that the Council has made reference to possible re-use of the premises for less intensive agricultural purposes, farm diversification or business use compatible with the Green Belt.
- I recognise that odour problems could amount to exceptional circumstances in Green Belt boundary cases. However, the objection site is greenfield land, outside the boundaries of a settlement and within the Green Belt all in circumstances where the housing needs of the District can be met on urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. I would expect the justification for housing as the preferred alternative to be equally exceptional. In this case, I am not satisfied that ways of mitigating the problems of smell, or uses of the site such as those suggested by the Council, have been adequately explored.
- With regard to noise, I recognise that a pig unit could attract significantly more heavy goods vehicles than a standard arable practice; that there are no restrictions on vehicle movements; and that Hollingthorpe Hall Pig Farm is one of the largest intensive pig farms in Europe. However, I find there to be no significant evidence of a related problem. For example, there is no technical evidence nor is traffic noise referred to by other objectors to the pig unit.

- In terms of visual amenity, a variety of uncomplimentary adjectives are used to describe the existing buildings. However, even if the land were derelict, I would not expect this to be a justification for altering Green Belt boundaries or allowing development.
- I have taken into account all the other matters raised on behalf of the objector including the unrestricted nature of the operation and the contribution of the site to the purposes of including land in Green Belts. However, in my opinion, there are no exceptional circumstances that would justify taking the pig farm out of the Green Belt and allocating the site for housing purposes.
- I now turn to land at Sandal Grange Farm, Walton Lane, Sandal. It is indicated that the review provision for housing land does not take into account the imminent RPG and the likely requirement for more housing land. In this regard, the housing needs of the District, and how those needs could be met, are discussed in Volume 2 of my report, all in the context of the final version of Regional Planning Guidance (Core Document 83). It is concluded that the demand could be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. There is no need to draw on Green Belt sites or urban extensions.
- I note that allocation of the site for housing could allow for the provision of a proper access arrangement for the adjoining nursing home and the proposed Sandal Cricket Club. However, I do not consider that these are exceptional circumstances that would justify the related revision of the Green Belt boundary.
- The final site to be considered lies north of the Hollingthorpe Estate, Hall Green. Currently designated as a Protected Area of Search, the adopted UDP recognises that, should circumstances permit development of all or part of the site, the favoured use would be residential. For my part, I recognise the “support” of the adopted development plan; also various locational advantages and the absence of constraints. However, as concluded in Volume 2 of my report, the housing needs of the District can be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocation. Extension sites such as the objections site would not be needed within the Plan period and no modification would be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5/4.2/1 That the second paragraph under the heading SEW 5 Walton Lane, Sandal be replaced by the following: “Supplementary Planning Guidance in the form of a Development Brief will be prepared to guide the development of this site.”

5/4.2/2 That land at Denby Dale Road West, Calder Grove should be allocated as a housing site in line with the entry in the Initial Deposit Alterations.

5/4.2/3 That no other modification be made in response to the objections.

4.3 historic park / garden / battle site - paragraph 4.5.2(A): sew hpg2 historic battle site, sandal castle

The Objections

1240/RW00009/South & East Wakefied/BF1	- English Heritage
934/W00673/South & East Wakefied/BF1	- Bryant Homes Yorkshire
911/W00752/South & East Wakefied/BF1	- Dr D Jones
953/W00787/South & East Wakefied/BF1	- H Wood

Summary of Objections

- The cemetery and allotment gardens north of Sparable Lane should be deleted from the area shown as the Site of the Battle of Wakefield.
- The Sandal Cricket Club ground land should be deleted from the area shown as the Site of the Battle of Wakefield.
- Standard reasons of objection.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- With regard to the Site of the Battle of Wakefield, I have visited the cemetery/allotment site and the cricket club ground. I could not see the castle and, in the absence of any interpretative material, I had no appreciation of the historical association with the battle of 1460.
- Policy E63 would go much further than safeguarding the character, integrity and importance of the battle site. It would preclude the loss of any of the component sites shown on the Proposals Map other than in exceptional circumstances. Whilst this could be justified in the case of sites with important contextual linkages or historic features, I do not consider that the provisions of the policy should apply to sites where the affinity is that of an historical association.
- The Council states that the reason for the allocation is primarily to protect the surviving historic landscape and any archaeological remains. Reference is made to a Medieval ridge and furrow system; also to war graves and valuable amenity space for residents. Whilst such features could be worthy of protection in their own right, I do not consider that Policy E63 and designation as part of the Site of the Battle of Wakefield is the appropriate mechanism for ensuring such protection.
- The objections of Dr Jones and H Wood list several standard reasons of objection. However, none are specific to historic parks/gardens/battle sites or of any obvious relevance to Paragraph 4.5.2(a). I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5/4.3/1 That the cemetery and allotment gardens north of Sparable Lane as well as the Sandal Cricket Club ground be deleted from the area shown as the Site of the Battle of Wakefield.

5/4.3/2 That no other modification be made in response to the objections.

4.4 green belt settlements - paragraph 4.5.6(A): sew gbs1 chapelthorpe

The Objections

422/W00209/South & East Wakefield/GBS1	- Mr J Henshaw
874/W00592/South & East Wakefield/GBS1	- Tim Greening-Jackson
875/W00593/South & East Wakefield/GBS1	- R F Nelson
876/W00594/South & East Wakefield/GBS1	- Christina Ohm
877/W00595/South & East Wakefield/GBS1	- Anne Cole
840/W00620/South & East Wakefield/GBS1	- Mr T R C Graney

841/W00621/South & East Wakefield/GBS1	- I & S McMaster
842/W00622/South & East Wakefield/GBS1	- Mr I Ogilvie
838/W00623/South & East Wakefield/GBS1	- Mr & Mrs J Rowland
864/W00624/South & East Wakefield/GBS1	- C A Poulter
859/W00805/South & East Wakefield/GBS1	- Graeme Ryland

Summary of Objections

- The Green Belt settlement infill boundary for Chapelthorpe should incorporate land at Red Gables; also land adjoining Old Boyn Hill Farm.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- I appreciate that land at Red Gables and adjoining Old Boyn Hill Farm all forms part of the village of Chapelthorpe. However, to my mind, the main purpose of defining the infill boundary is not to identify the historic form and limits of the village but to establish where limited infilling could be appropriate. In this regard, I agree that the boundary identified by the Council encompasses an area where infill could take place without affecting the character of the village or the wider Green Belt.
- I saw that Red Gables has a return frontage to Wood Lane. Behind the boundary wall is a large garden and, further to the southeast, what appeared to be an overgrown “paddock”. Together, these parcels form a significant gap between Red Gables itself and 27 Wood Lane. If included within the settlement boundary, both the garden and paddock would be potential building plots. However, to encourage development here could lead to a change in the character of the village. The existing open gap could be replaced by frontage development effectively linking 27 Wood Lane, and development beyond, with the main part of the village. More particularly, the openness of this part of the Green Belt would be materially diminished.
- Similar arguments apply to the land adjoining Old Boyn Hill Farm. Although development here would not link up with the dwellings further along Wood Lane, the barn is peripheral to the main village. New housing would extend the core area of the village down Wood Lane and significantly reduce the openness of the Green Belt. I do not consider that such development would be “rounding off” nor, as an agricultural use, would the site fall within the definition of previously developed land.
- I appreciate that the barn and its curtilage are rather unsightly in appearance. However, as indicated in Planning Policy Guidance Note No 2: Green Belts, detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed even where land has become derelict (Core Document 35, Paragraph 2.6). In my opinion, similar principles should apply to the identification of Green Belt settlement boundaries.
- I have taken into account all the other perceived benefits including the potential reduction in heavy traffic and the avoidance of access problems. However, in these and all other respects, I have concluded that there are no circumstances that would warrant extending the settlement boundary to include the objection sites.

RECOMMENDATION

5/4.4/1 That no modification be made in response to the objections.

4.5 washlands - paragraph 4.5.8: sew w12 boathouse farm, calder bridge

The Objection

202/RW00013/South & East Wakefield/WSH1 - Crigglestone Parish Council

Summary of Objection

- The proposed washland at Boathouse Farm, Calder Bridge should cover the related area of the flood plain of the River Calder.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- The concern of Crigglestone Parish Council regarding flooding is commendable. However, whilst flood plains and washlands both have a natural role as a form of flood defence, they are not the same thing. The flood plain of the River Calder includes land over which water flows in time of flood or would flow but for the presence of flood defences. Washlands are areas of the flood plain where water is stored in time of flood. They may have their effectiveness enhanced by the provision of structures to control the amount of water stored and the timing of its release to alleviate peak flood flows downstream. Different policy responses could be appropriate.
- In the absence of any technical evidence to the contrary, I consider that the advice of the Environment Agency should be followed. No modification to the Plan would be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION

5/4.5/1 That no modification be made in response to the objection.

5. walton / crofton/ sharlston community area proposals

5.1 mineral extraction industries - paragraph 5.1.2: wcs 1 & wcs 2 nostell brickworks

The Objections

762/W00375/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/ME1 - Ibstock Property and Minerals
762/W00376/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/ME1 - Ibstock Property and Minerals

Summary of Objections

- It is incorrect to say that that it will be necessary for full modern planning conditions to be approved by 31 July 2001.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- I acknowledge that 31 July 2001 is the date by which applications for the determination of new planning conditions should have been made rather than approved. However, given that an application has now been submitted, I consider that the related element of the text can be updated.

RECOMMENDATION

5/5.1/1 That under the headings WCS 1 Nostell Brickworks (North) and WCS 2 Nostell Brickworks (South), the words following Swine Lane be replaced by the following: "...received planning permission for the extraction of minerals in April 1973. Under the Environment Act 1995: Review of Mineral Sites, the site has been classified as an 'Active Phase 2' site."

5.2 housing sites - paragraph 5.2.2: wcs h28 and wcs 32 santingley lane, crofton; wcs h31 and WCS 35 grove house farm, walton; land at ings farm, sharlston; land at spring hill, crofton; redbeck farm, doncaster road, crofton; land to rear of sharlston working men's club; wcc 33 south of bedford and hill top farms, crofton; wcs 34 waterways land, walton

The Objections

881/RW00014/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1 - Crofton Parish Council
243/W00015/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1 - Mr L Scott
244/W00016/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1 - Mrs Joan Crossland
247/W00019/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1 - S Sultor
253/W00025/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1 - M Gollings
253/W00026/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1 - Shauna Gollings
268/W00042/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1 - Mr & Mrs L Clifton
287/W00070/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1 - S Sharratt
385/W00163/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1 - Arthur Turner
386/W00166/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1 - Peter Fenn
387/W00168/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1 - R Fenn

409/W00193/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mr D F Williamson
503/W00216/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mr J A Scott
501/W00220/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mr J Jennings
501/W00222/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mr P A Jennings
501/W00234/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mrs M Jennings
498/W00241/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mr G P Jackson
531/W00300/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Anne Gaines
531/W00301/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Leonard Gaines
546/W00312/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mr & Mrs Ovenden
558/W00319/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- A L Ripley
536/W00325/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Terry & Margie Burrows
569/W00330/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Raymond Telford
581/W00342/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- M Sykes
579/W00356/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mr P Haigh
586/W00358/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- J Wilsey
775/W00409/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mr & Mrs G Scargill
703/W00420/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- N H Bennett
693/W00430/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Barry Turner
693/W00431/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Brenda Turner
682/W00452/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- C Burton
680/W00453/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mrs J Campbell
677/W00458/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mrs K A Jennings
675/W00461/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Lynne & Paul Tate
674/W00464/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mrs L Ripley
819/W00474/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Graham Coopey
810/W00481/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Audrey Sharp
798/W00495/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Martin & Carole Baily
811/W00496/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Ian Hudson
810/W00499/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- William Sharp
1543/W00550/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- D Yearsley
1527/W00555/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- William Hughes
854/W00558/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Julie Sykes
1528/W00562/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mr & Mrs C P Scargill
881/W00641/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Crofton Parish Council
1118/W00647/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Martin Williams
1530/W00665/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Dr S Banks
1116/W00700/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Mr S J Perry
1544/W01371/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP1	- Cllr P W Beckett
259/RW00020/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP2	- Barratt Leeds
786/W00372/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP2	- Mr J W Gravett
790/W00389/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP2	- Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd
757/W00392/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP2	- Persimmon Homes (WY) Ltd
417/G00036/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP4	- Mr M Wildman
417/G00037/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP4	- Mr M Wildman
417/G00038/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP4	- Mr M Wildman
417/G00039/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP4	- Mr M Wildman
758/G00156/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP5	- Taywood Projects
758/G00155/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP5	- Taywood Projects
1546/W01426/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP6	- Mr D Baines

276/W00056/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP7	- Mr C Chapman
518/W00349/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP7	- Sharlston & District WMC & - Institute Ltd
868/W00629/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP7	- Magna Holdings Ltd
905/G00255/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP9	- Provincial Land Developments Ltd
905/W00800/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP9	- Provincial Land Developments Ltd
767/W00402/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP10	- Mr G A Thompson
690/W00438/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP10	- Mrs G A Harris
757/W00463/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP10	- Persimmon Homes (WY) Ltd
871/W00615/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP11	- Kevin Swift
1083/W00668/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP11	- Dr N H Clark
1083/W00671/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/HP11	- Olivia Clark

Summary of Objections

- Land at Santingley Lane, Crofton should not be allocated as a housing site.
- The Protected Area of Search at Santingley Lane, Crofton should be afforded greater protection including Green Belt designation.
- Land at Grove House Farm, Walton should be allocated for residential development (Annex B1 or, alternatively, Annex B2).
- Land at Grove House Farm, Walton should not be allocated as a housing site.
- Some longer-term reassurance should be given as to the preservation of land at Grove House Farm, Walton as an open space.
- Land at Ings Farm, Sharlston should be taken out of the Green Belt and used for housing and community purposes as part of an extended Special Policy Area.
- Land at Spring Hill, Crofton should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for housing or, alternatively, as a Protected Area of Search.
- Land at Redbeck Farm, Doncaster Road, Crofton should be re-allocated for housing purposes.
- The boundary of the Green Belt to the rear of Sharlston Working Men's Club should be reviewed and the land zoned for housing purposes.
- Land south of Bedford and Hill Top Farms, Crofton should be allocated as a housing site.
- The Waterways Land, Walton should be allocated as a housing site.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- With regard to land at Santingley Lane, Crofton, almost all the objections were made at the stage of the Initial Deposit Alterations when the Council was contemplating the allocation of the site for housing purposes. However, under the Revised Deposit Alterations, the site would revert to a Protected Area of Search. The majority of the objections are thereby negated.
- Nevertheless, it has been suggested that greater protection should be afforded to the Protected Area of Search. For example, there could be reference to the need for a Section 106 obligation dealing with traffic calming. In my view, and in the absence of any specific allocation, such a reference would be inappropriate and premature. In terms of the suggested Green Belt designation, this too would be inappropriate. On-going protection of the site would

be achieved through the designation of the site as a Protected Area of Search. There are no exceptional circumstances that would justify an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

- Turning to land at Grove House Farm, Walton, it is indicated that there is an identified need for new housing allocations and that the objection site should be a high order option. However, in Volume 2 of my report, I have concluded that the housing needs of the District can be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. As such, there is no need to draw on lower-order greenfield extension sites. The allocation of the objection site would not be justified. It should remain as a Protected Area of Search and thus enjoy the protection of Policy OL4. The case for any longer-term protection would need to be advanced at the time of any future review.
- I have taken into account matters such as the background and current policy status of the site; its physical, locational and sustainability characteristics; and the Council's own previous assessment of the site's merits. However, I find that there are no overriding considerations in this regard.
- The objections relating to Ings Farm, Sharlston concern two areas of land. One area amounting to 6.8 ha lies at West Lane, Sharlston Common/Old Sharlston. The second area comprises 13.2 ha of land at Sharlston Common. It is argued that the Sharlstons should be considered together. Reliance should not be placed solely on proposals for Sharlston Colliery. In providing an uplift for the area as a whole, a balanced package of regeneration and environmental benefits would stem from incorporation of the two objection parcels.
- It appears to me that any effects of developing the objection land would be experienced principally in Sharlston itself, that is, in the area lying alongside the A645 Weeland Road, mainly but not exclusively on its northern side. However, I gained the impression of an established community, well served by shops and other services. I appreciate that, as well as a requirement for good-quality play space, the rugby club, the cricket ground and the bowls club could all benefit from additional space. However, there is nothing that suggest to me that it is necessary to take land out of the Green Belt and to develop it in whole or in part for housing purposes.
- The housing needs of the District can be met by urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. Given also that there is no particular evidence to suggest that Sharlston is in need of regeneration or environmental improvements, I consider that there are no exceptional circumstances that would justify taking the objection land out of the Green Belt. In my opinion, land at Ings Farm should not be used for housing and community purposes whether as part of a Special Policy Area or otherwise.
- Land at Spring Hill, Crofton also lies within the Green Belt. On behalf of the objector, it is indicated that there would be a "lack of harm" in taking the site out of the Green Belt. To my mind, this is not an exceptional circumstance that would justify amending the boundary. In my opinion, bearing in mind that the housing needs of the District can be met on urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocation, there is no necessity to change the Green Belt boundary irrespective of any locational and other advantages to which reference has been made.
- In addition, housing development on the objection site would prejudice important Green Belt purposes. It would fail to safeguard the countryside from encroachment; and, by building on a greenfield extension site, the recycling of derelict and other urban land could be affected, thus harming regeneration objectives. I have concluded that the site should remain as Green Belt. The alternative of allocating the site as a Protected Area of Search would be unacceptable. Such an allocation would give recognition to the possibility of long-term development for which there is no significant justification.

- With regard to land at Redbeck Farm, Doncaster Road, Crofton, it is indicated that its designation as Green belt is an anomaly. I do not agree. I recognise that the objection site is sandwiched between the built-up settlement to the southeast and the railway land. However, I consider that it fulfils important Green Belt purposes. The land represents an area of open countryside outside any settlement or built-up area. Its continued designation as Green Belt will assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Further, by resisting development here and encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land, urban regeneration will be assisted.
- Although it is asserted that the Council has not released sufficient housing land, that is not my conclusion. In Volume 2 of this report, I have determined that the housing needs of the District can be met on previously developed land and other reconfirmed allocations in urban areas. My assessment takes into account any additional allocations that could be required to provide for contingencies. All in all, I find that there are no exceptional circumstances that would justify the re-allocation of Green Belt land at Redbeck Farm.
- In terms of the land at the rear of the Charlston Working Men's Club, I have some sympathy with the objectors. Here is a piece of land that, with the recent development of housing to the south, is effectively built up on three sides. It comprises overgrown allotments and other unsightly vacant and derelict land. Part of the site would appear to be brownfield land. I would say that the land contributes little to the purposes of including land in Green Belts. In addition, the land is not playing the sort of positive role that would be associated with the use of land in Green Belts.
- Nevertheless, Government guidance in the form of PPG 2 indicates that Green Belt boundaries should not be changed unless exceptional circumstances exist that necessitate revision. In addition, it is stated that detailed boundaries should not be altered or development allowed merely because land has become derelict. I am also mindful of the advice in PPG 3 on housing. This indicates that villages will only be suitable locations for accommodating significant additional housing where it can be demonstrated that additional housing will support local services that would become unviable without some modest growth.
- In short, there is no evidence that suggests to me that the provision of housing would meet local needs and/or support local services. Similarly, it is not apparent to me that, of necessity, the site would have to be developed for housing purposes or taken out of the Green Belt. All in all, I find that there is inadequate justification for the proposed modification.
- Land south of Bedford and Hill Top Farms, Crofton is at present a Protected Area of Search. To my mind, the main issue is whether sufficient sites have been allocated to meet the reasonable housing need of the District over the Plan period. In this regard, as concluded in Volume 2 of my report, I find that the District's needs can be met on urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. There is no need to call on greenfield extension sites such as the objection site. Notwithstanding any relative merits, therefore, I have concluded that there are no overriding considerations and that the allocation of the objection site for housing purposes would not be justified.
- The Waterways Land at Walton is a Protected Area of Search in the adopted UDP. It is now put forward as a potential housing allocation. It is indicated that access problems have been resolved, there are no environmental constraints and there is housing around three sides of the site. It is considered that development would improve the village scene. For my part, I note that development here would represent a greenfield extension to the existing built-up area. However,

the housing needs of the District can be met on more sustainable sites, namely urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. In my opinion, the objection site would not be needed.

RECOMMENDATION

5/5.2/1 That no modification be made in response to the objections.

5.3 land reclamation - paragraph 5.5.8: wcs 36 walton colliery tips

The Objection

871/W00614/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/LREC2 - Kevin Swift

Summary of Objection

- Reference to Walton Colliery Tips should not be deleted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- The objector has indicated that there should be continued reference, in the Plan, to Walton Colliery Tips. The text should also indicate that the work has still to be finished off properly. For my part, I agree with the Council that, fundamentally, reclamation of these colliery tips has been completed. I would expect any outstanding works to be carried out as part of an aftercare programme. Essentially, such works would be of a detailed nature and reference to them in a development plan would be inappropriate.

RECOMMENDATION

5/5.3/1 That no modification be made in response to the objection.

5.4 special policy areas - paragraph 5.8.2: wcs d25 sharlston colliery

The Objections

1555/RW00002/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Warmfield-cum-Heath Parish
	- Council
1560/RW00024/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr C Fogo
1560/RW00025/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs S J Lister
1560/RW00026/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr D S Ward
1561/RW00027/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Anne Noble
1562/RW00028/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- W Fox
1563/RW00029/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Glen Dickinson
1563/RW00030/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs Helen Dickinson
1564/RW00031/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Paul Arnold
1565/RW00032/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr D Slater
1565/RW00033/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs D M Slater
1566/RW00034/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr M Myers
1566/RW00035/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Jayne Ann Myers

1567/RW00036/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- C Parker
1568/RW00037/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr A Haslam
1569/RW00038/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- B Kaye
1570/RW00039/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- R W Elcoate
1571/RW00040/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Christine Kemp
1571/RW00041/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- B M Wasti
1572/RW00042/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Joyce Dainton
1572/RW00043/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Paul Dainton
1573/RW00044/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs M Harper
1574/RW00045/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs B Jodrell
1575/RW00046/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs F E Cole
1575/RW00047/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Irving Cole
1576/RW00048/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- M Broom
1578/RW00050/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Beverley Bruce
1579/RW00051/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- C Bruce
1175/RW00052/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs P Wood
1781/RW00053/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Miss C Masefield
1782/RW00054/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs E L Masefield
1783/W00056/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs H Tingle
1783/RW00057/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr R Tingle
1584/RW00058/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Miss J Wainwright
1585/RW00059/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Tracey Holmes
1586/RW00060/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr G D Bucknall
1586/RW00061/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrd D Bucknall
1587/RW00062/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Eileen McDonagh
1588/RW00063/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- C Teal
1589/RW00064/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Carolyn Stead
1590/RW00065/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Lena Ward
1590/RW00066/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- J H Ward
1591/RW00067/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs M White
1592/RW00068/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Stuart Smith
1592/RW00069/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Margaret Smith
1593/RW00070/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- G Beecher
1593/RW00071/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- J Beecher
1594/RW00072/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- V Beecher
1595/RW00073/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- N Whiteley
1703/RW00074/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- P Bucknall
1596/RW00075/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Paul Bucknall
1596/RW00076/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Patricia Arnold
1597/RW00077/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- C Henderson
1598/RW00078/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Joanne Jukes
1599/RW00079/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs H Arnold
1599/RW00080/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- David Arnold
1601/RW00083/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Joe Fisher
1602/RW00084/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr P L Rhodes
1603/RW00085/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- E Severn
1604/RW00086/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- P Fensome
1604/RW00087/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- A Fensome
1587/RW00088/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- M McDonagh

1605/RW00089/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs K Shaw
1606/RW00090/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- C Hazelton
1607/RW00091/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Tim Kaye
1611/RW00092/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- A M Peaker
1608/RW00093/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- B R Hancock
1609/RW00094/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Alex Anderson
1610/RW00095/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- J Hunter
1607/RW00096/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr & Mrs Kaye
1612/RW00097/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- New Sharlston Community - Action
1611/RW00098/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- D Peaker
1611/RW00099/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- B Peaker
1613/RW00100/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- B Williamson
1614/RW00101/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Iris Allen
1614/RW00102/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- R Allen
1615/RW00103/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr T M Appleyard
1615/RW00104/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mary Appleyard
1616/RW00105/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Denise Gingell
1617/RW00106/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- K Parkes
1618/RW00107/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- K R Summerscales
1618/RW00108/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mark Summerscales
1619/RW00109/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr D Richardson
1619/RW00110/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr J Richardson
1619/RW00111/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Pauline Richardson
1620/RW00112/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs Y M Wood
1621/RW00113/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Russell Ong
1623/RW00115/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- D Dooler
1579/RW00116/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- M Bruce
1620/RW00117/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs A Wood
1624/RW00118/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- F A Mullaney
1624/RW00119/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- J Mullaney
1625/RW00120/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- E Mullaney
1598/RW00121/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Terry Jukes
1626/RW00122/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr M A Jennings
1627/RW00123/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- N Goodwin
1628/RW00124/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs J Golding
1628/RW00125/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr G Golding
1629/RW00126/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- C Tomlinson
1630/RW00127/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Emma Pearson
1629/RW00128/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- M Tomlinson
1630/RW00129/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- J Maitland
1631/RW00130/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Diane Broadbent
1632/RW00131/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs A Keighley
1631/RW00132/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- J A Broadbent
1631/RW00133/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- M Broadbent
1631/RW00134/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- P Broadbent
1632/RW00135/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs S Keighley
1633/RW00136/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- M Morgan
1626/RW00138/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Pamela Jones

1627/RW00139/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- E Goodwin
1633/RW00140/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- J Morgan
1635/RW00141/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Lynn Golding
1636/RW00142/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Miss S Gamble
1637/RW00143/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr & Mrs Moverley
1638/RW00144/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- C Whitehead
1637/RW00146/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- S Moverley
1626/RW00147/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs A Jones
1640/RW00148/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Kevin Richardson
1641/RW00149/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Joanne Pybus
1642/RW00150/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- John Sayles
1642/RW00151/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- T Sayles
1643/RW00152/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- John Richardson
1644/RW00153/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs D Starkey
1644/RW00154/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr R Starkey
1645/RW00155/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- M Farrar
1646/RW00156/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- S Armstrong
1647/RW00157/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- B Armstrong
1648/RW00158/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Ms L S Wagstaff
1649/RW00159/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Maureen Garside
1649/RW00160/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Leslie Garside
1650/RW00161/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Sylvia Carswell
1650/RW00162/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Ronald Carswell
1651/RW00163/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs M Masefield
1652/RW00164/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Miss L Goodman
1653/RW00165/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Cathy Pearson
1643/RW00166/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- V Richardson
1654/RW00167/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr D K Bruce
1655/RW00168/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Barry Cleghorn
1651/RW00169/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr C Masefield
1656/RW00170/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Leanne Charles
1656/RW00171/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Kevin Charles
1654/RW00172/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs K E Bruce
1657/RW00173/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr B R Moverley
1658/RW00174/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Philip Kefford
1659/RW00175/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Susan Shepherd
1660/RW00176/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Doreen Gidman
1662/RW00178/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- M J Stearne
1663/RW00179/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Karen Shatton
1665/RW00181/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr E T Holland
1665/RW00182/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Pauline Holland
1666/RW00183/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Ben Wood
1646/RW00184/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- P Armstrong
1645/RW00185/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr B Farrar
1666/RW00186/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Elsie Wood
1667/RW00187/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Barry Bayliss
1669/RW00189/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Martin Bailey
1669/RW00190/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Beryl Bailey
1670/RW00191/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr R Webster

1670/RW00192/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Miss K Grogan
1667/RW00193/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Brian Bayliss
1671/RW00194/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs M Hill
1672/RW00195/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Anita Knaggs
1672/RW00196/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Michael Knaggs
1671/RW00197/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr R Hill
1673/RW00198/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mark Fox
1674/RW00199/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Beverley Charles
1675/RW00200/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Kath Kelly
1676/RW00201/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr M Cawthra
1675/RW00202/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- R Kelly
1677/RW00203/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Rachael Mariecodd
1677/RW00204/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- James Garahan
1678/RW00205/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr D O Donnell
1673/RW00206/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Donna Dewhirst
1679/RW00207/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- M Cunniff
1679/RW00208/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr J Cunniff
1680/RW00209/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Una A Pedley
1680/RW00210/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Ronald Pedley
1681/RW00211/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Helen Margaret Fox
1681/RW00212/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Stephen Fox
1682/RW00213/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr P Fox
1682/RW00214/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mrs D Fox
1683/RW00215/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Carole Williams
1641/RW00216/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Philip Kendall
1640/RW00217/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Lorraine Richardson
1684/RW00218/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Val Horner
1684/RW00219/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Martin Horner
417/RW00230/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr M Wildman
1697/RW00234/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- J M Cox
1086/G00322/All/SPAS	- GOYH
1086/RW00249/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- GOYH
255/W00029/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr A W Ripley
417/W00207/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr M Wildman
223/W00231/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Peter Smith
1069/W00718/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Mr M Harrison
1508/W01405/Walton / Crofton / Sharlston/SPA1	- Bradwell & Co

Summary of Objections

- A significant proportion of the objectors would wish the Sharlston Colliery site to remain in the Green Belt for one reason or another.
- Many more reject the notion of additional housing, factories and the like without necessarily linking their objection to the Green Belt issue.
- Regeneration is not seen as necessary or urgent.
- Other objectors are looking for some form of natural and/or community after-use for the site such as heathland or wetland.
- Certain objectors are specifically against the idea of future opencasting.

- Yet others point to the pressure on schools and other facilities and amenities or to the effect on the character and nature of New Sharlston.
- There is objection to restricting the proposed uses to one particular site.
- There is objection to the use of the special policy areas approach.
- There are “Standard Reasons of Objection”.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

Main Issue

- In my opinion, the main issue relating to the proposals for Sharlston Colliery is whether there are exceptional circumstances that would necessitate alteration of the Green Belt boundary. If there were inadequate justification for the Council’s proposals, the majority of the objections would be negated.

Background

- The Sharlston Colliery site, now owned by UK Coal, closed in May 1993 with the loss of 535 jobs. It comprises about 60 ha of derelict land including hardstandings as well as former spoil disposal and coal stocking areas. The site is prone to fly tipping including the dumping of abandoned cars. Some natural re-vegetation has taken place although this is limited due to the lack of soil resources and the nature of the overlying materials.
- The colliery site is located in a tract of open countryside lying generally south of Normanton. The majority of the area, including the colliery site, is designated as Green Belt although the nearby settlements of Streethouse and Sharlston are inset villages. New Sharlston, a small settlement with about 150 houses, borders the colliery site on its western side. New Sharlston is also inset. Additionally, a small hardcored area in the southwestern corner of the colliery site is excluded from the Green Belt. At the time of the adoption of the Unitary Development Plan, it was envisaged that this land would be available for some modest regenerative development.
- The Council proposes a mix of housing and industrial uses with vehicular access being primarily achieved through a new link road to the Normanton Bypass. Community and retail uses ancillary to the housing are also envisaged. A masterplan prepared by UK Coal illustrates an employment area comprising over 92,900 sq m (1 million sq ft) of floorspace for mixed employment uses on 20.5 ha of land; 256 private houses in two separate housing areas; an old persons’ village with some 220 flats and approximately 22 bungalows; and community facilities likely to include a shop, health centre and village hall. The Council has not considered any of the landowner’s proposals.

Need for Regeneration

- The objection site falls within the broad area of South Yorkshire and the Coalfields. This is a first priority regeneration area under Policy S2 of Regional Planning Guidance. In addition, deprivation in the area is stated to be significantly higher than the average. As such, under Policy R1 of the Revised Deposit Alterations, all relevant agencies are encouraged to give priority to sustainable development that promotes economic growth and employment; improves accessibility; and protects and enhances the environment. Further, the former colliery area is subject to ERDF Objective 2 and SRB6 funding. Here the objective is regenerating localities that are pockets of deprivation.

- The area scores highly on national indices of deprivation. According to the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2000, Normanton and Sharlston Ward is the 7th most deprived ward in the District and within the top 13% of most deprived wards in England. The index is the function of a number of domains that include income, employment, health, education, housing and access.

Whether the Proposed Outcomes Amount to Exceptional Circumstances

- The regeneration needs of this particular area are the prime justification for the removal of land at Sharlston Colliery from the Green Belt and its allocation as a Special Policy Area. In this regard, I was told that the regeneration proposals had four main intended outcomes:

- to provide increased employment opportunities;
- to raise the attractiveness of New Sharlston for housing investment;
- to improve local residents' environment through the provision of local facilities; and
- to improve local residents' environment through the provision of open space.

I consider below each of these intended outcomes.

Increased Employment Opportunities

- The Council states that the New Sharlston, Sharlston and Streethouse communities have been badly affected by colliery closures, particularly the closure of the Sharlston colliery in 1993. However, the unemployment statistics do not fully reflect the impact of economic decline in these communities. This is because the area falls within Normanton and Sharlston Ward. The number of residents in Normanton with its superior and improved economic characteristics heavily influences the statistics. Nevertheless, ward youth unemployment is higher than the District, regional and national averages. In addition, male youth unemployment is 10% higher than in Great Britain.

- For the objectors, it is pointed out that the colliery closed in 1993. There is hardly an "urgent" need to regenerate the area after such a time lapse. In any event, some of the colliery workers were transferred to other mines; and very few came from New Sharlston in the first place. In addition, some 535 ha of employment land were available in the District at the end of 2000. This is similar to the amount of new land that was available for industrial use in the 1994 UDP.

- In terms of unemployment figures in Wakefield District, it is stated that these were never as bad as for some of the real black spots. The rate for Normanton and Sharlston Ward is now lower than that for Wakefield as a whole. The unemployment rate has fallen consistently since 1993. This downward trend has led to the lowest unemployment levels for 25 years. In absolute terms, the number of unemployed claimants in Normanton and Sharlston Ward stands at 243 (August 2001).

- For my part, I appreciate that the unemployment figures could be distorted by the situation in Normanton; that youth and male unemployment could be relatively high; and that the ward is in the top 16% of employment deprived wards in England. However, in my opinion, the total number of unemployed in the ward as a whole is very low. Even if all that unemployment was concentrated in New Sharlston and Streethouse, I do not consider that there would be a case for a sizeable allocation of employment land.

- In this regard, I am aware that much of the 535 ha of employment land elsewhere may not be genuinely available or meet the aspirations of developers, investors or employers. However, I have no doubt that, for the residents of the Sharlstones, there is relatively convenient access to

existing and emerging job opportunities in Wakefield District. There are no exceptional circumstances that, for such a low number of claimants, would justify taking land out of the Green Belt for extensive local provision.

Raising the Attractiveness of New Sharlston for Housing Investment

- I can see that reclamation of Sharlston Colliery together with the building of new houses and related facilities would raise the attractiveness of New Sharlston for housing investment. I am also aware that recent house sales have fallen to the level of £11,000 a property and that new development would be likely to enhance the attractiveness of the area and lead to improved prices. However, in these and all other respects, I do not consider that there is adequate justification for the removal of Sharlston Colliery from the Green Belt.
- When I looked at the existing housing on my sites visits, I did not perceive the stock to be in a run-down or poor condition. Indeed, I note from the Index of Multiple Deprivation that, in the housing domain, Normanton and Sharlston Ward does not even come in the lowest quartile but ranks 3,076th “most deprived” out of 8,414 wards in England.
- Certain improvement, such as improvements to access roads, would be an undoubted benefit. Nevertheless, I have not seen or heard anything to remotely suggest that it is necessary to help raise the attractiveness of New Sharlston to housing investment by taking land out of the Green Belt and developing the colliery site in line with the Special Policy Area proposals.

Provision of Local Facilities

- I saw that local facilities, notably in New Sharlston, are very limited. The only community facilities that I saw here were a family pub and the Sharlston Colliery Welfare Club. However, given the size of New Sharlston, and to a lesser extent Streethouse, I would not expect any significant local facilities to be provided. Further, a fuller range of facilities, including a clinic, are available in Sharlston itself. Although such facilities are not necessarily within walking distance, I consider that they are reasonably accessible to the residents of New Sharlston and Streethouse.
- As part of the Special Policy Area initiative, there is the prospect of a community shop, health centre and village hall. Facilities such as these would no doubt be of benefit to existing residents, particularly of New Sharlston. However, they would only be justified as part and parcel of development of the scale that is contemplated, development that could impose its own pressures on services such as schools. Provision for an existing settlement as small as New Sharlston would not be justified. There are, therefore, no exceptional circumstances that would warrant taking land out of the Green Belt.

Provision of Open Space

- UK Coal’s masterplan for Sharlston Colliery illustrates what I take to be areas of open space. In this regard, I acknowledge that, for existing residents, there could be public access to landscaped open space, ecological areas and the like. However, in my opinion, there is no evidence that residents are suffering from a deficiency of open space, in either quantitative or qualitative terms, such that there is a necessity to make new provision as part of a scheme involving the loss of Green Belt land.
- In any event, I consider that the provision would pale into insignificance when compared with the loss of such a large area of open Green Belt. I appreciate that there is no general public access to the Sharlston Colliery site. Nevertheless, in the main, it is a major undeveloped area that contributes significantly to the open character and appearance of this part of the countryside.

Other Circumstances

- I appreciate that areas where deprivation is significantly higher than the average would warrant concerted regenerative efforts. The same is true of areas eligible for ERDF and SRB funding. However, the Index of Multiple Deprivation indicates that, in Normanton and Sharlston ward, the domains most deserving of investment are education and, to a lesser extent, health. To my mind, the proposals would result in very little assistance in these areas.
- In support of the Council's proposals, I have taken into account the derelict nature of the site and its availability for development. The colliery site is a large area of despoiled land that, in my opinion, presents a negative image and is harmful to the visual appearance of the countryside. Nevertheless, as acknowledged by the Council at the Inquiry, Green Belt boundaries should not be altered merely because land has become derelict.
- I can see that, by improving the appearance of the site, the image of the District would be enhanced and there would be regenerative benefits in this regard. However, from the answers to my questions at the Inquiry, it is clear to me that other non-development ways of reclaiming the site and its retention in the Green Belt have not been explored adequately. That is not to say that some of the uses envisaged by the public could be realistically achieved. It has to be recognised that Sharlston Colliery is in private ownership and there is no reason to suppose that non-development based after-uses, or even the avoidance of fly tipping and the dumping of cars, could be achieved without some form of recompense.
- In this regard, proposals involving coal recovery, land reclamation or even opencasting would have to be considered on their merits. Legitimate concerns would need to be addressed but I see no justifiable case for rejecting such options in principle.
- I have also considered the sustainability of this location for a major new development and the contribution of the site to the Green Belt. I appreciate that the site is near a railway station; also that it would be, at least in part, regarded as previously developed land. Nevertheless, I perceived the site as being in a rural setting, isolated in visual terms from other significant built development. Development here would represent encroachment into the countryside in the open Green Belt gap south of Normanton. All in all, I consider that regeneration efforts would be better directed towards the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Conclusions on Exceptional Circumstances

- The Council's evidence is to the effect that regeneration of this area is required so as to increase local employment opportunities, raise the attractiveness of New Sharlston for housing investment and improve residents' environment through the provision of local facilities and open space. However, I do not consider that, whether singly or in combination, these are matters deserving of significant regenerative initiatives. Certainly, regeneration involving major loss of Green Belt land and development for mixed-use purposes would not be justified.
- In conclusion, I am firmly of the opinion that the Council's proposals would be harmful to the purposes of including land within Green Belts. There are no exceptional circumstances that would justify taking the Sharlston Colliery site out of the Green Belt and its development in accordance with the Special Policy Area proposals.

Other Matters

- The Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber has raised a general objection to the designation of special policy areas. In respect of Sharlston Colliery, the objection is negated by my conclusions on the main issue. However, I would have found that an adequate amount of

information is contained within the text of the Plan and, combined with the intention to prepare Supplementary Planning Guidance, the special policy areas approach would be appropriate in this particular case.

- The objections of Mr Wildman are to the effect that not all the regenerative development should be concentrated at Sharlston Colliery. There are sites at Sharlston Common/Old Sharlston that have a role to play. Again, these objections are negated by my conclusions on the main issue. In any event, and as indicated in Section 5.2 above, I do not consider that there is any justification for the allocation of Mr Wildman's objection land.
- On a final matter, the objection of Bradwell & Co lists several "Standard Reasons of Objection". However, none are specific to special policy areas or of any obvious relevance to Paragraph 5.8.2. I consider that there is inadequate justification for any modification.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5/5.4/1 That references to the regeneration of Sharlston Colliery as a Special Policy Area be deleted from the Plan.

5/5.4/2 That no other modification be made in response to the objections.

6. south wakefield rural community area proposals

- 6.1 housing sites - paragraph 6.2.2: land at rear of 176 blacker lane, netherton; land off new road, overton; prospect farm, 150 new road, middlestown; woolley colliery

The Objections

231/G00006/South Wakefield Rural/HP2	- David Stuart Earnshaw
1050/W00635/South Wakefield Rural/HP3	- Simon Elliott Associates
225/W00006/South Wakefield Rural/HP4	- Mr M Blackburn
509/W00510/South Wakefield Rural/HP5	- MED Contracting

Summary of Objections

- The line of the Green Belt boundary at the rear of 176 Blacker Lane, Netherton should be varied.
- Land off New Road, Overton should be allocated for residential development.
- Land at Prospect Farm, 150 New Road, Middlestown should be made available for residential development.
- Land at Woolley Colliery should be allocated for housing and mixed uses.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- With regard to the Green Belt boundary at the rear of 176 Blacker Lane, Netherton, I appreciate that amendment would facilitate provision of an infill property. However, in my opinion, there is no need to change the boundary. Although not straight, it is well defined and easily recognisable. It has been drawn to contain the main built-up part of Netherton. Although there would be properties either side of the land proposed to be omitted from the Green Belt, such land is not required to help meet the District's housing requirement. In short, there are no exceptional circumstances that would justify changing the line of the Green Belt boundary.
- Land off New Road, Overton is also within the Green Belt. However, in my opinion, development here would constitute encroachment into the countryside. Further, by facilitating the development of a greenfield extension site rather than encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land, urban regeneration objectives would be prejudiced. In this regard, the housing needs of Wakefield can be met on urban brownfield sites and reconfirmed allocations. I do not consider that there is any need to amend the Green Belt boundary, to help enhance the appearance of the area or otherwise. All in all, there are no exceptional circumstances for taking this land out of the Green Belt and allocating the site for housing purposes.
- A third Green Belt site in the South Wakefield Rural Community area lies at Prospect Farm, Middlestown. It is stated that this is an infill area on a site that constitutes part of the village. Adequate access could be provided and there would be no major impact on the area. For my part, I note that Middlestown is a village inset within the Green Belt. The existing Green Belt boundary encloses the area where limited development would be appropriate. There are no exceptional circumstances for changing the boundary.

- With regard to unallocated land at Woolley Colliery, I note that an outline planning application for residential and mixed-use development purposes has been the subject of a call-in inquiry. In relation to the UDP Review, it was agreed between the objector and the Council that the Plan should reflect the outcome of the Secretary of State's decision on the call-in application. In my opinion, that is a sensible way forward and I recommend accordingly.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5/6.1/1 That, in relation to Woolley Colliery, the Plan be modified to reflect the Secretary of State's decision in respect of the call-in application for residential and mixed-use development proposals (Ref: YH 5115/219/77).

5/6.1/2 That no other modification be made in response to the objections.

6.2 green belt - paragraph 6.5.6: land at the green, woolley

The Objection

749/G00094/South Wakefield Rural/GBA1 - Mr D Rowbottom

Summary of Objection

- The Green Belt boundary at The Green, Woolley should not be amended.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- For the Council, it is argued that, because of a drafting error, the Green Belt boundary is not shown on its intended line. This error, combined with a proposal to develop the site for housing, necessitates revision of the Plan. On behalf of the objector, it is indicated that no exceptional circumstances exist. In particular, there has been no change in circumstances since 1994 and no error in drafting the adopted UDP. Indeed, the Council's proposal would be contrary to PPG 2 that argues against changes to detailed boundaries of the Green Belt.
- For my part, I have carefully compared the Green Belt boundary shown on the Proposals Map of the adopted UDP with that drawn on the Policy Map for the South Wakefield (Rural) Community Area of the Western Local Plan (Document WMDC 71). I would say that, in the adopted UDP, the line of the relevant part of the boundary is shown as being a little further to the east. However, the difference amounts to little more than the width of a line; and there is still a nib of land at the western end of the objection site that, in both versions, is definitely outside the Green Belt.
- Nevertheless, I would acknowledge that, as evidenced by the circumstances surrounding the 1997 planning application, there have been difficulties in interpreting the boundary. I also saw that the boundary is not clearly defined on the ground, crossing as it does an area of open ground. In addition, I consider that the appeal decision of 21 September 2000 (Document WMDC 72) is material to my recommendation.
- At Paragraph 7 of the appeal decision, the Inspector draws attention to the quality of the village of Woolley, a component of which is its setting, particularly the parkland to the east and northeast. He speaks of views from the private road, views that enable the high quality of the village setting to be appreciated. He states that, "I consider that the development of the appeal

site, the majority of which appears as an integral part of the landscaped setting rather than as a part of the developed area, would seriously impair the outlook which opens up from the gate piers on the access road.”

- I concur with this appreciation of the role of the objection site in contributing to the setting of the village, a conservation area. In my opinion, it is necessary to keep permanently open the entire area of land that forms the objection site and thus assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; also to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- From what I saw, I would say that the objection site is clearly outside the limits of the settlement and an obvious and integral part of the Green Belt that extends to the northeast of Woolley. As such, the present boundary is an anomaly. In addition, the Green Belt in this area should follow clearly defined boundaries. To my mind, the various up-to-date considerations represent exceptional circumstances that necessitate revision of the Green Belt boundary. I conclude that the boundary represented by the Council’s proposal is the sensible solution in this case.

RECOMMENDATION

5/6.2/1 That no modification be made in response to the objection.

6.3 green belt settlements - paragraph 6.5.6(A): swr gbs1 midgley

The Objection

429/G00057/South Wakefield Rural/GBS1 - Mr & Mrs D Johnson

Summary of Objection

- The Green Belt settlement boundary for Midgley should incorporate land at The Chapel, Stocksmoor Road.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- I appreciate that The Chapel, Stocksmoor Road, falls within the village of Midgley. However, to my mind, the purpose of the settlement boundary is to define the area where infilling could be permitted. Given that Midgley is characterised by continuous frontage development along the west side of Stocksmoor Road, I am of the opinion that the objection land northeast of The Chapel could be included within the settlement boundary without prejudicing the character of the village or the openness of the Green Belt.
- On the other hand, I do not consider that the core of the village extends beyond The Chapel. In my opinion, when viewed from Bar Lane, the fringe of the village is loosely knit. The Chapel and the buildings at Black Bull Farm are seen in the context of open Green Belt land surrounding and to the south of Midgley. The land between Black Bull Farm and The Chapel, although part of a walled garden, contributes to the openness of the Green Belt. In my opinion, the land southwest of The Chapel should not be included within the settlement boundary.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5/6.3/1 That land northeast of The Chapel be included in the Settlement Infill Boundary for Midgley.

5/6.3/2 That no other modification be made in response to the objection.

7. Wakefield city centre proposals

7.1 Outer areas: housing - paragraph 7.6.3

The Objections

871/W00616/Wakefield City Centre/HP3	- Kevin Swift
1710/RW00258/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- North Wakefield Community
	- Group

Summary of Objections

- The text should be amended to include reference to freedom from crime, well-maintained streets and good parking.
- College Grove should be identified as a Housing Renewal Area.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- I note that the Council has made an amendment to the relevant text that, in my opinion, adequately addresses the general thrust of Mr Swift's objection. The outstanding matters are, in my opinion, points of detail and their inclusion in the UDP would be inappropriate. Accordingly, I do not recommend any modification in response.
- With regard to the identification of the College Grove area as a Housing Renewal Area, it is not the role of the development plan to decide what areas should be so designated. I am aware, however, that the potential for declaring such areas is being assessed by the competent authority.

RECOMMENDATION

5/7.1/1 That no modification be made in response to the objections.

7.2 Retailing - wcc 11, WCC 17 and key development area wcc 19 B): the bus station / market / marsh way area

The Objections

438/W00228/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Nicholas Shields
904/W00660/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Capital Shopping Centres Plc
904/W00661/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Capital Shopping Centres Plc
951/W01339/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd
951/W01340/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd
951/W01341/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd
1685/RW00011/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Mrs J Stones
1686/RW00220/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- David Bilics
1688/RW00222/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Michael Garthwaite
1689/RW00223/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Mr & Mrs A Miller

1690/RW00224/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Ian Morton
1691/RW00225/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Richard Holmes
1692/RW00226/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Mr D Brambles
1693/RW00227/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Jean Mable Goldman
1694/RW00228/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Mr G Wilkinson and - Mr & Mrs D Sharp
1695/RW00229/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- J E Hardie
1698/RW00236/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- Wakefield Market Traders Action - Group
1710/RW00259/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- North Wakefield Community - Group
1710/RW00260/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1	- North Wakefield Community - Group

Summary of Objections

- Any redevelopment in the Bus Station/Market/Marsh Way area should maintain the present function of Marsh Way.
- Town centre-type retail uses should not be permitted outside the Retail Policy Area unless they meet the tests of PPG 6.
- The Retail Policy Area should be extended to incorporate the Marsh Way Key Development Area.
- The UDP should not predetermine points of detail, specifically the future retention of Marsh Way.
- There will be serious affects on the vitality and viability of the market.
- The Retail Policy Area should not be extended. The Key Development Area should not extend east of Marsh Way or north to Jacob's Well Lane.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- The objection regarding the function of Marsh Way is made in the context of an emerging planning application for major retail development. This shows a realignment of Marsh Way to the east and an "awkward" new roundabout. Coupled with a concern at the perceived absence of a proper transport strategy, it is seen as important to deal adequately with cross-city flows, the movement of HGVs and other matters.
- For my part, I acknowledge that important concerns have been identified. However, the functioning of a realigned Marsh Way is considered in a Traffic Impact Assessment. This is an integral part of the emerging application for the retail development proposals where important shopping concepts, such as the avoidance of severance, are balanced against other matters. I see no particular need for reference to the functioning of Marsh Way in the UDP itself.
- The objections of Capital Shopping Centres Plc essentially stem from the proposals for the redevelopment of the bus station/market/Marsh Way area. In this regard, the Council considers that a further major food store and a department store are needed in the City centre. In retail floorspace terms, I was told on behalf of the Council that a successful development would need to have a critical mass of at least 25,000 sq m.

- At the heart of the objections are a number of particular arguments:
- the bus station/market/Marsh Way site is not a town centre site;
- non-town centre sites should not be supported in the Plan unless they meet the tests in PPG 6 – need, retail impact and sequential approach; and
- in relation to the sequential approach, it has not been demonstrated that all town centre sites have been thoroughly assessed.
- Matters relating to need and retail impact are not disputed. However, it is indicated that the Retail Policy Area should not be extended to include “artificially” the redevelopment site within the town centre.
- For my part, I would agree that the entire bus station/market/Marsh Way site does not fall within the town centre. I acknowledge that the Marsh Way element is within Wakefield City Centre and, as such, could be considered as part of the “town centre”. However, in retail policy terms, the Marsh Way area is clearly outside the central shopping area and, in my experience, should be treated as an edge-of-centre location.
- Paragraph 1.10 of PPG 6 indicates that all potential town centre options should have been thoroughly assessed before less central sites are considered for development for key town centre uses. In this regard, I note that a conventional sequential assessment of potential sites has not been carried out or documented. Nevertheless, I consider that the objectives of PPG 6 have been met.
- In reaching this conclusion, I have taken into account a number of factors. Firstly, Wakefield City Centre has been the subject of a number of recent reports. These include a PPG 6-type health check (Core Document 78), customer and business surveys (Core Document 79) and a strategy report (Core Document 80). The key objective of the latter report was “to identify deliverable opportunities”. It contains a Strategic Action Plan that identifies the bus station/market/Marsh Way area as an area of retail redevelopment potential. I appreciate that other retail opportunity sites are referred to in the strategy, such as possible locations for a department store, but the bus station/market/Marsh Way site is the only site large enough to accommodate the critical mass of development now envisaged.
- Secondly, I have no evidence or intimation of any equivalent “rival” site. From all the consultations that took place as part of the preparation of the above documents, and indeed in relation to the Unitary Development Plan review itself, no equivalent alternative sites have come forward.
- Thirdly, I have the evidence of my own site visits in the City Centre area and the evidence given at the Inquiry. In particular, I was told that no alternative site was available for the sort of development proposed and agreed to be necessary.
- In the light of the above, I consider it appropriate to extend the Retail Policy Area to the northeast of Marsh Way; also to redefine the related Key Development Site and Area, all as proposed. No related modifications are necessary.
- One further matter, raised at the Inquiry, relates to proposed Paragraph 7.8.8. On its face, this would appear to preclude the provision of further retail warehousing floorspace in the City Centre during the Plan period. This could be seen as contrary to Government policy as recently re-stated in Mr Raynsford’s speech of 29 February 2000 to a conference convened by the Local Government Association and the National Retail Planning Forum. In my opinion, it should be

made clear that Paragraph 7.8.8 refers to the “Outer Area” of the City Centre. Subject to the provisions of the paragraph, any proposals would still need to follow the sequential approach.

- With regard to the extension of the Retail Policy Area to incorporate the Marsh Way Key Development Area, I note that it is already intended to extend the RPA northeast of Marsh Way. The latest retail proposal would be contained within this extended area. However, in terms of the advice in PPG 6, I consider that any further extension, over and above that considered above, has not been justified.
- In terms of predetermining points of detail, specifically the future retention of Marsh Way, I have carefully read Paragraphs 7.8.4 and 7.8.14 (b). It does not appear to me that either paragraph comments directly on the retention of Marsh Way. I acknowledge that there are statements, to my mind entirely justifiable, to the effect that severance problems need to be resolved. However, I do not find that there is any inappropriate detail concerning the retention or otherwise of Marsh Way itself.
- Turning to the objections of the market traders and their Action Group, I note that these are broadly aligned with those of Capital Shopping Centres Plc. It is stated that the town centre will be unnecessarily extended creating a separate trading area in opposition with the established core. I do not agree. In my opinion, the provisions of the Unitary Development Plan will facilitate new retail development of a form and nature that will enhance the vitality and viability of the City Centre, and help arrest its relative decline, in circumstances where no comparable alternative sites are available.
- It is also stated that the proven contribution of the market to vitality and viability has been ignored. Again, I do not agree. It is clear from the development brief for the site that the market use is proposed to be retained, albeit not on precisely the same site. Indeed, the plan accompanying the Action Group’s written representations shows a new open market in Westmoreland Street/The Springs; a new meat and fish market; and a new market hall. To my mind, these are all indicative of a central role for Wakefield’s markets and the new investment that is proposed. I would expect the benefits of the market, to both employment and to the City Centre as a whole, to continue.
- North Wakefield Community Group considers that the Retail Policy Area does not need to be extended and that the case for extension has not been made. Reference is made to the findings of the West Yorkshire Retail Study to the effect that land is available for 9,290 sq m (100,000 sq ft) of floorspace; to the fact that the study did not show a need for further food retailing; and to other supporting evidence.
- For my part, I understand the Retail Study to say that, for comparison goods, there was scope for a further 11,700 sq m of floorspace for the period 1998 to 2006. However, that is not the same as saying that 11,700 sq m of floorspace could be accommodated within currently approved areas. In any event, the latest scheme proposes approximately 40,000 sq m of mixed use floorspace of which the retail component, comparison and convenience, would be 25,892 sq m. I have already accepted that an extension of the Retail Policy Area that would accommodate a development of this size would be justified. It also follows that to limit the extent of the Key Development Area and preclude development to the east of Marsh Way and north to Jacob’s Well Lane, as suggested by the objector, would not be appropriate.
- So far as food retailing is concerned, I appreciate that the Retail Study was referring to comparison goods. However, for the reasons set out in Section 4.3 of the Council’s proof WMDC/Wakefield City Centre/RETAIL1, I accept that a strong case had been made out for further food and grocery floorspace. I see no objection, in principle, to the Council’s related

proposals. I would expect matters such as traffic congestion and the like to be addressed as part of any planning application.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5/7.1/1 That in the penultimate sentence of Paragraph 7.8.8, the words “this part of” be added between the words “in” and “the City Centre”.

5/7.1/2 That no other modification be made in response to the objections.

7.3 key development areas - paragraphs 7.8.13 & 7.8.14: wcc 19 a) former freight yard complex; wcc 19 c) George Street / ings road area

The Objections

1240/RW00008/Wakefield City Centre/KDA1	- English Heritage
511/W00302/Wakefield City Centre/KDA1	- Railtrack PLC
946/W01323/Wakefield City Centre/KDA2	- GMI Rovinian Limited

Summary of Objections

- The UDP should highlight that the expanded site of the Former Freight Yard Complex includes parts of two conservation areas and a number of listed buildings and that regard should be had to these matters in any development proposal.
- Reference to rail freight not being an appropriate form of development at the Former Freight Yard Complex, and detailed consideration of car parking, should be deleted from the text.
- Reference to highway improvements on specific named roads should be avoided.
- Part of the Key Development Area, under WCC19 C), should be re-allocated for retail development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- Regarding reference to conservation interests within the Former Freight Yard Complex, I consider the amended text under Paragraph 7.8.14(a)(i) of the Revised Deposit Alterations to be adequate. I would expect the Council, in assessing any development proposal for the site, to pay proper regard to the relevant listed buildings and conservation areas.
- In terms of development for rail freight uses, I note that PPG 13 offers support for the increased use of rail for the movement of freight. However, this support is qualified by other considerations. In the present case, the Council states that to encourage industrial and commercial traffic through a City Centre setting would be undesirable. In my opinion, this is an overriding consideration and development of the site for rail freight use would not be appropriate.
- I note that the former goods yard enjoys permitted development rights and that rail freight use could commence without the need for planning permission. Nevertheless, certain ancillary works, such as access improvements, could require permission. In my view, notwithstanding any permitted development rights, environmental considerations dictate that development of the site for its historic use should not be encouraged.

- Regarding car parking, and as recognised at the Inquiry, the text of the Revised Deposit Alterations refers to an enlarged area that includes public City Centre car parking. The reference under Paragraph 7.8.14(a)(iii) to a reduction in this provision is therefore appropriate and no modification is required.
- Turning to the issue of reference to highway improvements on two named roads within the area, the objector considers this to be overly detailed and specific. In my opinion, this reference brings greater certainty and indicates what is likely to be expected in developing the site. This can only be of benefit. Such specific reference is not harmful to the UDP and does not rule out the possibility of highway improvements to other, unnamed, roads. I do not recommend any modification in response.
- The title of the extended Key Development Area was highlighted by the objector as being inaccurate in describing the area as a whole. The Council indicated that the objector's suggested title of Balne Lane/Burton Street/Westgate was acceptable. In addition, the objector highlighted text relating to the replacement of Westgate station. To my mind, this text no longer accurately reflects the current situation. It would be more appropriate to refer to upgrading, expansion or replacement of station facilities.
- Finally, I turn to the George Street/Ings Road Key Development Area. The objector considers that the Arthur Ellis Works, that occupies the southeastern corner of the KDA, should be allocated for retail development. In shopping policy terms, I would regard this as an edge-of-centre site. However, the objector has not undertaken an assessment of need or demonstrated a sequential approach to site selection such as is required by PPG 6. In my opinion, without such an assessment, it would be inappropriate to consider the allocation of the site for retail development in the Unitary Development Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5/7.3/1 That references to the Former Freight Yard Complex be amended to read "Balne Lane/Burton Street/Westgate".

5/7.3/2 That after the words "will benefit from" in the first sentence of Paragraph 7.8.14(a), the following words be substituted: "...any proposal to upgrade, expand or replace facilities at the current Westgate Station."

5/7.3/3 That no other modification be made in response to the objections.

7.4 special policy areas - section 7.11: wcc d51 kirkgate / sun lane; wcc d40 wakefield waterfront

The Objections

1086/G00322/All/SPAS	- GOYH
1086/RW00251/Wakefield City Centre/SPA1	- GOYH
1086/RW00252/Wakefield City Centre/SPA2	- GOYH
790/W00390/Wakefield City Centre/SPA2	- Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd
947/W01324/Wakefield City Centre/SPA2	- Jarvis Rail

Summary of Objections

- The designation of the Kirkgate/Sun Lane and Wakefield Waterfront areas as Special Policy Areas is not acceptable.
- The housing capacity for the Wakefield Waterfront SPA is excessive.
- Land adjoining Kirkgate Station should be included within the Wakefield Waterfront Special Policy Area but taken out of the Conservation Area.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- The Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber is concerned that, for both the Kirkgate/Sun Lane and Wakefield Waterfront areas, designation as Special Policy Areas is not appropriate. For my part, I consider that an approach that allows a mix of land uses and an element of flexibility is fitting in these cases. I note that, for the Kirkgate/Sun Lane site, a regeneration brief is to be prepared. For Wakefield Waterfront, a commercial feasibility study is available for the core area, there is an adopted development brief for the area south of Wakefield Lock and planning permission exists for the skill centre site. In all the circumstance, I consider that appropriate advice is or will be available. However, I feel that adding references to Government guidance could strengthen the text.
- The housing capacity for the Wakefield Waterfront Special Policy Area has been amended to 200 in Annex B1 of Document 2 of the Revised Deposit Alterations. The objection relates to the figure of 300 in Annex B of Document 2 of the Initial Deposit Alterations. In the absence of further information from the objector, and from inspection of the extent of the site, I consider this site to be substantial in size and fully capable of providing the minimum number of dwellings denoted in the Revised Deposit Alterations.
- Regarding the inclusion of land adjoining Kirkgate Station within the Wakefield Waterfront Special Policy Area, I note that the requested amendment has been carried out in the Revised Deposit Alterations. In respect of the site's exclusion or otherwise from the Conservation Area, this is a matter to be determined under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, not under the development plan. As such, no modification would be appropriate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

5/7.4/1 That the following words be added at the end of both Paragraphs 7.11.3 and 7.11.4: "Development will be progressed in accordance with Government guidance."

5/7.4/2 That no other modification be made in response to the objections.