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Information

This Core Strategy Preferred Options Report, the Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report and their accompanying Sustainability Report are available to view and download on the Council’s web-site at: www.wakefield.gov.uk/ldf. Copies are also available to view at main libraries and Council offices and can be obtained free of charge from the above address or by ringing (01924) 306495. If you would like to talk to a planning officer working on the LDF about any aspect of this document please contact the Spatial Policy Group on (01924) 306616 / 306620 / 306417.

If you would like an extract or summary of this document on cassette, in large type, in Braille or any other format, please call the Access to Services Implementation Group on (01924) 306764.
1 Introduction and Explanation

1.1 The Local Development Framework

1.1.1 The Council is introducing a new type of plan, known as the Local Development Framework (LDF), to guide the use of land and new development throughout the District. It is being prepared under new government legislation for development plans and will replace the Unitary Development Plan First Alteration (UDP) which was adopted in January 2003. The new LDF system is described in more detail in Appendix 1 ‘The New Development Plan System’ to this report whilst a glossary of terms used can be found in Appendix 9 ‘Glossary of Terms’.

1.1.2 The LDF will include policies and proposals for the development and use of land in the District for the period to 2021. It will be closely linked to Wakefield District Partnership’s Community Strategy, Fast Forward, addressing issues which relate to land use and development in different parts of the District, with the overall intention of making it a more attractive and prosperous place to live. The LDF will also provide the policy framework for determining planning applications.

1.2 The Core Strategy Development Plan Document

1.2.1 Whereas the UDP was a single document, the LDF will be made up of a number of separate Local Development Documents. This report is concerned with the Core Strategy Development Plan Document which will be the LDF’s key strategic planning document. It will:

- define the spatial vision for Wakefield District to 2021;
- set out a series of objectives designed to achieve the vision;
- include a spatial development strategy to meet the objectives and accommodate the anticipated need for new development, including that needed to deliver the Community Strategy;
- include strategic policies to guide and control the overall scale, type and location of new development and transport investment; and
- include a statement of the number of additional dwellings to be provided.

It will not include details of land allocations nor primary development control policies – these will be in separate Development Plan Documents. All other Local Development Documents must conform to the Core Strategy.

1.3 The Preferred Options Stage - Community Engagement

1.3.1 Stakeholder and community involvement is a fundamental requirement of the new planning system. Details of how the community and stakeholders will be involved in the preparation of Local Development Documents are contained in a separate document – the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). More details are given in Appendix 1 ‘The New Development Plan System’.

---

1 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
1.3.2 In January and February 2005 the Council carried out widespread consultation with statutory bodies, local organisations and groups and individual citizens on the issues which the initial LDF should address and the opportunities for dealing with them. It published an ‘Issues & Options Report’ relating to three Development Plan Documents (DPDs) to stimulate discussion and debate:

- Core Strategy Development Plan Document
- Site Specific Policies and Proposals Development Plan Document
- Development Control Policies Development Plan Document

1.3.3 A total of 1,358 separate comments were received from 114 different respondents covering all three documents. These comments have been considered and taken into account in this next stage of preparing each document – ‘Preferred Options’. A short summary of the views put forward at the Issues & Options stage is included in the explanation accompanying the strategy and policies in later chapters of this document. A fuller report of the Issues & Options consultation is published separately and can be viewed on the Council’s web-site.

1.3.4 This is the latest of several rounds of public engagement that the Council is undertaking, in line with the proposals in the SCI and fulfilling statutory requirements. The purpose of the ‘Preferred Options’ stage is for the Council to seek the views of the community and stakeholders on the proposals it is recommending for the LDF Core Strategy which will shape the future planning of the District. The aim is to encourage public involvement before decisions are made about the content of the final document to be submitted to the Secretary of State.

1.4 Structure of the Preferred Options Report

1.4.1 After this Introduction and Explanation there follows a chapter which sets out the context within which the Core Strategy is being prepared, including the issues facing the District which need to be tackled and the current national, regional and local policy framework. The remainder of the report sets out the Council’s preferred options for the LDF’s core vision, objectives, development strategy and strategic policies and explains why each has been chosen.

1.4.2 Figure 1 ‘Relationship of the Core Strategy to Other Documents’ explains how the Core Strategy relates to the strategies which influence its content and its relationship to other parts of the LDF. Table 1 ‘Content of the Core Strategy DPD’ summarises the purpose of the different parts of the Core Strategy – vision, objectives, strategy and policies. A leaflet which explains the purpose and summarises the main points of the Core Strategy is also available.

Figure 1 Relationship of the Core Strategy to Other Documents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Where found in the Preferred Options Report</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Vision</td>
<td>Section 3.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes a summary of the characteristics of the District and of the issues that need to be addressed. Sets out the vision, what needs to be done to achieve it and what the District should be like in 2021 as a result. Gives direction to the new development and infrastructure investment needed to deliver Fast Forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Objectives</td>
<td>Section 3.3</td>
<td>Objectives 1 – 11</td>
<td>Eleven objectives to help measure success in moving towards the vision for the District and achieving development which is sustainable, in line with national and regional priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Development Strategy</td>
<td>Section 3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guides the location of new development in the District and the provision of services and infrastructure to achieve the vision and objectives. Based on a settlement hierarchy, the strategy seeks to concentrate most development in the largest most accessible centres to help achieve urban renaissance. Development in smaller centres should be to meet local needs and help to achieve sustainable communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Spatial Policies</td>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
<td>Policies CS1 – CS4</td>
<td>Four strategic policies are proposed to establish general development principles which all new development should adhere to, to help create attractive, high quality sustainable places:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The Location of Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Development Criteria (relates to planning obligations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- High Quality Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Policies</td>
<td>Chapters 5 to 15</td>
<td>Policies CS5 – CS40</td>
<td>More detailed policies which translate the vision, objectives, strategy and development principles into courses of action for different types of activity. These form the basis for the allocation of specific sites and for more detailed development control policies which are proposed in separate DPDs. They guide the scale and type of development in different locations and include a policy on the number of additional houses to be built each year (CS6). Topics are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Economy and Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Transport and Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Retailing and Town Centre Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Facilities and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Leisure, Recreation and Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Community Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Green Belt and Safeguarded Land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Content of the Core Strategy DPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Where found in the Preferred Options Report</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|         |                                            |            | • Environment  
|         |                                            |            | • Waste Management  
|         |                                            |            | • Minerals |

**Preferred and Rejected Options**

1.4.3 The context described in the next chapter effectively limits some of the options for the LDF. Where there are considered to be no reasonable alternatives to the approach favoured by the Council the term ‘Preferred Approach’ has been used. Where there is a choice to be made between different options, the report sets out the option favoured by the Council as the ‘Preferred Option’. The alternative options that have been considered are then outlined together with a brief explanation of why each has been rejected. These are termed ‘Rejected Options’.

1.5 Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA)

1.5.1 To ensure that the LDF’s policies and proposals will create sustainable development, each of its documents must comply with the requirements of the EU Directive on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)\(^3\) and must be subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (SA), required under new legislation\(^4\). This means testing objectives, strategies and policies at each stage of preparation to assess their potential impact on environmental, economic and social objectives and making any necessary changes to ensure sustainability. The Sustainability Report which accompanies this Preferred Options Report fulfils these requirements. Copies of the report and a summary are available on request and can be accessed on the Council’s web-site.

1.5.2 A Scoping Report and Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report were issued for the Issues & Options consultation earlier in 2005. The Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report appraised both the proposed objectives and the various options for strategy and policies put forward at that time. The outcome of the Initial Sustainability Appraisal has been taken into account when choosing the preferred options for objectives, strategy and policies at this next stage. Appendix 2 ’Core Strategy Policies - Links to Objectives, Initial Sustainability Appraisal and Monitoring’ shows how the preferred options for the policies included in chapters 4 ‘Strategic Spatial Policies’ to 15 ‘Minerals’ of this report were assessed in terms of sustainability, where an equivalent proposal was included at the Issues & Options stage. Since then, further consideration has been given to the content of the Core Strategy which has led to a number of changes being made to the objectives, strategy and policies. The latest Sustainability Report appraises the amended versions as they appear in this report.

---

\(^3\) Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, and  
A Practical Guide to the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive, ODPM, 2005  
1.6 How Do I Get Involved?

1.6.1 We are writing to:

- consultees identified in the Council’s Statement of Community Involvement;
- all those who responded to the Issues & Options Consultation;
- any one else who has asked to be kept informed about the preparation of the LDF;

to let them know that the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report, the Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report which is also being published for consultation, and their accompanying Sustainability Report are available for comment. If you are aware of anyone else who may wish to be informed let us know and we will write to them.

1.6.2 We need your views. If you have comments on the Council’s preferred options for the vision, objectives, development strategy and policies put forward in this report or you wish to suggest alternatives, please:

- comment online on the Council’s web-site at www.wakefield.gov.uk/ldf; or
- fill in the enclosed comments form and return it to the address below; or
- e-mail your comments to stratpoludp@wakefield.gov.uk.

You can also comment on the Sustainability Report in the same ways.

All comments should reach us by 5.00 p.m. on Wednesday 1st March 2006.

Send your comments to:

Wakefield Metropolitan District Council
Spatial Policy Group
Regeneration & Housing Services
PO Box 92
Newton Bar
Wakefield
WF1 1XS
Fax: (01924) 306660

If you wish to be kept informed of progress in preparing the LDF and be notified of future consultation stages tick the relevant box on the form or e-mail us with details and we will add your name and address to our mailing list.

1.7 What Happens Next?

1.7.1 All comments received during this 6 week period of consultation will be considered carefully by the Council and will be taken into account in preparing the final version of the Core Strategy DPD to be submitted to the Secretary of State, which is due to take place in Autumn 2006.

1.7.2 Whilst everyone’s views matter and are taken into account it is not always possible to meet everyone’s wishes and aspirations. Difficult choices will have to be made about the strategy and policies to be put forward. To help you know how the Council has responded to your views a report of the Preferred Options consultation will be issued with the final Core Strategy. If, when the Core Strategy is submitted to the Secretary of State you think that your views
have not been reflected adequately there will be an opportunity to make a formal representation which will be considered by an independent inspector at a Public Examination. Further details about this will be given at the time of submission.

1.7.3 Details of the timetable for preparing each LDF document, including the points at which engagement will take place, are shown in the Local Development Scheme (LDS). The LDS has been adopted by the Council and agreed by the Government Office and is available to view on the Council’s web-site or from the above address. The LDS will be reviewed early in 2006 to reflect recent changes to the timetable. More details about the LDS are given in Appendix 1 ‘The New Development Plan System’
2 **Context**

2.1 **District Profile**

2.1.1 Wakefield Metropolitan District covers some 350 square kilometres and forms one of five districts which make up the county of West Yorkshire. The new Draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), which will be issued for consultation in January 2006, identifies the District as lying within the Leeds City Region[^5]. It is situated to the south of Leeds itself and to the east of Kirklees, whilst Barnsley and Doncaster metropolitan districts adjoin to the south. Selby District, which is predominantly rural, lies to the east.

2.1.2 The District occupies a strategic location astride the M1, M62, A1 and main East Coast rail line. This and its proximity to Leeds make it highly accessible and able to play a prominent role within the sub-region. Whilst the influence of Leeds as a centre for employment, shopping, leisure and other services, is felt throughout the District, there are also strong links with other adjoining districts, notably Barnsley, Doncaster and Kirklees.

2.1.3 The north of the District is largely urban. Wakefield city is the main urban area and is identified as a sub-regional centre in new Draft RSS. It serves as the main centre for jobs, shopping, leisure, culture, health and other services for much of the District. Three major new developments are planned at the Waterfront, Marsh Way and Westgate which will help to transform the city centre and make it more attractive and accessible. In addition, the District contains a further thirteen settlements of between 5,000 and 40,000 population and many villages and smaller settlements, each with its own character and role.

2.1.4 The towns of Ossett and Horbury lie to the west of Wakefield whilst the urban area of Stanley/Outwood adjoins to the north. These settlements provide local employment and services but have also become commuter settlements for Leeds.

2.1.5 The Five Towns, comprising the principal service centres of Castleford and Pontefract and the smaller towns of Normanton, Knottingley and Featherstone, are located in the north-east of the District astride the M62 and A1. These settlements share strong historic, economic and cultural links based around the growth and subsequent decline of coal mining and other industries. The legacy of this industrial past is being tackled as these settlements develop new roles, including the Wakefield Europort development, one of the main distribution locations in the region with direct rail services to mainland Europe via the Channel Tunnel, and the Glasshoughton regional leisure complex and designer outlet village.

2.1.6 About 70% of the District is rural in nature, concentrated mainly in the south. This area comprises a series of smaller towns and villages set within open countryside and includes major visitor attractions – Nostell Priory house and park, the National Mining Museum and the West Yorkshire Sculpture Park. The South East includes the towns of Hemsworth and South Elmsall/South Kirkby together with a number of smaller settlements whose development has been associated with the former coal mining industry. The area has links with Doncaster and Barnsley and relies on these centres, as well as Leeds and Wakefield, for jobs and services.

2.1.7 Appendix 3 ‘District Profile’ contains background information about the District whilst the following paragraphs describe some of the main points. The chosen indicators record the current state of the District relative to the region and nation as a whole. Monitoring these items in future will help to show how the context within which the LDF is working is changing and what impact the LDF policies, alongside many other factors, are having.

[^5]: See Appendix 4 ‘National, Regional and Local Policy Context’
Population

2.1.8 The District has a population of 318,300 (2003 mid year estimate) with an estimated 1.6M people living within easy commuting distance, and 6.8M within one hour’s drive. In the 10 years 1993-2003 the population grew by only 1.3% compared with an increase nationally of 3.6%. However, growth has been more rapid in recent years fuelled by strong net-inward migration especially from Leeds District. The latest projections show that, if current trends continue, the population will grow by a further 9.0% by 2028. In line with national trends the District’s population is ageing and this trend is set to continue. Numbers aged over 60 will increase by 55% in the next 25 years, whilst those aged under 60 will fall by 3%. The working age population will decrease as those born between 1945 and 1970 move into retirement and are replaced by smaller numbers born since the mid-1970s. Ethnic minorities accounted for just 2.3% of the District’s population at the time of the 2001 Census, compared with 9.1% in England as a whole.

Economy

2.1.9 The District forms an integral part of a wider regional economy and labour market and enjoys the benefits of its proximity to Leeds, one of the fastest growing cities in the UK. There has been a dramatic restructuring of employment over the last 20 years with distribution and service industries replacing coal mining and other traditional industries, as the economy has successfully adapted and diversified. Forecasts suggest that employment will continue to grow though not all parts of the District are benefiting equally. Following a rapid decline in recent years, the unemployment rate is now below regional and national levels, as is the rate of long term unemployment. However, ill-health, worklessness, and low educational and workforce skills continue to be of concern.

Deprivation

2.1.10 The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004 (IMD2004) shows that Wakefield is ranked the 54th most deprived local authority area in England and 35% of the District’s population live in areas that are amongst the 10% most deprived nationally. The IMD also shows the District to have relatively high levels of deprivation in employment, income, health, education and skills.

Housing

2.1.11 A wide range of housing of different types and different prices is available across the District. House prices are still below regional and national averages but have risen dramatically in recent years so that affordability is becoming a major issue. Compared with the regional and national picture there are more semi-detached properties in Wakefield and fewer terraced houses and flats. Rates of home ownership have been below regional and national levels in the past but are now only slightly lower. A smaller proportion of the housing stock is unfit than in other parts of the region but many houses are in need of some improvement to bring them up to an acceptable standard.

Travel

2.1.12 Wakefield’s strategic position provides excellent access to all parts of the UK by road, rail and waterway. Further major improvements are planned to the road network. Levels of car ownership in the District are in line with those for the region but are below national rates and it is to be expected that they will increase as incomes rise. Despite low car ownership, more
people use their cars to travel to work in Wakefield than in the region as a whole or nationally, and journeys tend to be longer. This reflects the dispersed nature of settlements in the District and the difficulty in providing viable bus services in some places.

Environment

2.1.13 In the past the environment of much of the District has been damaged by coal mining and other industrial activity which have left a legacy of pollution, contamination and dereliction. However, much as been done to rectify this in recent years. Dereliction has been cleared, land restored and new environmental assets created, like Anglers and Pugneys Country Parks. Much remains to be done but there is a growing appreciation by residents and visitors of the character and quality of the local landscape, and the need to protect important features.

2.2 Issues Facing the District

2.2.1 In order to inform the Core Strategy there needs to be a good understanding of the needs, constraints and issues facing the District, particularly those which are relevant to the LDF. Many of the strategies and other documents published by the Council and its partners refer to the issues and concerns facing the District which need to be tackled, but the main ones are drawn together in the Community Strategy, Fast Forward. They are summarised below.

2.2.2 Overall, there is a need to ensure a continuing increase in prosperity through new job creation and business development, better quality housing, leisure opportunities and transport services, at the same time as ensuring that other things which contribute to the quality of life, the District’s historic and natural assets, its health and education services, are protected, maintained and enhanced. Whilst all parts of the District need to share in improvements, through for example improved access to jobs and services, some parts of the District are clearly more deprived than others and need to be given higher priority for investment in new infrastructure, housing and environmental improvements.

Housing

2.2.3 The rate of new house-building in the District has been higher than allowed for in the UDP in recent years. The demand for new housing remains high in the north and west of the District, resulting from the growth of the Leeds economy which has attracted new people to live in the District, including many former Leeds residents. How to accommodate this high level of demand is an issue for the District. Partly as a result of high demand, house prices have risen significantly. This has led to a sharp increase in the need for affordable housing in most parts of the District which is not being met.

2.2.4 Whilst the housing market in Wakefield District is generally buoyant there are a number of areas of poor housing, particularly in the South East of the District, which are exhibiting signs of market failure with significant numbers of vacant properties. In addition, a significant proportion of the housing stock fails to meet the Government’s Decent Homes standard. Action to address these problems has begun and needs to intensify.

Economy

2.2.5 Over the last 20 years many parts of the District have seen the loss of mining, textile and other manufacturing jobs. Though these have largely been replaced and unemployment is now lower than the regional rate, there are concerns about the quality and vulnerability of the
new employment opportunities being created. Also, there is a high level of ‘hidden’ unemployment in the District with large numbers of people aged 50-65 being economically inactive. The rate of youth unemployment also remains above the national average.

2.2.6 There has been an uneven development of the economy with some areas, particularly the eastern half of the District, lagging behind in terms of employment and income levels. There is also a need for training and the development of new skills to be more closely linked with the development of new employment opportunities. High quality, high income jobs are also needed, particularly those which are knowledge based.

**Education, Training and Skills**

2.2.7 GCSE attainment levels have improved significantly but the numbers of young people staying in full time education after 16, though increasing, are still below the national average. The number of people who are working and are qualified to NVQ level 4 is also low and there are significant numbers who have no qualifications at all. Some parts of the District fall well below the national and local averages for engagement and attainment in learning and have been recognised as needing additional support.

**Transport**

2.2.8 The loss of local facilities and the decline in the use of public transport have led to an increasing reliance on the private car. Improving accessibility to services by non-car modes of transport is a major issue to be addressed. Access to employment opportunities is also a concern in the South East of the District. Bus services between the smaller settlements and the main service centres need to be improved as do rail and bus services to centres in neighbouring districts.

**Environment**

2.2.9 A clean, well maintained, environment is a key factor in achieving a high quality of life for residents. Many of the scars resulting from former mineral extraction and the District’s industrial past have been removed but signs of neglect and dereliction in some residential, town and village centres feature highly in people’s concerns.

2.2.10 Protected sites in Wakefield District cover just 2% of the District’s land area and the amount of tree cover is only 3.8%, one of the lowest percentages in the country. Protection and enhancement of the District’s landscape features, wildlife habitats, historic heritage and open spaces is therefore a major concern.

2.2.11 There is a need to protect the identity of individual settlements in the District by maintaining the Green Belt wherever possible. The character of many settlements has also been lost or spoilt over the years by poor quality development. This trend needs to be reversed.

**Community Safety**

2.2.12 Generally, Wakefield District has a lower than average incidence of crime. However, this is not reflected in people’s fear of crime. Surveys clearly show that fear of crime and particular aspects of crime are having a serious impact on people’s lives in some parts of the District. Causes of concern are house burglaries, youth crime, anti-social behaviour and drug-related crime. Most people place reducing crime as the key priority that would contribute to making their area a better place to live.
Health

2.2.13 A range of indicators suggest a significant proportion of the District’s population have health problems. More than 20% of people in the District have reported in surveys that they have a limiting long-term illness, health problem or disability. On average people living in areas to the east of Wakefield city experience significantly higher levels of poor health compared to those living in the west of the District. Of particular concern is the need for more services to be provided locally and to be more integrated.

2.3 National, Regional and Local Policy Context

2.3.1 Preparation of Wakefield’s LDF will take place within the context provided by Government planning policy statements and guidance, the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), new Draft RSS and Wakefield’s Community Strategy, Fast Forward. Together, these provide a clear framework for preparation of the more detailed policies and proposals contained in the LDF. The LDF needs to take account of national planning policy, must be in general conformity with RSS and has to demonstrate clear links with the Community Strategy. In turn, the LDF will be an important means by which these higher level strategies and policies are implemented.

2.3.2 In addition, the LDF has a key role in helping to co-ordinate and deliver many other strategies and programmes at regional, district and local level. Further details of these and the national, regional and local policy context are given in Appendix 4 ‘National, Regional and Local Policy Context’.

The Community Strategy Fast Forward

2.3.3 The Wakefield District Community Strategy, Fast Forward, published by the Wakefield District Partnership in 2003, represents a shared commitment by key organisations to work together to achieve a long-term vision of Wakefield District, to secure the future well being of people who live and work in the area. The Council and its partners are using the framework of ‘vision’, ‘key challenges’, ‘principles’ and ‘priorities’ in Fast Forward to draw up plans for action throughout the District.

2.3.4 Delivering the vision, particularly creating a dynamic local economy, achieving attractive environments, improving the quality of housing, improving accessibility and increasing the range of services available locally, will depend, in part, on harnessing local advantages and opportunities to bring about the regeneration of existing communities. A number of priorities for action to meet the Fast Forward challenges are proposed. The priorities set out under the challenge of ‘developing a dynamic local economy’ recognise the need to develop co-ordinated approaches at a sub-district level based around regeneration focusing on:

- The Urban Renaissance of Wakefield City
- The Five Towns Initiative
- Reconnecting the Coalfield Communities in the South East

2.3.5 The LDF will be the means by which the spatial elements of Fast Forward, i.e. those which apply in different ways in different parts of the District, are expanded and implemented. Fast Forward stresses the importance of the way its challenges are met. The principles included in Fast Forward, relating to involving local people and making sure that actions promote social cohesion and sustainability, are equally relevant to the LDF.

6 Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire & the Humber to 2016, Government Office for Yorkshire & the Humber, December 2004
Regeneration

2.3.6 The strategic framework for regeneration in Wakefield District is set out in a report prepared for first (the development agency for Wakefield) and the Council by Leeds Metropolitan University in 2003. The recommendations of the report have been accepted by the Council and are reflected in the priorities of Fast Forward. Three priority regeneration areas are identified in the strategy report and Fast Forward. Action plans and local forums are being established to develop and deliver specifically tailored programmes in these areas. The LDF will need to take account of and help to achieve the different strategies, priorities and programmes.

Urban Renaissance

2.3.7 Urban renaissance is a key agent of regeneration. Yorkshire Forward launched a programme of urban renaissance in a number of towns across the county in 2001. An initial urban renaissance vision for Wakefield District was published in 2002 following a series of public events. A second report in 2005 aims to define how the vision might be realised. The urban renaissance approach seeks to:

- Ensure efficient and careful use of land and buildings.
- Remove demand for random greenfield development.
- Make good public transport a viable public option.
- Produce an attractive environment for walking and cycling.

2.3.8 The aim is to create a network of compact, multi-use towns within the District which are well connected to each other and the rest of the sub-region through a strategy of intensified development, linked to a high quality public realm, and increased transport connections. A separate strategy document has been prepared for Wakefield city to inform preparation of the LDF, particularly the Central Wakefield Area Action Plan. The vision is for the city to be a hub for the expanding knowledge economy, to be the natural focus of cultural life and to experience expanded retail, entertainment and leisure facilities.

2.3.9 The Five Towns, especially Castleford and Pontefract, are also part of the urban renaissance programme. Key themes and objectives were developed in a report published in 2003 and a more detailed strategy was published in 2005. The key themes and objectives identified are to expand and diversify town centres to bring them back into use, make them more accessible to outlying neighbourhoods and improve public transport links between towns. New development should be concentrated within centres using brownfield land to protect Green Belt and ensure the separate identity of settlements is maintained. The vision is to create a group of self-sustaining settlements through collaboration.

2.3.10 The strategy, policies and land allocations in the LDF will be one of the means by which the urban renaissance vision and proposals are implemented.

Parish Plans

2.3.11 A number of local communities have prepared Parish Plans setting out their vision for the future and highlighting local issues which need to be addressed. Where relevant, the findings of Parish Plans will be taken into account in the preparation of the LDF. However, in many
cases the proposals or aspirations set out in the plans are too detailed for specific reference
to be made to them in Local Development Documents. The following parishes are known to
have prepared or be preparing Parish Plans though the list is expanding continually:

- Badsworth
- Crigglestone
- Ryhill and Havercroft
- Sharlston
- South Hiendley

2.3.12 For local communities thinking of preparing a Parish Plan, advice is available from the
Countryside Agency\(^{11}\) whilst Yorkshire Planning Aid\(^{12}\) will be able to help with preparing the
plan.

2.3.13 Those contemplating development in settlements where a Parish Plan has been or is being
prepared should consult the plan at an early stage and should speak to the Parish or Town
Council to see how the proposed development can contribute to meeting local aims and
aspirations.

2.4 Conformity

2.4.1 The LDF vision, objectives, strategy and policies need to be closely linked to the vision,
challenges and priorities identified in Fast Forward and with national and regional policy
guidance. Appendix 5 ‘Core Strategy Objectives - Links to Higher Level Strategies’ shows
how the preferred objectives for the Core Strategy link to the five challenges in Fast Forward,
the four themes in current RSS and the Government’s four aims for sustainable development.
This demonstrates that the LDF Core Strategy is clearly rooted in and conforms to higher
level strategies and objectives.


\(^{12}\) Yorkshire Planning Aid, The Royal Town Planning Institute, Yorkshire Branch, 8 Woodhouse Square, Leeds, LS3 1AD
3 Spatial Vision, Objectives and Development Strategy

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 This chapter of the LDF Core Strategy DPD will set out the overall vision, objectives and strategy for development in Wakefield District for the period to 2021. The LDF development strategy will need to be consistent with RSS and with national planning policy guidance and will also be one of the most important delivery tools for achieving the Community Strategy, Fast Forward.

3.2 Spatial Vision

3.2.1 Fast Forward sets out the vision for the District for the next 25 years. The LDF shares and supports this overall vision. The Core Strategy’s spatial vision for the District which will give direction to the development and infrastructure needed to deliver Fast Forward up to 2021. Work has been carried out recently aimed at deciding the direction in which different parts of the District should be moving, in the context of evolving urban renaissance and regeneration activities. This too has been drawn on in developing the vision for the LDF.

3.2.2 The preferred approach to the spatial vision to be delivered through the LDF is:

"By 2021 Wakefield District will be a more attractive, prosperous and sustainable place in which to live, for all sections of society. The quality of life for residents will have improved relative to conditions in the region and nation as a whole. The Council will work with the Wakefield District Partnership, other agencies, groups and citizens to bring about the desired changes and will seek to direct new development, infrastructure and services towards fulfilling the vision."

The District will continue to make a significant contribution to the prosperity and diversity of the Leeds City Region and the wider Yorkshire & Humber Region. Close links with neighbouring areas will be strengthened and the District will benefit from the expansion of the sub-regional economy by taking advantage of its accessibility to other centres within the Leeds City Region and to the national transport network. New job opportunities will have been created by attracting investors seeking to take advantage of the District’s excellent road, rail and water transport links. New jobs will also have been created in cultural and media industries focused around the new Hepworth Gallery.

The demand for new development generated by continuing economic growth will be accommodated in a sustainable way, by ensuring that the benefits are spread throughout the District, particularly to deprived communities, and that the environment is protected and enhanced. More sustainable patterns of living will be achieved through a spatial strategy which aims to create balanced communities, where individual settlements have a range of housing, jobs and services appropriate to their size and function and where other jobs and higher level services can be accessed conveniently by sustainable means of transport.

Wakefield city, Castleford and Pontefract will continue to be the main centres of the District where most homes, jobs and services are located. The other urban areas of the District will be more attractive and viable that at present, being the focus of local shopping, employment and service provision. Investment and new activities have been attracted particularly to city and town centres where they will contribute to urban renaissance and other regeneration initiatives.
Wakefield will be a distinctive, vibrant city at the heart of the District’s economy. It will be a thriving commercial centre presenting a distinctive retail offer, modern office accommodation, a range of quality residential opportunities and a mix of excellent leisure and cultural facilities.

Urban renaissance initiatives in the ‘Five Towns’ (Castleford, Pontefract, Normanton, Knottingley and Featherstone) will have helped to transform these urban areas, providing new housing, economic opportunities, good quality transport links and a high quality environment. Castleford and Pontefract town centres will provide a range of shopping, service, health and transport opportunities which meet the needs of those living in the area. Glasshoughton (Castleford) will continue to provide sub-regional leisure and niche shopping opportunities which complement and enhance the town centres.

In the South East of the District, Hemsworth will have developed as a market town and South Elmsall/South Kirkby will have become a viable, sustainable centre for local jobs and services, together providing the focus for this part of the District.

Only limited additional development will have occurred outside the urban areas, with most of that focused into local service centres where modest growth to bring about more balanced communities will have helped to improve the relative sustainability of these settlements. In villages and the smallest settlements new development will have been very limited, aimed particularly at supporting the rural economy, providing community facilities and increasing the availability of affordable housing.

An appropriate scale of housing will have been provided in each settlement, reflecting local needs and the level of jobs and services available. The range of housing types and the quality of living environments offered to residents will have increased through taking advantage of opportunities presented in new developments. Problems of market failure in parts of the housing stock in the South East of the District will have been overcome, through concerted action by the agencies involved, and the area will have developed a buoyant housing market. Wherever new housing has been built, a high priority will have been given to the provision of housing which is affordable to existing residents. Action by Wakefield and District Housing, the Council and private owners will have improved the existing housing stock, mainly through refurbishment but in some places through selective demolition and rebuilding.

Improved public transport services will have enabled speedier, more convenient travel throughout the District and the wider sub-region, allowing people in rural areas and smaller communities to take advantage of the range of jobs and services available in larger centres. Investment in key highway schemes and new traffic management measures will have helped to relieve congestion particularly in town centres and on the strategic highway network.

The quality of the District’s rich historic and natural heritage, its diverse wildlife and habitats and the character of its landscape and open spaces will have been protected and enhanced through action by the Council and its partners. The openness of much of the District outside the urban areas will have been protected by maintaining the Green Belt. Improved standards of design and management will have helped to improve the character and appearance of the District’s settlements, its Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings. Residential amenity will have been protected and improved by effective control of all forms of pollution. Residents will also be safer because opportunities for crime will have been reduced through careful design.”
3.3 Spatial Objectives

3.3.1 The Core Strategy will include a set of objectives to help measure the success of the strategy in moving towards the vision for the District and to bring about a more sustainable approach to development. The spatial vision for Wakefield described above and the national and regional planning policy context outlined in the previous chapter will be the basis for determining the spatial objectives for the LDF. The following objectives have been identified as the preferred approach: Appendix 5 ‘Core Strategy Objectives - Links to Higher Level Strategies’ shows how the proposed objectives relate to aims and priorities in higher level strategies.

1. To ensure that all new development, activities and uses of land adhere to and promote the principles of sustainable development and enhance the quality of life for District residents.
2. To meet the needs of the District by building on its strengths and the opportunities provided through good links with the wider Leeds City Region, enabling it to play a prominent role in the creation of sustainable communities, in line with the strategy and policy framework provided by the Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire & the Humber.
3. To locate development where it will provide the opportunity for people to satisfy their day-to-day needs for employment, shopping, education, leisure, health and other services locally or in places which minimise the need to travel and are accessible safely and conveniently by non-car modes of travel – walking, cycling, public transport. This will be achieved by:
   a. concentrating most new development within urban areas, with major developments located in the largest settlements;
   b. focusing development activity in Wakefield city and other town centres, taking advantage of existing services and high levels of accessibility;
   c. allowing small scale development in local service centres, villages and rural areas which meets identified local needs or maintains the viability of local services.
4. To make it easier to travel around the District and the wider Leeds City Region and to access local services and amenities using sustainable transport modes (walking, cycling, public transport), by increasing transport choice and improving public transport accessibility.
5. To provide sufficient good quality housing of the appropriate sizes, types, tenures and affordability to meet the identified needs of the District, in line with the housing requirement of RSS, by promoting efficient use and improvement of the existing housing stock and providing new housing in sustainable locations.
6. To create attractive, successful and accessible city and town centres by encouraging development which provides a range of services and activities which are appropriate to the function and size of the centre.
7. To support the growth of a dynamic local economy which increases prosperity for all sections of the community by:
   a. encouraging investment and enterprise in the District and the development of clusters of economic activity;
   b. building on the competitive advantages enjoyed by the District;
   c. the urban renaissance of Wakefield City;
   d. reconnecting the Coalfield Communities in the South East;
   e. the urban renaissance of the Five Towns;
   f. encouraging the diversification of the rural economy.
8. To provide a range of high quality, accessible cultural, recreational and leisure opportunities across the District to improve the quality of life for residents and visitors.

9. To protect and enhance the historic heritage, character and identity of the individual settlements of the District by:
   a. ensuring that the scale and location of development in each settlement is in keeping with its size, form and character;
   b. ensuring that the buildings and open spaces which create character are protected, maintained and enhanced;
   c. ensuring high quality, sustainable, design in all new development;
   d. retaining the Green Belt to make a clear distinction between town and country.

10. To ensure that the District’s natural environment, including wildlife habitats and landscape character, is conserved and protected and that new development identifies, protects and enhances important assets.

11. To promote and maintain a clean, attractive and safe environment by reducing waste, avoiding pollution, ensuring efficient use of resources and promoting high quality design in all new development.

3.3.2 The Core Strategy will need to acknowledge that development is often about resolving conflicting objectives and that the strategy and policy framework will need to be applied flexibly in order to meet communities’ needs and aspirations.

3.4 The Spatial Development Strategy

3.4.1 This section of the Core Strategy sets out the spatial development strategy which will guide the location of new development in the District and steer development and the provision of services and infrastructure towards the achievement of the vision and objectives. This is a key aspect of the LDF.

3.4.2 There was general support for the principles of the proposed spatial development strategy outlined in the Issues & Options Report, though many who commented want to see the strategy applied flexibly to promote wider sustainable development objectives. Some also expressed a desire to see additional sustainable development allowed in smaller communities and rural areas. Some thought the role of Wakefield District in the region and Leeds City Region also needs to be recognised more fully. Some of the principles were thought to be of over-riding importance and were really strategic objectives, whilst potential conflicts between principles were identified, which need to be resolved. There was general support for a settlement hierarchy but it needs to be clearer, applied consistently and the relative weight given to the hierarchy vis-à-vis priorities for regeneration needs to be resolved. The principle of brownfield before greenfield should be applied in the context of the settlement hierarchy and the need to achieve sustainable development.

The Role and Function of Places

3.4.3 To support the spatial strategy and to assist in making choices about where new development should be located, it is necessary to understand the appropriate role and function of each settlement in the District both now and in future. In general, it is not anticipated that the relative size of settlements will change significantly but in some cases their functions need to be enhanced or strengthened, particularly where this will enable needs to be met locally leading to the creation of more sustainable communities. Identifying roles and functions can be aided
by establishing a settlement classification or hierarchy. This will help to identify those settlements where most development should take place and others where development ought to be limited, with the overall intention of creating sustainable settlements.

3.4.4 A number of sources and guidelines need to be considered when devising a settlement classification. Brief details of these are given in Appendix 6 ‘Defining / Classifying Settlements’. In addition, work has been undertaken to identify the range of services and facilities and the number of jobs available in each of the District’s settlement and its accessibility to higher level centres. The results are shown in Figure 3 ‘Settlement Appraisal’ in Appendix 6 ‘Defining / Classifying Settlements’. This information has been used to draw up the proposed settlement classification described below. The preferred approach is to adopt a threefold classification as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Areas</th>
<th>Local Service Centres</th>
<th>Villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield City – sub regional centre</td>
<td>Ackworth (Moor Top)</td>
<td>Badsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleford – principal service centre</td>
<td>Crofton</td>
<td>Darrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontefract – principal service centre</td>
<td>Fitzwilliam/Kinsley</td>
<td>Hall Green/Chapelthorpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Featherstone</td>
<td>Ryhill/Havercroft</td>
<td>High &amp; Low Ackworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemsworth</td>
<td>Upton</td>
<td>Kirkhamgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middlestown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knottingley (inc. Ferrybridge)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Netherton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton (inc. Altofts)</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Featherstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossett</td>
<td></td>
<td>Notton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmsall/South Kirkby</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharlston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley/Outwood</td>
<td>South Hiendley</td>
<td>Streethouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thorpe Audlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Bretton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woolley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Settlement Hierarchy

3.4.5 Urban Areas are generally those settlements which are most accessible, offering the highest level of services and employment opportunities where most new development should be concentrated.

3.4.6 Local Service Centres are the main settlements in the more rural parts of the District where employment, housing, services and other facilities can be provided close together to meet the needs of the immediate area.

3.4.7 Villages are smaller settlements where small scale development should take place to meet community aspirations, maintain the viability of local services and meet needs originating within the settlement.
3.4.8 The settlement classification set out above underlies the preferred approach to the spatial development strategy which will deliver the spatial vision and objectives. Within each settlement type there is scope to consider different options as the basis for making choices about the appropriate scale of development in individual settlements.

**Urban Areas**

3.4.9 The urban areas vary considerably in size and in the range of services they offer. Broadly, to create and maintain sustainable communities, the scale of new development should be commensurate with the size and function of the existing settlement with the largest urban areas now being the focus for most development in future. However, in order to meet the wider spatial objectives set out above it is necessary to consider other factors when assessing the appropriate scale of development in individual urban areas. These include:

- the need to take advantage of the growth opportunities afforded by location within the Leeds City Region;
- the spatial priorities identified in the Community Strategy for urban renaissance and regeneration;
- the need to tackle high levels of deprivation in some communities and to spread the benefits of growth more widely;
- the pressure on infrastructure and services created by past development and the availability of spare capacity;
- the opportunities afforded for new development.

3.4.10 Taking account of these factors the preferred approach to the development strategy for urban areas is as follows:

- **Wakefield City** is the largest settlement in the District and the only sub-regional centre. It offers the greatest range of services and employment and has a high degree of accessibility by public transport and other sustainable modes. The development strategy should seek to enhance the city’s role as a sub-regional centre within the Leeds City Region and to ensure that more new development takes place within the Wakefield urban area than in other places. The city centre should be the main focus of new retailing, leisure, commercial office and cultural developments in the District to support the high priority afforded to the urban renaissance of the centre in the Community Strategy. New housing should also be concentrated in the city centre and generally within the urban area, making best use of previously developed land and good quality public transport routes (high service frequencies, new vehicles and upgraded boarding facilities). Key locations for new development are: Wakefield Waterfront, Marsh Way and Westgate.

- Outside Wakefield City, the strategy should aim to focus new development in the following urban areas:
  
  i. Castleford, Pontefract, Normanton, Knottingley and Featherstone (the Five Towns)
  ii. Hemsworth and South Elmsall/South Kirkby in the South East of the District.

In the Five Towns new development should support urban renaissance and enable the towns to develop together as a network of inter-related urban areas. Castleford and Pontefract are the two largest settlements, which are identified as principal service centres in new Draft RSS, and they should be the focus for new
employment, housing, retailing, leisure, and cultural developments. Key locations for new development are: Castleford town centre and riverside, Glasshoughton, Pontefract town centre and the former Prince of Wales Colliery site. In the South East the aim of the strategy should be to maintain the open nature of the area and to concentrate new development within the urban areas of Hemsworth and South Elmsall/South Kirkby. The scale and location of new development should help to make these settlements more sustainable and able to act as service centres for this part of the District. Improving accessibility to and within this part of the District is essential to the success of the strategy. The scale of new housing should be to support housing market renewal. Key locations for new development are: South Kirkby Business Park and the Westfield Lane area in South Elmsall.

- The urban areas of Ossett, Horbury and Stanley/Outwood have experienced considerable housing growth in recent years and have developed a role as commuter settlements for Leeds. This has given rise to pressures on existing infrastructure and facilities. There is considerable demand for new development, particularly housing, in these urban areas but the aim of the development strategy should be to limit the scale of additional development to that which is needed to create and maintain a balanced range services and facilities which are commensurate with each settlement's size and function, and which can be accommodated within the capacity of existing or proposed infrastructure. This would allow new development and redevelopment to take place which revitalises town centres and makes best use of the limited supply of development opportunities within the existing urban areas where services, facilities and infrastructure are available or can be made available as part of the development.

Local Service Centres

3.4.11 Away from the urban areas decisions need to be made about the scale of development which is appropriate in smaller settlements. The preferred approach is to identify Local Service Centres where employment, housing (including affordable housing), services and other facilities can be provided close together to serve the needs of the immediate area. They will be the larger more sustainable settlements which have the best public transport connections, the highest numbers of shops and facilities, and relatively high proportions of jobs in relation to the number of residents of working age.

3.4.12 The settlements of Ackworth (Moor Top), Crofton, Fitzwilliam/Kinsley, Ryhill/Havercroft, and Upton already act as local centres and it is proposed that they be identified as Local Service Centres in the Core Strategy. The aim of the development strategy should be to create more balanced, sustainable communities by allowing limited new retail, employment and housing development to maintain and enhance the level of services to meet the needs of the settlement and its immediate area, without undermining the viability of services in other settlements. Service providers will be encouraged to support and develop appropriate facilities in these centres. Key aims will be to diversify the local economy to increase job opportunities and improve public transport accessibility.

Villages

3.4.13 Outside urban areas and settlements proposed as local service centres the scale of new development should be limited in order to help create sustainable communities. The preferred approach is to identify villages where some small scale development may be acceptable to meet specific local needs.
3.4.14 In settlements identified as Villages with relatively few facilities and low public transport accessibility, the development strategy should aim to limit the scale of future development. Within these settlements small scale development which helps to diversify the rural economy or provides new or improved community facilities will be encouraged. New housing would be allowed which is of a scale appropriate to the settlement and is necessary to meet identified local needs or to maintain the viability of existing services, without adding to the need to travel. When considering proposals for re-using existing buildings preference will be given to employment and community uses before residential.

Other Settlements

3.4.15 Most of the District outside urban areas, local service centres and villages lies within the Green Belt where specific policies apply to new development. However, there are a number of small settlements and groups of buildings which are not identified as villages but are not washed over by the Green Belt. In these places the preferred approach is to allow only very limited new development.

- Outside urban areas, local service centres and villages, in settlements not washed over by the Green Belt, the aim of the development strategy should be to severely limit the scale of all forms of new development and to contain development within the confines of the settlement, to ensure that the principles of sustainable development are not compromised. When considering proposals for re-using existing buildings preference will be given to employment and community uses before residential.

3.4.16 Villages and larger settlements in the hierarchy are shown on the ‘Key Diagram’. To help with identifying sites for development within individual settlements which are sustainable and comply with the spatial development strategy, it will be necessary to identify settlement boundaries. Usually, but not always, these will coincide with the Green Belt. Proposed settlement boundaries will be published for consultation at the time of the Site Specific Policies and Proposals Preferred Options Report.
4 Strategic Spatial Policies

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 The Core Strategy will also include the strategic policies which give effect to the spatial vision and objectives and implement the spatial development strategy. This chapter sets out policies which establish broad principles which new development should adhere to. Later chapters set out proposed policies on individual topics. Where appropriate, these indicate the scale and location of development anticipated in the period to 2021. They also form the basis for the allocation of sites in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD and for the more detailed policies in other DPDs which guide and control new development.

4.2 Development Principles

4.2.1 First amongst the strategic policies are those which establish general development principles. These principles need to be taken into account fully in new development, whether large or small and for whatever use, whether new build or a conversion, and when planning new transport and utilities infrastructure. Some development principles are provided by the national and regional context described in chapter two, others derive from the spatial objectives and spatial development strategy. The principles are needed to achieve attractive, high quality sustainable places where people want to live, work and relax and to ensure that the special qualities of local areas are retained and enhanced. The development principles are considered under four headings:

- Principles Determining the Location of Development
- Sustainable Development
- Development Criteria
- High Quality Design

Principles Determining the Location of Development

4.2.2 One of the main ways in which the Core Strategy can contribute to creating more sustainable communities is by including a policy which give a distinct spatial direction to the distribution and location of development and activities between and within settlements. This will help to deliver the third spatial objective and ensure that development is in accordance with the spatial development strategy. These locational principles will be applied when identifying sites for development in the Site Specific Policies & Proposals DPD and when assessing planning applications. The preferred approach is to include the following policy:
Policy CS 1

Principles Determining the Location of Development

The development and use of land which is of a scale and nature appropriate to a particular settlement or location and which contributes to making the settlement more sustainable, will be supported. Development proposals should accord with the spatial development strategy, the development principles and with other LDF policies, within the following broad framework:

a. most new development should take place within the urban areas, with major developments located in the largest settlements of Wakefield, Castleford and Pontefract. In other urban areas the scale of development should reflect the settlement’s size and function, the spatial priorities for urban renaissance and regeneration in the Community Strategy and the need to tackle high levels of deprivation in some communities. In particular, new development should be located within Wakefield city and other town centres, taking advantage of existing services and high levels of accessibility;

b. in local service centres limited development should take place to increase sustainability by enhancing the level of services, facilities and jobs provided, or to meet the needs of the settlement and its immediate area;

c. in settlements identified as villages only small scale development which supports rural diversification, creates community facilities, meets identified local needs or maintains the viability of existing services should take place. Development should be confined within the existing boundaries of the settlement;

d. in other settlements not washed over by the Green Belt development should be strictly limited and be confined within the existing boundaries of the settlement;

e. in the Green Belt development should conform to national, regional and LDF policies relating to the Green Belt.

In villages, smaller settlements and rural areas priority will be given to the re-use of existing buildings for employment and community uses before residential.

Within the above framework, the suitability of sites for development will be assessed by:

i. adopting a ‘sequential approach’ to meeting development needs, giving highest priority to land and buildings within urban areas and local service centres. Where needs can not be met in this way, consideration should be given next to sites which extend these settlements and are accessible by good quality public transport and finally, if necessary, to sites around nodes in good quality public transport corridors;

ii. in each of the locations in (f) in sequence, giving first priority to the re-use of previously developed land and buildings before the use of suitable greenfield land is considered;

iii. giving priority to sites which are accessible by public transport, walking and cycling and by rail and water for uses generating large freight movements;

iv. avoiding sites which have an adverse impact on the District’s environmental assets and resources.
Rejected Options – Principles Determining the Location of Development

Urban Areas

1. Cater for new development in urban areas in accordance with the level of demand in the recent past without regard to the need to achieve wider spatial objectives.

Reason – This option would lead to a greater amount of development in the west of the District, notably in Ossett, Horbury and Stanley/Outwood, causing greater pressure on facilities here and possibly undermining attempts to regenerate communities in other parts of the District.

Local Service Centres

2. Limit the scale of new development in Local Service Centres to meet an identified local need.

Reason – The aim is to create balanced communities. Allowing little or no new development might gradually lead to a reduced level of service provision and might cause pressure for development in less sustainable settlements.

3. Increase the number of Local Service Centres.

Reason – The essential purpose of the designation is to capitalise on existing levels of service provision and to focus new development and services to best effect. There are important differences in size and function between the identified Local Service Centres and other settlements. To increase their number would lead to more new development occurring in less sustainable locations and would spread available resources more thinly.

General

4. Allow a more dispersed pattern of development to encourage service provision and regeneration throughout the District, giving priority to settlements which are most deprived.

Reason – Whilst this might lead to more services becoming available in the smaller settlements it might also lead to pressure on other services, would fail to make best use of the opportunities in the larger urban areas undermining their role and function, would cause scarce resources to be spread more widely and, without a balanced provision of jobs and homes, could lead to increased car travel. It is an argument often put forward to support additional housing in rural areas but the scale of development required to justify additional services is usually excessive and out of keeping with the size of the settlement. Overall, this approach does not always lead to sustainable development and is not supported by national and regional guidance.

5. Allow no new development in villages and the smallest settlements.

Reason – This would restrict the ability to meet particular local housing needs locally and might stifle economic diversification in rural communities where this can be provided sustainably. However, it is clear that the scale of development must be strictly limited.

6. Allow further development on greenfield land on the edge of settlements particularly in the vicinity of motorway junctions or reflecting market demand.

This option would have significant impact on bio-diversity and landscape and would lead to development away from existing service centres causing a significant increase in car travel. It could bring potential economic benefits but with adverse effects on social and environmental conditions it would be unsustainable.
4.2.3 The principles of sustainable development are fundamental to national and regional planning policy (see Appendix 4 'National, Regional and Local Policy Context'). These principles will also underpin the spatial development strategy and all policies and proposals in the LDF. Sustainable development means achieving economic growth and removing social inequalities whilst at the same time protecting and enhancing the environment. The first spatial objective is to ensure that development is sustainable. This section aims to ensure that the location, scale and type of development allowed follows sustainable development principles and achieves environmental, economic and social gains for current and future generations.

4.2.4 Probably the greatest challenge to achieving sustainable development is climate change. Everyone has a responsibility to modify his or her lifestyle to offset the potential impact of climate change. Local authorities, agencies and businesses need to be aware of the predicted impacts of climate change and plan to adapt to the resulting effects. They also need to ensure that their actions do not worsen the impact of climate change by adopting and implementing sustainable policies. This means conserving scarce resources, encouraging renewable energy technologies, encouraging buildings to incorporate sustainable construction technologies, including water and energy conservation measures, and seeking to minimise the production of waste and providing recycling facilities. To be sustainable, development should make a contribution towards meeting specific targets (national, regional and sub-regional) for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, production of renewable energy and waste recycling.

4.2.5 It is important that new development does not have an adverse impact on existing neighbours and future occupants but helps to create and maintain quality environments that are clean, safe, healthy and pleasant. The LDF can make a significant contribution to protecting people and the environment from the potential adverse effects of natural forces and human activity by controlling the type and location of new development. There is a broad range of issues which need to be considered including flood risk, air quality and community safety.

4.2.6 The state of the environment affects quality of life and it is necessary to ensure that development does not lead to adverse impacts on the environment and local amenity. A policy on sustainable development should therefore seek to conserve and enhance the historic and natural environment, landscape character and bio-diversity, particularly protected sites of international, national and local importance.

4.2.7 When determining planning applications the Council will need to be sure that the proposal performs well against key sustainability tests. It is now an integral part of the plan making process that plans are subject to sustainability appraisal and it is considered reasonable, in appropriate cases, to require applicants to appraise their development proposals, to demonstrate that they contribute towards sustainable development.

4.2.8 Where a proposal would compromise sustainability, it should be for the applicant or developer to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority the impracticability of using more sustainable methods, systems, materials and energy sources and provision of sustainable infrastructure, and that all reasonable attempts have been made to mitigate the negative impacts of the proposal on sustainability. Additional cost will not, on its own, amount to impracticability.

4.2.9 The preferred approach is to develop a key policy which draws together all sustainability themes to ensure that the fundamental principles of sustainable development underpin all development proposals. This will include a requirement for applicants and developers to submit a sustainability appraisal alongside planning applications for new developments to address the principles of sustainable development. Development should only be permitted
where it is demonstrated to be consistent with the principles of sustainable development, as appropriate to its location, scale and form. This policy has links with many other policies, both in the Core Strategy and other LDF documents, where issues are dealt with in greater detail.

Policy CS 2

Sustainable Development

All proposals for the development and use of land must be sustainable. To ensure sustainability, proposals will be assessed in terms of the District’s identified needs and their potential impact on communities and the environment. Development will be supported where it is demonstrated that the following criteria have been taken into account and where appropriate measures are provided.

New development should:

a. be appropriate for the settlement in terms of scale, location, impact on amenity, character, distinctiveness and availability of local services;

b. provide safe and convenient access by public transport, bicycle and on foot to day-to-day needs for employment, shopping, education, leisure, health and other services, minimising the need to travel by car;

c. include measures to manage traffic and reduce congestion;

d. make efficient use of land, buildings and infrastructure;

e. make provision for services to the public and infrastructure made necessary by the development;

f. be designed to a high standard, being attractive, adaptable, accessible, safe and secure;

g. promote sustainable economic growth and employment;

h. promote safe and inclusive communities by reducing social inequalities and disadvantages and through improving health, economic and social well-being;

i. conserve and enhance buildings, sites and places of historic, archaeological or architectural importance;

j. conserve and enhance valued open spaces, the character and quality of local landscapes and the wider countryside;

k. conserve and enhance bio-diversity, wildlife habitats and species;

l. take account of the potential impact of climate change and incorporate measures to minimise greenhouse gas emissions;

m. protect the quality of natural resources including water, air and soil;

n. include appropriate measures to restore derelict or contaminated land;

o. avoid the risk of flooding and pollution in the form of noise, lighting, vibration, odour, emissions or dust;

p. conserve resources by employing sustainable building techniques, incorporating energy and water conservation measures and the use of renewable energy, wherever practical;

q. minimise waste production and maximise waste re-cycling.

These criteria will be used to assess development proposals. Applicants and developers will be expected to demonstrate that they have been taken into account and may be required to submit a sustainability statement alongside a planning application, at a level of detail reflecting the scale of development. This will be in addition to an Environmental Impact Assessment, where it is required by legislation.
Rejected Options - Sustainable Development

No options were considered as this policy reflects national and regional guidance and fundamental planning principles, though detailed changes to the wording or other criteria might be considered.

Development Criteria

4.2.10 It is important that provision is made for additional infrastructure, services and facilities resulting from new development and for their future maintenance, as well as for suitable access, parking, drainage and landscaping within the site. All new development contributes to demands on existing infrastructure, community facilities and public services. Developers will therefore be expected to contribute towards the necessary improvements or new provision to serve needs arising from their development. There was support in the Issues & Options consultation for clear and comprehensive polices in the LDF setting out where developer contributions will be required through a planning obligation. Development should not take place before the infrastructure needed by its occupants is in place. Development will only be permitted when agreement has been reached between the relevant parties on the funding and programmed implementation of required on-site and off-site provision.

4.2.11 The preferred approach is to include a policy in the Core Strategy that provides a checklist for developers to help ensure that all requirements are met. This will cross refer to other parts of the LDF, notably the Development Control Policies DPD and Supplementary Planning Documents where more detailed policies will be set out.
Policy CS 3

Development Criteria

Proposals for development will be supported that have made suitable arrangements for the improvement or provision of on-site and off-site infrastructure, services and facilities made necessary by the development and for their future maintenance, which may include but not be limited to:

a. layout and design;
b. building/surfacing materials;
c. landscaping;
d. car and cycle parking;
e. safe and convenient access for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles;
f. public transport services and facilities;
g. managing traffic and reducing congestion;
h. foul and surface water drainage and watercourses;
i. sustainable urban drainage systems;
j. flood risk;
k. pollution from noise, lighting, vibration, odour, emissions or dust;
l. storage and recycling of waste;
m. contamination and ground conditions;
n. sustainable construction;
o. use of renewable energy;
p. minimising opportunities for crime;
q. affordable housing;
r. education facilities;
s. open space including play space;
t. community and recreation facilities;

Arrangements for the provision of or improvement to the required standard will be secured by planning obligations or in some cases conditions attached to a planning permission.

Rejected Options – Development Criteria

No options were considered as this policy reflects fundamental planning principles, though detailed changes to the wording or other criteria might be considered.

High Quality Design

4.2.12 Good design is a key element in sustainable development. Raising the quality of design in new development is one of the Council’s aims which is expressed in spatial objective 9, and was supported in responses to the Issues & Options consultation. Improving the quality of the built environment is a key part of urban renaissance. The importance of good design is
also emphasised in national planning policy. The LDF will seek to ensure that development in the District enhances and protects its local distinctiveness and visual quality, and raises the quality of life for residents and visitors.

4.2.13 All new buildings should be of high quality design, must respect and enhance their surroundings, must not harm local amenity, should protect local distinctiveness and character and should take full account of people with special needs. They should be of an appropriate scale, design and materials for their location and include provision for landscaping. Public art may make a significant contribution to enhancing local character and identity, and will be supported where appropriate.

4.2.14 Developing an understanding of the characteristics of an area and the context should always form part of the work undertaken before drawing up a development proposal. A design led approach will ensure that every proposal, whatever its scale, responds positively to the particular characteristics of a site and its surroundings and reinforces local distinctiveness and landscape character. In appropriate cases the Council will, in accordance with PPS1, require a Design Statement to be submitted with a planning application.

4.2.15 Development proposals should ensure that the design and layout accommodates the needs of people with disabilities, women, the elderly and those with small children and that suitable access is provided. Special attention should be paid to access to public buildings in accordance with Government guidance and the Council’s Access for All document.

4.2.16 The preferred approach is to develop a design policy in the Core Strategy that establishes the need for high quality design. The Development Control Policies DPD will include more specific policies to be used in determining planning applications and it may be appropriate to bring forward Supplementary Planning Document(s) on design issues, to develop design principles further. All those proposing development are advised to consult the Government guidance document ‘By Design’ (the companion to PPS1).

Policy CS 4

High Quality Design

All development proposals should demonstrate high quality, sustainable, design and landscaping which is appropriate to the scale and nature of the development and which:

a. respects and enhances its surroundings;
b. protects local amenity;
c. protects and enhances local distinctiveness and character;
d. takes full account of the people with special needs.

Planning applications should be accompanied by sufficient supporting information to demonstrate how design related considerations have been addressed, including a Design Statement, where appropriate. Detailed design and landscaping requirements will be set out in the Development Control Policies DPD and other LDF documents. Proposals that meet these requirements will be supported.
Rejected Options – High Quality Design

No options were considered as this policy reflects the fundamental need for high quality design, though detailed changes to the wording or other criteria might be considered.
5 Housing

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 The amount, distribution and affordability of housing in the District in future are major issues for the LDF Core Strategy to tackle, in order to provide good quality housing to meet identified needs in line with spatial objective 5. Housing is also the most extensive land use and, in its relationship with jobs, services and transport networks, it is a key ingredient in helping to achieve sustainable development.

5.1.2 The pressures for housing development remain strong in many parts of the District, particularly the areas closest to Leeds, and must be carefully managed to ensure that the qualities and characteristics that attract people to the area in the first place are not damaged and that the demand can be accommodated without placing excessive pressure on existing infrastructure and services. In some areas there are problems associated with low demand and abandonment which need to be addressed.

5.1.3 The Core Strategy should have the following objectives for Housing:

- To provide an adequate and continuous supply of land for housing to meet the housing requirement in RSS in sustainable locations;
- To ensure the provision of a range of housing types and sizes, including affordable housing, to meet the identified needs of all sectors of the community;
- To protect and enhance the residential environment by ensuring that new residential development, whether through new build or conversion, is appropriate to its location;
- To support efforts to improve and renew the existing housing stock set out in the Regional Housing Strategy and the Council’s own Housing Strategy.

5.2 The Scale of Additional Housing

5.2.1 New RSS will establish the additional housing requirement for each local authority area in the region for the period 2004 to 2021. The LDF will need to ensure that enough land is available to meet the housing requirement for the District set in new RSS.

5.2.2 A slight majority of those responding to the LDF Issues & Options consultation wish to see a somewhat higher requirement figure than in the UDP First Alteration to meet current levels of demand and to bring about urban renaissance in parts of the District. This was balanced by concerns about the negative impact of high rates of house-building on the environment and infrastructure, the adverse effects on weak housing markets in some areas and the likely increase in commuting to Leeds if new housing is not accompanied by jobs. Some considered that the issue is really a matter for RSS to determine. Whatever the eventual requirement, there was concern that the supply should be more closely managed to ensure that actual house-building does not over-shoot the requirement by a wide margin.

5.2.3 The annual housing requirement set out in the UDP First Alteration and current RSS is a gross figure i.e. the actual number of houses to be built. In future, Government guidance stipulates that the requirement in new RSS and LDFs should be expressed as a net figure i.e. additions to the stock net of any losses as a result of clearance and other changes.

Estimates of the likely scale of future clearance will need to be added to the net housing requirement to arrive at a gross figure of new dwellings to be built, which will determine how much housing land is needed.

5.2.4 The proposed level of additional housing for each local authority area is included in new Draft RSS, which will be issued for consultation in January 2006. Policy CS5 below reflects new Draft RSS. The figure for Wakefield and other West Yorkshire authorities is considerably higher than previously, reflecting the RSS strategy of concentrating the majority of new development in urban centres and recent trends which show net-inward migration to the sub-region. It is also expected that future economic growth will add to the attraction of the area and increase the need for housing later in the LDF period. This higher housing requirement than in the UDP will help to support urban renaissance in the District.

5.2.5 Estimates of future clearance will need to be based on information from the Council’s Strategic Housing Service and Wakefield and District Housing but for the interim a working assumption of 150 dwellings per annum is being used in the gross housing requirement figures which apply until 2016.

5.2.6 Reflecting the above, the preferred option is to include the following policy in the Core Strategy:

**Policy CS 5**

*The Scale of Additional Housing*

In accordance with policy H1 of new Draft RSS, provision is made for the following numbers of dwellings to be built in Wakefield District each year:

- 1,320 – 2004 to 2011
- 1,380 – 2011 to 2016

The figures for 2004 to 2016 are gross figures and include provision to replace an average of 150 dwellings lost from the stock each year.
Rejected Options - The Scale of Additional Housing

1. Keep the same housing requirement as in the UDP.
   
   Reason – The housing requirement in the LDF has to conform to the figure specified in new Draft RSS.

2. Aim to meet the full market demand for housing.
   
   Reason – The demand for housing is highest in the northern parts of the District and meeting it fully is potentially unsustainable from an environmental and travel point of view. Also, the benefits of new housing would not be felt in communities most in need of regeneration.

3. Accommodate a higher level of house building than in the recent past, based on the need to encourage regeneration.
   
   Reason – The housing requirement in new Draft RSS is considerably higher than in the UDP and it can be distributed through the LDF to encourage regeneration where this is needed.

During the period from April 2004 to March 2021 (17 years) this will result in a net increase of 22,040 in the number of dwellings in the District.

5.3 The Distribution and Location of Housing

5.3.1 Responses to the Issues & Options consultation broadly supported the idea that the distribution of new housing should be based on the spatial development strategy, suitably amended, but that it should be applied flexibly taking account of opportunities and demand. The distribution should be sustainable and be related to the location of jobs. Those responding also generally agreed that the sequential approach to identifying sites should be used, providing the suitability and availability of sites is appraised thoroughly. However, the sequential approach should be applied within the framework of the spatial development strategy. In line with the strategy, there was also general support for the proposal to limit the number of dwellings to be allowed through the conversion of isolated buildings in rural areas, in the interests of creating sustainable settlements.

Principles for Distributing New Housing

5.3.2 It is proposed that in future the distribution of new housing should reflect the spatial development strategy and the settlement classification on which the strategy is based, within the overall intention of creating sustainable settlements. It should also recognise:

- the principles determining the location of development in policy CS1;
- the spatial priorities of the Community Strategy for urban renaissance, housing market renewal and regeneration, and the role that new housing can play in achieving these priorities;
- the need to achieve a specific target for the proportion of new housing to be built on brownfield land set out in RSS; and
- the opportunities afforded to provide new housing, particularly as part of mixed use schemes in town centres.
Taking account of the above principles, the following policy is proposed as the preferred option:

Policy CS 6

The Distribution and Location of Housing

The net requirement for additional housing identified in Policy CS5 should be distributed as follows:

a. the largest amount of new housing should be built within the largest urban areas – Wakefield, Castleford and Pontefract – in particular within the city and town centres, reflecting their overall sustainability in terms of the jobs and services available and their accessibility;

b. lesser amounts of new housing should be built within the other urban areas reflecting their relative size and function, the need for urban renaissance and housing market renewal, the availability of infrastructure and the opportunities for new housing;

c. limited amounts of new housing should be built in local service centres directly linked to enhancements in the level of services provided or meeting the needs of the settlement and its immediate area;

d. in villages new housing should take place which is of a scale necessary to meet identified local needs or to maintain the viability of existing services, without adding to the need to travel. In these villages new development and redevelopment which meets the above criteria will be permitted within the existing built-up area of the village commensurate with the size of the village, up to a maximum scheme size of 10 dwellings, provided that development would fill the whole land parcel or site at a density which complies with density policies. Development may exceptionally consist of up to 15 dwellings where this would make the best use of a redundant building or brownfield site.

e. in other settlements not washed over by the Green Belt housing proposals should be for not more than two dwellings comprising.

i. closing a small gap in an otherwise built-up frontage to an existing road; or

ii. the redevelopment or sub-division of an existing residential curtilage; or

iii. the sub-division of an existing dwelling; or

iv. the change of use or redevelopment of a non-residential building where this would not result in a loss of local employment or service provision.

In very exceptional cases a slightly larger development may be permitted if this would lead to the sustainable recycling of a brownfield site bringing positive overall benefit to the settlement.

f. within the infill boundary of one of the following Green Belt settlements shown on the Proposals Maps:

- Carr Gate
- Chapelthorpe
- East Hardwick
- Midgley
- North Elmsall
- Old Snydale
- Warmfield
- Wentbridge
- Wragby
housing proposals should be for not more than two additional dwellings comprising:

i. closing a small gap in an otherwise built-up frontage to an existing road; or
ii. the sub-division of an existing dwelling; or
iii. the change of use of a non-residential building where this would not result in a loss of local employment or service provision.

The development must fall wholly within the confines of the infill boundary and must comply with policy GB2 in the Development Control Policies DPD.

In accordance with policy CS1, when proposing the change of use of a non-residential building to residential use in villages and smaller settlements, developers will need to demonstrate that proper consideration has been given to employment and community uses before residential. The following indicative figures for net annual additional housing in individual settlements are proposed as a basis for monitoring until 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Indicative Net Annual Additional Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleford</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontefract</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Featherstone</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemsworth</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horbury</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knottingley (inc. Ferrybridge)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton (inc. Altofts)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossett</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmsall/South Kirkby</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley/Outwood</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackworth (Moor Top)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofton</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzwilliam/Kinsley</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryhill/Havercroft</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,170</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rejected Options – The Distribution and Location of Housing

General

1. Spread new housing round the District so that land is allocated in each settlement in proportion to its current size.

2. Concentrate new housing where demand is strongest, based on the number of houses built in the recent past.

Reason – Both these options take no account of wider objectives to support regeneration and create sustainable communities.

3. Base the scale and distribution of new housing on the scale of identified urban potential in each urban settlement.

Reason – The availability of urban brownfield land has been taken into account but on its own this option may lead to large scale development in smaller urban areas with low regeneration priority.

4. Relate the scale and distribution of new housing to the number of jobs likely to be created in future, to balance housing and employment opportunities.

Reason – This is an important consideration in seeking to create balanced, sustainable settlements. Broadly, the largest settlements have most job opportunities therefore this option is reflected in the spatial development strategy.

5. Do not include indicative rates of completion for individual settlements.

Reason – Without some indication of the appropriate scale of development in the main settlements it will be difficult to monitor whether the spatial development strategy is being implemented. Alternative rates of completion could be considered.

Villages

6. Allow small scale development in villages which meets local needs without setting a limit to the size of individual schemes.

Reason – It is recognised that any limit to the size of individual developments must be somewhat arbitrary but without some limit it will be difficult to ensure that the overall scale of development in villages is limited.

7. Allow no new housing in villages.

Reason – This would restrict the ability to meet particular local housing needs locally where this can be provided sustainably.

Other Settlements

8. Do not place a specific limit on the size of individual housing developments in the smallest settlements not washed over by the Green Belt.
Reason – Without some limit on the size of individual developments it will be difficult to ensure that the overall scale of development in the smallest settlements is strictly limited, particularly in the case of conversions. The preferred option does allow more than two dwellings to be built in exceptional circumstances.

9. Allow no new housing in the smallest settlements.

Reason – This might mean that small scale housing need can not be met locally but it is clear that the scale of development must be strictly limited.

Additional Dwellings in Green Belt Infill Settlements

10. Add to the list of settlements to which the policy applies.

11. Allow infill in all parts of the Green Belt providing the criteria set out in the policy are met.

12. Amend the definition of infill to include ‘rounding off’ as well as ‘closing a gap’.

Reason – The policy reflects national planning guidance. The intention of the spatial development strategy is to severely limit the scale of housing in smaller settlements and rural areas where it is essential to maintain the openness of the Green Belt. It is considered that any of the above options would undermine the strategy and Green Belt policy.

5.3.3 Detailed policies relating to the building of new houses and the change of existing buildings to residential use in the Green Belt are set out in the Development Control Policies DPD.

5.3.4 The overall requirement and its distribution will be met through new house building on sites specifically allocated for housing in the LDF and through windfall development on other non-allocated sites, including conversions (i.e. sub-divisions of existing dwellings) and changes to the use of other buildings.

5.3.5 New draft Government guidance states that the LDF Core Strategy should plan housing provision for 15 years from the anticipated date of adoption, consistent with annual housing requirement in RSS. Sufficient developable land should be allocated to meet the requirement for the first five years, after making a realistic allowance for windfall housing based on past rates of development on windfall sites. Land should also be identified for the subsequent 10 years. This land should be phased for delivery and the sequence in which sites should come forward should be set out, with the most sustainable sites brought into the five year supply first. It is anticipated, however, that new RSS will only require LDFs to identify sufficient housing land for the period up to 2016.

5.3.6 This Core Strategy covers the period to 2021, 17 years from the base in April 2004 and 14 years from the anticipated date of adoption in 2007. It is proposed that the LDF should accommodate the requirement for new housing and make the necessary land allocations for the first 5 years following adoption, 2007 to 2012, and that further allocations be identified to meet housing provision for the period to 2016 which can be brought forward into the five year land supply as required. Land requirements for the longer period to 2021 can be identified in future reviews.

5.3.7 A significant proportion of the requirement has been completed or is already committed in the form of existing planning permissions or land allocations in the UDP which have not yet been taken up and which are suitable to be carried forward into the LDF. The remainder will be provided through new housing allocations with an agreed allowance for future windfall housing on unallocated sites.

5.3.8 The Core Strategy will need to set out in some detail how the housing requirement will be met. It will need to take account of:

- the number of dwellings completed since 2004
- the scale of existing commitments
- the proposed future windfall allowance
- the expected rate of clearance
- the gross additional need for housing land allocations.

5.3.9 Appendix 7 ‘Housing’ gives details of current information on these items. A more robust analysis will be included in the submission Core Strategy document. A separate Housing Technical Paper will be published to provide additional background information on housing.

5.3.10 Sites identified in the Urban Potential Study, together with sites proposed to the Council during the Issues & Options consultation and other known sites will be considered as potential new housing allocations. The basis for identifying suitable housing allocations will be:

- the spatial development strategy and the principles determining the location of development in policy CS1;
- the annual housing requirement in policy CS5;
- the principles for distributing new housing and the proposed distribution in policy CS6, including the indicative figures for individual settlements;
- the suitability of the site, assessed in terms of national and regional planning policy;
- the need to achieve a specific target for the proportion of new housing to be built on brownfield land set out in RSS; and
- the opportunities afforded to provide new housing, particularly as part of mixed use schemes in town centres.

5.3.11 Proposed individual housing allocations will be set out in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD Preferred Options Report due to be published in spring 2006. The following policy is proposed as the preferred option for housing allocations:
Policy CS 7

Housing Allocations

Sites are allocated in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD to accommodate the scale of house-building required in policy CS5 for the period up to 2016. Sites have been identified based on the following principles:

a. the spatial development strategy and the principles determining the location of development in policy CS1;
b. the principles for distributing new housing and the proposed distribution in policy CS6, including the indicative figures for individual settlements;
c. the suitability of the site, assessed in terms of national and regional planning policy;
d. the need to achieve a specific target for the proportion of new housing to be built on brownfield land set out in RSS; and
e. the opportunities afforded to provide new housing, particularly as part of mixed use schemes in town centres.

Rejected Options – Housing Allocations

1. Identify housing allocations for the full LDF period to 2021.

Reason – In order to identify sufficient housing land for the full LDF period to 2021 it might be necessary to include some greenfield sites on the edge of settlements. This could undermine the RSS and LDF strategy of concentrating development in urban areas. Also, these allocations may never be needed if previously developed land continues to come forward at the current rate. Sites for the longer period to 2021 can be identified in future reviews of the Core Strategy and Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD.

5.4 Phasing

5.4.1 National planning policy guidance16 established a new policy direction for the delivery of housing through the planning system based on “plan, monitor and manage”. The approach includes the managed release of housing sites to control the pattern and speed of house building.

5.4.2 As noted above (paragraph 5.3.5), new draft national guidance now states that the LDF Core Strategy should provide housing for 15 years from the date of adoption and that land should be allocated for the first five years, after making an allowance for windfall, with further land identified for the subsequent 10 years to be brought forward as required to maintain the five year supply, with the most sustainable sites developed first. However, new RSS will probably only require LDFs to identify sufficient housing land for the period up to 2016. Allocations will therefore be identified in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD for the period 2004-16 (12 years).

5.4.3 Those responding to the Issues & Options consultation generally accepted the need for a phasing policy but wish to see it applied flexibly and to reflect the genuine sustainability and availability of sites.

5.4.4 The LDF Core Strategy will need to include a policy to ensure that the delivery of housing developments is managed and phased over time. Sites proposed for housing will need to be assigned to phases taking account of the following criteria:

- the need to provide a supply of land to meet the annual housing requirement for the District in policy CS5 for the first five years following adoption (2007-2012);
- the need to provide a continuous supply of land to meet the annual housing requirement for the District in policy CS5 for the period up to 2016;
- the need to provide a land supply to enable the indicative annual requirement figures for individual settlements to be achieved;
- the need to achieve a specific target for the proportion of new housing to be built on brownfield land each year set out in RSS; and
- the availability of the necessary infrastructure to enable the site to be developed.

5.4.5 The intention should be that sites with the highest priority based on the spatial development strategy and development principles are released first, with lower priority sites released in later phases. The availability of the necessary infrastructure and the need to provide additional capacity in some locations will also determine the timing of the release of some sites. This will also help to ensure development is sustainable. The Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD will show how allocations will contribute year by year to meeting the housing requirement.

5.4.6 The Core Strategy will also need to indicate how the land supply will be managed to ensure that the housing requirement is met. The new draft national guidance referred to above (see paragraph 5.3.5) states that the housing land supply should relate to sub-regional housing markets. The way in which land is managed for release will depend on which type of housing market the District, or parts of it, fall into – “high growth”, “managed release”, “low growth” or “managed reduction”. The identification of sub-regional housing markets will be agreed in new RSS but for the time being it has been assumed that Wakefield District will be a “managed release” market area. In this case the annual housing requirement figure will be a minimum to be achieved above which only limited additional growth will be allowed. If completions exceed or are below the limit, action will be needed to manage the release of sites into the five year supply.

5.4.7 In line with Government requirements, the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) will include a housing trajectory showing the actual rate of completions and the projected rate of future house-building year by year based on existing and new planning permissions and contributions from allocations. Similar information might be provided for individual or groups of settlements. This will provide a firm basis for monitoring the extent to which the LDF is delivering the required scale and distribution of housing.

5.4.8 The adequacy of the five year housing land supply will be assessed through the AMR process. If the rate of completions varies by more than 10% from the net annual requirement figure during a three year period (to allow for fluctuations in the housing market) the phasing and release of individual sites will be reviewed to ensure that the supply of land is sufficient to bring the rate of house building back into line with the requirement. The review will be carried out in consultation with the Yorkshire & Humber Assembly (YHA).

17 See Appendix 1 ‘The New Development Plan System’
5.4.9 The preferred option is to include a policy which identifies three phases. The housing allocations proposed in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD Preferred Options Report will be assigned to, and released in accordance with, these three phases. Some of the larger developments are likely to be spread over more than one phase:

Policy CS 8

Phasing

1. To ensure that the scale of house-building is in line with the gross requirement of 16,140 (1,320x7 + 1,380x5) dwellings to be provided under Policy CS5 between 2004 and 2016:
   a. 3,960 will be provided in Phase 1 between April 2004 and March 2007, largely through sites already committed;
   b. 6,660 will be provided in Phase 2 between April 2007 and March 2012;
   c. 5,520 will be provided in Phase 3 between April 2012 and March 2016.

2. Sites allocated for housing in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD will be assigned to enable the required rate of completion to be achieved in each phase.

3. Based on the findings of the Annual Monitoring Report, sites in phase 3 will be brought forward, as required, to maintain the five year supply of land for housing.

4. If during any continuous three year period, the net annual rate of house building in the District varies by more than 10% from the net annual requirement in policy CS5, the phasing and release of allocations in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD will be reviewed in consultation with the Yorkshire & Humber Assembly.

Rejected Options – Phasing

1. Use more or different periods for the phases.
   Reason – Alternative phases could be used but a short phase in the early years when there is greater certainty allows the supply to be controlled more closely.

2. Do not include a phasing policy.
   Reason – Whilst this makes monitoring easier and allows the market freer reign it makes the supply more difficult to manage and may well result in completions exceeding the housing requirement in policy CS5. It is also contrary to Government guidance.

5.5 Windfall Housing

5.5.1 The UDP First Alteration includes a criteria based policy (H6) to control windfall housing development. In most cases, planning applications which conform to this policy have been granted permission. The level of housing completions on windfall sites has been running well above the level allowed for in the UDP First Alteration. This has been the main reason why the overall rate of completions has exceeded the housing requirement by more than 20%.
The LDF Core Strategy needs to include policies which seek to monitor the level of windfall housing more closely and tailor it to the housing requirement for the District and individual or groups of settlements.

5.5.2 PPG3 sets out the policy guidance for making allowance for windfall housing in development plans. This guidance states that no allowance should be made for windfall housing arising on greenfield sites. It is clear therefore that windfall housing on greenfield sites should be seen as an exception. The Issues & Options consultation asked whether there should be an embargo on greenfield windfall sites or whether their size should be limited. Neither option was widely supported but it was recognised generally that windfall housing on greenfield sites should be tightly controlled. The key factor is to ensure development is sustainable. The following policy is proposed as the preferred option to control windfall housing on greenfield sites:

**Policy CS 9**

**Greenfield Windfall Housing Sites**

Housing proposals involving more than 2 dwellings on greenfield sites not specifically allocated for housing in the LDF (greenfield windfall sites) will only be considered where:

a. the Annual Monitoring Report shows that the housing requirement for the District or a particular settlement is not being met; or
b. the development would help to meet an identified local need, particularly a need for affordable housing, which cannot be met elsewhere; or
c. the development is required to maintain the viability of an existing service; and in all cases:
d. the proposal accords with policy CS6 and the development principles;
e. the site does not have an open space or amenity value protected under other LDF/UDP policies or the Council’s Greenspace Strategy;
f. the site comprises ‘infill’ (i.e. it has existing development on at least three sides);
g. development would bring a piece of underused land into beneficial use.

It will be the responsibility of the developer to demonstrate that the proposal meets all the above criteria.
Rejected Options – Greenfield Windfall Housing Sites

1. Allow no new housing on greenfield windfall sites.

Reason – This might lead to some greenfield land for which there is no beneficial use being left unused. The preferred option will prevent this from occurring whilst tightly controlling when greenfield land can be developed.

2. Apply the policy to all greenfield windfall housing.

Reason – Under policy CS6 infill comprising 1 or 2 dwellings will be permitted in even the smallest settlements. Some of these infill sites will be greenfield. It would seem unreasonable to apply the policy to these small sites.

3. Limit the size of greenfield windfall sites.

Reason – It is expected that greenfield windfall sites will be small but it is difficult to identify a suitable size threshold. It is considered that the policy as drafted will ensure that only exceptionally will greenfield sites be developed.

5.5.3 PPG3 indicates that windfall housing proposals usually represent a sustainable option for the reuse of previously developed land and buildings within urban areas, especially where the reuse of redundant or surplus employment land or buildings is involved. However, the Issues & Options consultation showed general concern about the increasing loss of land formerly occupied by employment uses to housing. Whilst windfall housing proposals on previously developed land can generally be supported where they are in line with other LDF policies, it is necessary to consider the needs of other land uses and activities and to ensure that overall the amount of housing built is not excessive. (The need to protect valuable employment land is considered further in the next chapter.) Nevertheless, with the emphasis in the spatial development strategy on housing within urban areas and local service centres, it is anticipated that levels of windfall housing on brownfield land will continue to be high. The proposed allowance is referred to in Appendix 7 ‘Housing’.

5.5.4 The following Core Strategy policy is proposed as the preferred option:
Policy CS 10

Brownfield Windfall Housing Sites

Housing proposals involving previously developed land or buildings not specifically allocated for housing in the LDF (brownfield windfall sites) which accord with policy CS6 and the development principles will be supported subject to the following considerations:

a. the proposal would not lead to an excessive anticipated rate of completions when compared to the housing requirement for the District and the particular settlement;
b. where the site is currently or was last used for employment purposes, its use for housing would not lead to a shortage of land or buildings for employment use;
c. where the site or building is currently occupied, satisfactory arrangements are in place to provide acceptable alternative accommodation;
d. the proposal does not involve the loss of an essential community service or facility, unless satisfactory alternative provision is made.

Rejected Option - Brownfield Windfall Housing Sites

1. Do not seek to limit housing on brownfield sites which comply with policy CS6 above and the development principles.

Reason – This is the approach taken in the UDP which has led to housing completions running well ahead of the housing requirement and to concerns about the loss of employment land. The supply of brownfield windfall housing needs to be managed but alternative criteria could be considered.

5.6 Housing Mix

5.6.1 A key element in ensuring that new homes meet local needs is providing homes of the appropriate type, size and affordability. The trend in the past years has been for new homes to have three and four bedrooms, though this has changed somewhat in recent years with the move towards higher densities and more house-building in city and town centres. It is important that as the population ages and the trend towards smaller households continues, the types of dwelling being provided reflect these changes.

5.6.2 New draft Government guidance on planning for mixed communities states that LDFs should set out the broad balance between the numbers of different household types to be provided across the plan area over the plan period. The latest household projections for Wakefield District from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister are 1996-based. Table 3 ‘ODPM 1996 Based Household Projections – Wakefield’ below from these projections shows the expected changing household composition through to 2021.

Table 3 ODPM 1996 Based Household Projections –Wakefield

5.6.3 All housing sites should contribute to the creation of mixed communities and should reflect the balance between different household types, but in particular large sites of 60 dwellings or 2 hectares or more should show how they have reflected the changing household composition in the types of dwelling they provide.

5.6.4 Changes to the Building Regulations in 1999 help to ensure that all new dwellings are constructed to mobility standards, having regard to the characteristics of each site, but there is also a need to provide a proportion of new dwellings built to or easily adaptable to wheelchair standards to enable people to live independently. The Council wishes to see a proportion of new dwellings built to accommodate the needs of wheelchair users.

5.6.5 The Council undertook a Housing Needs Survey in 2002 and a new study is being commissioned which is due for completion by February 2006. The aims of the study include an assessment of housing need throughout the District in terms of households and dwellings by size, type, tenure, location and affordability. Findings from the study will be used to inform the submission Core Strategy.

5.6.6 The preferred option is to include the following policy in the Core Strategy to ensure that all development provides an appropriate mix of dwelling size, type and affordability to secure a sustainable housing balance in each settlement:

## Policy CS 11

### Housing Mix

All proposals for housing must take account of local needs in terms of size, type and tenure and provide an appropriate mix of dwellings to meet these needs. On larger sites close to shops and services provision should also be made for dwellings built to or easily adaptable to wheelchair standards. Large sites of 60 dwellings or 2 hectares or more should show how they reflect the changing household composition of the District in the types of dwelling provided.
Rejected Option – Housing Mix

1. Do not include specific guidance on housing mix.

Reason – This option would allow the market to determine the appropriate mix of dwellings which has led to significant gaps in provision in the past. It would also be contrary to Government guidance.

5.7 Accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers

5.7.1 Appropriate provision is also required to address the particular needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people. Regional Planning Bodies (Yorkshire & Humber Assembly) are required to work with local authorities and the Regional Housing Board to assess the needs of gypsies and travellers when preparing RSS. Under provisions introduced by the Housing Act 2004 when local housing authorities produce a local housing assessment they should also take into account the needs of gypsies and travellers. A draft ODPM Circular proposes that where there is an assessment of unmet need for gypsy and traveller accommodation in the area, LDFs should identify suitable sites. Criteria based policies will also be required to assess sites which are proposed to meet future or unexpected demand.

5.7.2 Wakefield is currently meeting the demonstrated need for permanent accommodation for both gypsies and travellers provided at the Council owned site at Heath Common in Wakefield. Although travelling patterns indicate distinct seasonal trends in the number of gypsies and travellers passing through the District, with high numbers in the summer months and very few in winter, there is little current evidence to suggest a need for further permanent accommodation in the District. However, the latest Housing Needs Survey will further assess the housing needs of gypsies and travellers.

5.7.3 Local and regional housing needs assessments, the draft ODPM Circular, Planning for Gypsy and Traveller Sites, and Circular 22/91: Travelling Showpeople will be taken into account when planning applications proposing accommodation for gypsies, travellers or travelling show people are considered. It is proposed that an appropriate criteria based policy be included in the Development Control Policies DPD to assess the suitability of proposed sites.

5.8 Affordable Housing

5.8.1 The Issues & Options report indicated that the provision of an adequate supply of affordable housing is a growing concern which must be addressed in the LDF. The UDP First Alteration includes a policy and supporting reasoned justification to help deliver affordable housing and this is supported by Supplementary Planning Guidance. This includes a Housing Needs Statement which updates the need for affordable housing each year. The Council will continue to rely on the saved UDP policy and the SPG when determining planning applications until the relevant parts of the LDF come into effect. The SPG will eventually be replaced by an SPD.

20 Supplementary Planing Guidance: Affordable Housing (SPG6), WMDC, March 2004.
5.8.2 Affordable housing encompasses a variety of types and tenures that are subsidised in some way to make the dwellings affordable to those who cannot afford a home on the open market. It comprises:

- low cost market housing, such as shared equity home ownership;
- social rented housing, typically housing provided by registered social landlords (housing associations);
- supported housing requirements e.g. for older people, people with physical or learning disabilities, or other vulnerable groups.

5.8.3 The main objective for the LDF is to secure an appropriate scale and distribution of affordable housing that meets the level of identified need. The Core Strategy needs to set out the Council’s aims for the provision of affordable housing through the planning system, to establish the scale of need and to describe the circumstances under which an element of affordable housing will be required as part of a planning permission.

5.8.4 One of the key decisions is the appropriate figure for the proportion of the dwellings in housing proposals which should be affordable. Several responses to the Issues & Options consultation support a higher rate than the maximum of 25% specified in the UDP, though others are concerned that too high a rate will make schemes unviable and think the rate should remain unchanged. Up to date information about the scale of need will be provided by the new Housing Needs Survey. Findings from the study will be used to determine the appropriate rates to apply in different parts of the District for inclusion in the submission Core Strategy. However, it is clear from the Housing Needs Statement 2004/05 that a higher rate than 25% can be justified and a rate of 30% is proposed as an interim measure as the preferred option.

5.8.5 Another decision is the threshold for the size of scheme where affordable housing should be provided. Government Circular 6/98 indicates that for settlements of more than 3,000 population a threshold of 25 dwellings (or 1.0 hectares size) should apply. For settlements below 3,000 population, appropriate thresholds should be adopted based on the scale of need and the likely opportunities. A threshold of 15 dwellings is currently set in the UDP for these smaller settlements. New draft Government guidance on planning for mixed communities (see paragraph 5.6.2) now states that the site-size threshold for affordable housing should be 15 dwellings or 0.5 hectares, though a lower threshold may be adopted in areas where need can not be met on sites of this size or more.

5.8.6 It is proposed to adopt the threshold of 15 dwellings or 0.5 hectares, subject to the following exception. Proposed policy CS6(d) seeks to limit most housing schemes in villages to 10 dwellings. It is important that housing in villages contributes to affordable and social housing provision. There needs to be policy support for the provision of affordable rural housing where need has been identified which will help to maintain sustainable rural communities. It will be necessary therefore to apply a threshold for affordable housing provision which is lower than 10 dwellings to make sure that opportunities are taken to provide necessary affordable housing in villages. As an interim measure a threshold of 0.2 hectares / 6 dwellings is proposed for settlements below 3,000 population as the preferred option. The new Housing Needs Survey will help establish what the appropriate threshold should be in all sizes of settlement for the submission Core Strategy.
Policy CS 12

Affordable Housing

1. All developments involving housing above the following size thresholds must make provision for an element of affordable housing to meet identified need:
   
a. in settlements of fewer than 3,000 population the proposed development is on a site of 0.2 hectares or more or is for 6 or more dwellings;
   
b. in settlements of 3,000 population or more the proposed development is on a site of 0.5 hectares or more or is for 15 or more dwellings.

2. The proportion of the dwellings on each site which are affordable should be sufficient to meet identified need up to a maximum of 30% of the total.

3. The thresholds and proportion of affordable housing required will apply to sites allocated for housing and to Special Policy Areas involving an element of housing as part of a mixed use scheme in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals Development Plan Document and to windfall housing sites.

4. The Council will seek to ensure that:
   
a. the affordable housing provided caters for the scale and type of need identified in its latest Housing Needs Survey; and
   
b. secure arrangements are in place to retain the benefits of affordability for initial and subsequent occupiers.

5. The Council will work with the private sector and Registered Social Landlords to achieve the required level of affordable housing.

Rejected Options – Affordable Housing

1. Set different site size thresholds for the provision of affordable housing.

   Reason – Different thresholds could be considered but it is important that all reasonable opportunities are taken to provide affordable housing whilst ensuring that developments remain viable.

2. Set a higher figure for the maximum percentage of dwellings on a site which should be affordable.

   Reason – Setting a higher percentage figure will help to meet the need for affordable housing and will enable people to remain within their communities. However, the percentage has to ensure that developments remain viable. The Housing Needs Survey will help establish appropriate figures based on an up to date assessment of needs.

5.8.7 The precise percentage of affordable housing to be provided will be a matter for negotiation at the time of a planning application having regard to any abnormal costs associated with the development to the total package of requirements associated with the development. It will be important to ensure that the affordable housing provided in new developments is of the right tenure mix to meet local needs. This too is a matter to be negotiated at the time of a planning application taking account of the Housing Needs Survey.
5.8.8 In the smallest settlements, falling within the scope of policy CS6(e) and (f), housing development will normally be limited to infill comprising one or two dwellings. All developments would therefore fall below the site threshold set in policy CS12. To enable affordable housing to be provided in these smallest settlements to meet local needs and contribute to sustainable rural communities, PPG3 and Circular 6/98 allow local planning authorities to grant planning permission on small sites within or adjoining existing settlements which would not normally be released for market housing, as an exception to normal policies. The need for affordable housing to be provided as an exception should be established by means of a local needs survey undertaken by the local community and agreed with the Council. Suitable sites should be identified based on the locational principles set out in policy CS1.

5.8.9 The preferred option is to include the following policy:

**Policy CS 13**

**Affordable Housing on Exception Sites**

Where a Local Housing Needs Survey has established a need for affordable housing which cannot be met in any other way, sites may be released solely for affordable housing use as an exception to normal policies relating to housing provision. Priority will be given to sites located within settlements which make best use of previously developed land or buildings. The scale of development should not exceed the level of need identified.

**Rejected Option – Affordable Housing on Exception Sites**

1. Do not include a rural exceptions policy.

Reason – This would mean the opportunity to provide affordable housing to meet a specific identified local need would be missed.

5.9 Existing Housing Areas

5.9.1 Spatial objective 5 aims to provide sufficient good quality housing to meet the identified needs of the District. It is important that the quality and condition of the stock is maintained if the aim of providing everyone with a decent home is to be achieved, and that best use is made of the stock to minimise the need for new housing. A significant proportion of both the private and public sector stock is below the Decent Homes standard whilst there are a number of areas of poor housing which are exhibiting signs of market failure with significant numbers of vacant properties.

5.9.2 The Council’s proposals for improving and making best use of the existing dwelling stock are set out in the Housing Strategy. The local authority housing stock has been transferred recently to Wakefield and District Housing who are developing programmes of improvement and renewal. In the South East of the District the Council is working with Barnsley and Doncaster Councils and English Partnerships to draw up a strategy for an area known as the ‘Green Corridor’ which has attracted funding from the Regional Housing Board to tackle the causes
and symptoms of poorly performing housing markets in the context of overall regeneration. This complements actions by the Transform South Yorkshire Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder.

5.9.3 A number of those responding to the Issues & Options consultation recognise the need for the LDF to support proposals to modernise and improve the existing housing stock, though some wished to see action which lies outside the scope of the LDF, e.g. more improvement grants.

5.9.4 The LDF needs to support the actions proposed in the Housing Strategy, the Green Corridor Strategy and the investment programmes being planned by Wakefield and District Housing. Housing improvement programmes should take account of the policies in the development principles section of this Core Strategy to make sure that they contribute to achieving sustainable development as well as creating quality homes for residents. Where improvement programmes involve the selective demolition and re-building of existing housing it is important that these are in line with the spatial development strategy and policy CS6 set out above, in terms of the scale of development proposed, in order to create sustainable development. The preferred option is to include the following policy in the Core Strategy to encourage improvement and replacement of the existing stock:

**Policy CS 14**

*Existing Housing*

*Actions proposed to improve the quality or make efficient use of the District's housing stock will be supported. Proposals should take account of the development principles of this Core Strategy to ensure that they contribute to sustainable development. Proposals which involve the redevelopment of existing housing will be supported where they conform to the spatial development strategy and policy CS6 of this Core Strategy and other LDF policies and proposals.*

**Rejected Option – Existing Housing**

1. *Do not include a reference to the redevelopment of existing housing.*

*Reason – If the LDF is to establish the spatial strategy for the District it is important that all development, including the redevelopment of existing housing, conforms to the strategy otherwise development could take place which is not sustainable in the wider context.*

5.10 Other Housing Issues

5.10.1 The Issues & Options consultation earlier in the year considered two other housing matters:

- Housing on Previously Developed (Brownfield) Land
- Housing Density

5.10.2 These topics will be covered elsewhere than in the Core Strategy.
5.10.3 The Issues & Options consultation indicated support for a higher target for housing on previously developed (brownfield) land, but some wished to see the current target retained recognising that a higher target may be unrealistic in the longer term. The new RSS will include a target which the LDF will need to adopt in order to achieve conformity. This will be based on the latest evidence available through consultation with the local authority and stakeholders. In the meantime, the target of 61% in RSS issued in December 2004 remains in place.

5.10.4 Replies to the Issues & Options consultation suggest that there is some support for higher minimum densities in housing developments and also indicate the need for better quality design. Others consider that density policy should continue to reflect national guidance. The Development Control Policies DPD includes a policy on housing density (H1) to ensure that housing proposals meet minimum density standards and make the best use of land resources, whilst protecting residential amenity. This will succeed UDP policy H18.

5.10.5 The preferred option is not to include specific Core Strategy policies relating to these subjects.

Rejected Options – Housing on Previously Developed (Brownfield) Land

1. Include a policy retaining the figure for housing to be provided on previously developed land at 61%, as in the UDP First Alteration.

   Reason – The figure for the percentage of housing to be provided on previously developed land in the LDF has to conform to the figure to be specified in new RSS.

2. Include a policy in the Core Strategy to establish the percentage of housing to be provided on previously developed land, based on new RSS.

   Reason – A policy could be included to reflect the target in new RSS but this would be a duplication since new RSS will form part of Wakefield’s development plan.

Rejected Option – Housing Density

Include a policy in the Core Strategy to set density standards for housing developments.

Reason – An appropriate policy is included in the Development Control Policies DPD.
6 Economy and Employment

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 One of the challenges of the Community Strategy, *Fast Forward*, is to deliver a dynamic local economy which increases prosperity for all sections of the community. This will be achieved by:

a. promoting and marketing a new image for the District;
b. encouraging investment and enterprise and the development of clusters of economic activity;
c. the urban renaissance of Wakefield City;
d. reconnecting the Coalfield Communities in the South East;
e. the urban renaissance of the Five Towns.

6.1.2 The Wakefield economy is inextricably linked with that of the wider Leeds City Region. The number of the District's residents working in Leeds has grown significantly in recent years and this trend is likely to continue, particularly as far as jobs in the expanding sectors of financial, business and other services are concerned. To strengthen its economy, Wakefield needs to take full advantage of opportunities presented by the continued growth of the Leeds economy, particularly building on those sectors where the District enjoys a competitive advantage. One such sector is logistics/warehousing/distribution where Wakefield's location astride major transport routes and its accessibility to Leeds and other regional centres makes it particularly attractive for development.

6.1.3 The role of the LDF, set out in spatial objective 7, is to support these priorities and to help sustain and enhance the District's economic performance, within the strategy and policy framework provided by new RSS for the region as a whole and the Leeds City Region. The Core Strategy should have the following objectives for Economy and Employment:

- To support the economic strategy for the District set out in *Fast Forward*;
- To ensure the District plays a full part in and benefits from the *Northern Way* development programme;
- To enable the District to fulfil its role in contributing to the growth of the regional and sub-regional economy by building on its strengths, opportunities and links;
- To build on the competitive advantages enjoyed by the District within the sub-region;
- To support the role of Wakefield city as a centre for public sector administration and services;
- To ensure sufficient employment land provision to meet requirements from a range of suitable sites, in sustainable and accessible locations, within the framework provided by RSS;
- To support existing businesses by applying positive policies towards the expansion of existing firms where appropriate;
- To reduce commuting distances and the need to travel, particularly by car, by providing opportunities to bring home and workplace closer together, and by encouraging employment opportunities in locations accessible by sustainable modes of travel;
- To strengthen the rural economy by enabling farm diversification and supporting sustainable rural enterprise.
Achieving these objectives will be helped by providing a range of locations, types and sizes of employment site to meet the needs of specific sectors of the business community and by protecting existing areas where employment continues to be the most appropriate use.

**6.2 Employment Land**

**6.2.1** The provision of additional well-located employment land and floorspace is essential to the District's future economic prosperity. The LDF must ensure a sufficient supply of suitable employment land that is available, capable of being developed, and provides a variety of sites to meet differing needs. It should be sufficient to ensure that local businesses have the opportunity to expand or relocate within the District and to meet demand arising from inward investment.

**6.2.2** A majority of responses to a question in the Issues & Options consultation about employment land suggested that the future supply should be sufficient to support economic regeneration rather than be based on past take-up rates or a crude assessment of the need to provide jobs. The proposed approach to identifying suitable sites was generally supported as was the need to make specific provision for different types of employment use. The allocation of land for particular activities should line up with the marketing and promotion of the area as an investment destination as well as building on its strengths and the potential for cluster development, e.g. around logistics and cultural and creative industries. The need to review all employment allocations through the LDF process to identify whether they are available, meet market requirements or could be put to a better alternative use, was generally supported. This is in line with national planning policy. PPG3.(n)

**The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)**

**6.2.3** Work done for the new Draft RSS identifies an over-supply of employment land in the region. The strategy in new RSS will aim to manage the supply by encouraging local authorities to de-allocate employment land which is no longer needed or not sustainable whilst ensuring an adequate supply in future. Seeking to align the supply of employment land with the RSS strategy is a key sustainability challenge.

**6.2.4** The need for different types of employment land has been calculated using output from the Regional Econometric Model. The model attempts to take account of the recent upturn in regional job creation and to reflect the aims of the Northern Way for future economic growth. Figures for Wakefield until 2016 show a maximum need for an additional 14 hectares for light industry/offices (B1 use class) and 21 hectares for warehousing (B8) and general industry (B2). These are net figures, i.e. they take account of the expected loss of existing employment land to other uses.

**6.2.5** It is recognised that the econometric model which produces the above figures is only one factor that needs to be considered by local planning authorities when developing employment land portfolios in their LDFs. It does not mean that further employment land does not need to be provided. The importance of providing the market with choice and flexibility in their site selection and the need to maintain a land-bank will result in a larger portfolio than the econometric modelling assessment would suggest. It is vital that the region has a range of sites available to meet employment and investment opportunities in a sustainable manner and it will be necessary to ensure that new sites come forward to avoid stagnation in the...
market. New RSS is likely to require LDFs to manage land portfolios so as to demonstrate the availability of a 2-4 year supply of employment land to meet anticipated sub-regional needs throughout the period to 2016.

6.3 **Scale of Employment Land**

6.3.1 Employment within Wakefield District is rising and recently published figures show that between 1998 and 2003 the number of people employed at workplaces within the District increased by 11.7%, the highest rate in West Yorkshire and above regional and national average growth rates. According to the Yorkshire Forward/CBI Survey of Regional Economic Trends in September 2004, 17% of companies in Wakefield expect employment to increase compared to a regional figure of 15%. Also, the take-up of land for employment uses in Wakefield District has averaged 24.5 hectares per annum during the period of the UDP First Alteration, April 1996 to March 2005. These employment and land take-up figures demonstrate the need for a land supply in the LDF well above the estimates from the econometric model.

6.3.2 Account also needs to be taken of the demand for different types of employment land, each of which has different locational and site requirements. In particular, provision needs to be made for the following types:

- Commercial offices (city/town centre and elsewhere)
- Light and general industry
- Wholesale and freight distribution
- Specialised employment land requirements e.g. land for specific relocation/expansion by existing firms or the development of clusters or to encourage inward investment in knowledge based industries.

6.3.3 The LDF will need to set out a clear strategic framework for employment land which:

- is in line with the strategy and policies for employment land in RSS and has regard to the role and influence of Leeds;
- meets the Council's objectives for economic regeneration and the spatial priorities of the Community Strategy for delivering a dynamic local economy;
- the principles determining the location of development in policy CS1.

6.3.4 Extensive areas of land, either within employment allocations or Special Policy Area designations in the UDP First Alteration, are already committed to employment use through the granting of planning permissions. Further work is needed to determine how much additional land will be required for the period to 2016. The policy below shows indicative totals based on current information.

6.3.5 The **preferred option** is to include a policy in the Core Strategy along the following lines:
Policy CS 15

Scale of Employment Land

Provision is made for 265* hectares of employment land to be developed in Wakefield District between 2004 and 2016. Of this:

- 75 hectares will be primarily for commercial office development;
- 80 hectares will be primarily for light and general industry;
- 110 hectares will be primarily for wholesale and freight distribution.

Sites are identified in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD to meet this provision.

Rejected Options – Scale of Employment Land

1. Assess the future need for employment land on the basis of past take-up rates.

Reason – On their own, past trends are not necessarily a good indication of future needs. This option would involve locations of poorer accessibility and with a high proportion provided on greenfield land.

2. Assess the future need for employment land on the basis of an estimate of the number of jobs which need to be provided and assumptions about the number of jobs which can be provided per hectare.

Reason – This is the approach used in preparing new RSS. It appears sustainable in economic and social terms because it seeks to match needs and opportunities. However, on its own it is considered to be an inadequate basis for identifying land requirements.

3. Make greater provision for employment land.

Reason – This would probably necessitate more greenfield land to be released from the Green Belt for which there is no clear justification leading to unsustainable development.

4. Make no additional provision for employment land.

Reason – This option would afford better environmental protection but might mean that demand for land is not met and opportunities to provide additional employment through new investment and regeneration are missed to the detriment of the future growth of the District’s economy.

5. Include a policy in the Core Strategy to establish the amount of employment land to be developed in each urban area and local service centre.

Reason – It may prove possible to include such a policy in the submission Core Strategy but work is not sufficiently advanced to enable this to be done at present. A policy of this nature may also prove to be too inflexible to respond to changing economic circumstances.

(* N.B. The scale of employment land to be provided in the LDF is still being considered in the light of new Draft RSS policy, the existing land supply and likely future needs.)
6.4 Location of Employment Development

6.4.1 The distribution of employment land should reflect the Core Strategy’s spatial development strategy and the settlement classification on which the strategy is based, with the overall intention of creating sustainable settlements. Major developments should therefore be located within or close to the largest settlements. Opportunities need to be taken to re-use or redevelop vacant sites and buildings within existing industrial areas before consideration is given to releasing further greenfield land for employment use. Within the overall supply, provision needs to be made for specific types of use, each of which has its own requirements. All new employment development should comply with the development principles of this Core Strategy to ensure that it contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.

Commercial Offices

6.4.2 Over recent years the District has seen the development of a number of out of town office parks positioned close to the M1 and M62 which have planning permission for significant additional floorspace and which will continue to be developed for the next few years. Although these sites are attractive because they are easy to develop and are accessible by car, they are less sustainable than sites within urban areas that are closer to where people live, can be accessed by public transport and can contribute to the vitality of city and town centres.

6.4.3 Wakefield city centre offers a cost advantage when compared to Leeds, where there is currently a significant shortage of floorspace. It is important that the city takes advantage of this and attracts major employers looking for office space into the centre. The presence of a healthy office market within central Wakefield would have a positive effect on the economy of the city itself and the wider District in terms of jobs and investment and would provide a more sustainable alternative to the out-of-centre office parks.

6.4.4 There is a shortage of good quality modern office accommodation in the city centre. The proposals for Westgate Key Development Area include the provision of a significant amount of office space but office development could also be encouraged in other parts of the centre. Detailed proposals will be spelt out in the Central Wakefield Area Action Plan.

6.4.5 There may also be limited scope for commercial office development in the District’s town centres and this should be encouraged, perhaps as part of mixed use schemes.

Wholesale and Freight Distribution

6.4.6 Because of its position astride the national motorway and rail networks, the District has attracted large amounts of warehousing in recent decades, including the Wakefield Europort freight interchange facility which is now almost full. Warehousing and distribution have provided an important source of employment. The District wishes to continue to take advantage of its location and to build-on the role it fulfils within the sub-regional and regional economy.

6.4.7 Much recent warehousing has been built on greenfield land close to motorway junctions, at locations which, for most uses, are not considered to be sustainable. Existing planning permissions mean that some further development will occur at these sites. It is accepted that because it uses large amounts of land and generates heavy goods vehicle movements, warehousing is not usually suited to locations within densely built-up urban areas but it is important that before further greenfield land is released to accommodate future warehousing development, every opportunity is taken to make use of more sustainable sites. In particular,
best use should be made of brownfield sites on the edge of existing urban areas which are close to existing housing and are accessible by public transport, whilst still having good access to the highway and rail networks.

Expansion by Existing Firms

6.4.8 The Council and its partners are keen to ensure that existing businesses within the District can prosper and grow. Making provision for existing firms to expand or relocate is important in providing new employment opportunities and ensuring continued economic growth. Development which involves the expansion or intensification of existing employment uses will be supported where this takes place within an area allocated for employment use or in an existing Employment Zone. In other places, proposals will generally be supported where they accord with the spatial development strategy, development principles and other LDF policies. Where proposals prove to be unacceptable, the Council will work with other agencies to try to provide suitable alternative accommodation within the District.

6.4.9 The preferred option is to include the following policy in the Core Strategy:

Policy CS 16

Location of Employment Development

Employment development, including the expansion or intensification of existing employment uses, will be encouraged to locate within the urban areas of the District, particularly within city and town centres and in existing Employment Zones, and on sites where employment use is proposed in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD. In particular:

a. Commercial offices will be encouraged to locate
   
i. in Wakefield city centre and in the town centres of the District. Developers should consider the scope for including an element of office floorspace in proposals for mixed use development in these centres;
   
ii. on sites proposed for this type of use in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD;

b. Wholesale and freight distribution activities will be encouraged to locate:
   
i. within employment allocations proposed for this type of use in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD;
   
ii. within existing Employment Zones which are suitable for this type of use, making best use of opportunities for redevelopment.

In other locations employment development proposals should be in accordance with the spatial development strategy and the principles determining the location of development in policy CS1, the development principles and other LDF policies.
Rejected Options – Location of Employment Development

1. Do not include a policy in the Core Strategy giving direction to where different types of employment use should locate.
   
   **Reason** – This would provide greater flexibility but would fail to support the spatial development strategy which seeks to concentrate development within urban areas, making best use of previously developed land.

2. Locate new employment sites close to existing or future housing where good public transport services are or can be provided.
   
   **Reason** – This is an important consideration in seeking to create balanced, sustainable settlements. Most employment sites are in or close to the largest settlements and this option is reflected in the spatial development strategy.

3. Allocate more land which is attractive to businesses, investors and the market, particularly in motorway corridors.
   
   **Reason** – This would lead to development in unsustainable locations, give rise to high levels of car usage and would undermine attempts to regenerate urban areas.

4. Employment allocations to be spread around the District so that land is available in every large settlement.
   
   **Reason** – This option supports provision of local jobs in each large community. However, not every settlement has land which is suitable for employment use or which is attractive to businesses. There could be significant adverse environmental impacts in some settlements.

6.4.10 The Core Strategy will need to show how the employment land requirement will be met, including the scale of existing commitments and the need for additional employment land allocations. A significant proportion of the requirement for all types of employment development is already committed in the form of existing planning permissions or land allocated for employment use in the UDP First Alteration which has not yet been taken up and which will be carried forward into the LDF. The remainder will be provided through new allocations.

6.4.11 Unlike housing, the amount of employment land provided through 'windfall' permissions is small, though there are a number of vacant sites within existing Employment Zones which contribute to the current land supply. It is difficult, however, to forecast the scale of future employment windfall development and no windfall allowance is proposed.

6.4.12 The most significant issue to be addressed is the extent to which the current supply of allocated employment sites matches, in terms of quantity, quality and location, the patterns of current and projected requirements. The results of monitoring show a sufficient supply of employment land across the District to meet demand for the next 17 years, based on average take-up rates. However, this crude estimate takes no account of the factors noted above (quantity, quality and location of sites) or the availability of specific sites to meet certain types of employment use.
6.4.13 There is a need to review existing undeveloped allocations in the UDP as part of the preparation of the LDF. The Government has issued guidance about undertaking such a review. This and guidance in new RSS will be followed when undertaking a review to make sure that existing allocations are still likely to be developed, comply with the LDF spatial development strategy and new RSS, and meet current criteria for sustainable development. A separate Employment Land Technical Paper will be published to provide additional background information on employment land.

6.4.14 Sites proposed to the Council during the Issues & Options consultation and other known sites will be considered as potential employment land allocations. The basis for identifying suitable allocations will be:

- the overall need for different types of employment land identified in policy CS15 (including any specific land requirements in RSS for the District or Leeds City Region);
- the spatial development strategy and the principles determining the location of development in policy CS1;
- the broad locations for different types of employment use identified in policy CS16;
- the suitability of the site, assessed in terms of national and regional planning policy guidance;
- the opportunities to provide new employment development close to housing areas giving people the opportunity to work close to where they live.

6.4.15 Proposed individual employment land allocations will be set out in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD Preferred Options Report due to be published in spring 2006 and in the Central Wakefield Area Action Plan. However, a number of key locations can be identified already:

1. Commercial Offices:
   - Wakefield City Centre (particularly Westgate Key Development Site)
   - Paragon Business Village, Snowhill, Wakefield
   - Calder Park, Denby Dale Road, Wakefield

2. Light and General Industry:
   - Silkwood Park, Dewsbury Road, Wakefield
   - Former Wakefield Power Station and Carriage Sidings, Doncaster Road, Wakefield
   - Green Lane, Featherstone
   - Former Prince of Wales Colliery Site, Park Road, Pontefract
   - South Kirkby Business Park, South Kirkby

3. Wholesale and Freight Distribution:
   - Normanton Industrial Estate Extension, Pontefract Lane, Normanton
   - Glasshoughton, Castleford

6.4.16 Several of these large sites are already being developed or have planning permission. At others, proposals for development are still to be finalised.
6.5 The Rural Economy

6.5.1 Those replying to the Issues & Options consultation gave general support to farm diversification schemes as part of a wider group of measures to aid rural economic regeneration. There was also some support for giving priority to employment and social uses over residential in schemes to convert rural buildings. Concern was expressed about the need to comply with existing policies and to control traffic movements.

6.5.2 The rural economy will be supported by enabling small-scale employment development and the expansion of existing firms within settlements identified as local service centres. This will help to diversify rural employment opportunities, maintain the viability of the centres and, potentially, reduce the need for local people to commute. In villages and smaller settlements sensitively designed small-scale employment development can help sustain the rural economy. The re-use of previously developed land and rural buildings will be facilitated, as will appropriate farm diversification schemes, including schemes which provide facilities for tourists. In line with policy CS1, in villages and smaller settlements preference will be given to the re-use of existing buildings for employment and community uses before residential. A careful balance will need to be achieved in supporting proposals that assist the economic sustainability of local communities whilst addressing any potential environmental consequences. Proposals will also need to comply with Green Belt policies, where these apply.

6.5.3 The following preferred option is proposed, consistent with the overall spatial development strategy. Proposals will need to comply with the spatial development strategy, the development principles and other LDF policies particularly those dealing with impact of development on the countryside and landscape character:

**Policy CS 17**

*The Rural Economy*

Development or activities of the following types which strengthen or diversify the rural economy or provide local employment, will be supported:

a. small-scale employment development and the expansion of existing firms within local service centres;

b. within villages, smaller settlements and rural areas:

i. the re-use of previously developed land and suitable redundant rural buildings for employment generating uses to meet the needs of local businesses;

ii. appropriate farm diversification schemes;

iii. appropriate tourism related initiatives;

c. improvements to infrastructure needed to facilitate employment development in rural areas;

d. improvement of public transport links to employment areas in urban areas and local service centres.

Development should be of a scale appropriate to the location, should not have an adverse impact on the local environment or amenity and should accord with the spatial development strategy, development principles and other LDF policies, including those relating to development in the Green Belt.
Rejected Options – The Rural Economy

1. Allow larger scale employment development in local service centres.

Reason – Some local service centres, notably Ackworth, already have significant outstanding commitments for employment development which are sufficient to meet needs. In others, the scope for additional employment development appears to be limited without causing adverse environmental impact.

2. Do not allow any employment development in the smallest settlements and rural areas.

Reason – This option would miss opportunities to support the rural economy leading to more travel to work and less sustainable communities. However, it is important that rural employment development is small scale and does not have an adverse impact on the locality.

New employment developments in local service centres and villages are likely to be limited because of their potential impact on local character. Making best use of existing employment sites within these settlements is therefore important. Existing employment sites should be retained to provide local employment, unless specific criteria are met. The preferred option is to include the following policy:

Policy CS 18

Protection of Existing Employment Sites in Rural Areas

The conversion, change of use or re-development of existing employment sites to non-employment uses within local service centres, villages, smaller settlements and rural areas will be resisted unless the following are met:

a. the existing use has an adverse impact on the environment or local amenities; or
b. it is demonstrated that the site is inappropriate for any employment use; or
c. the overall benefit of the proposal outweighs any adverse effect on employment opportunities and the range of available employment land and premises; and in all cases:
d. where the site or building is currently occupied, satisfactory arrangements are in place to provide acceptable alternative accommodation.

Rejected Option – Protection of Existing Employment Sites in Rural Areas

1. Do not seek to offer specific protection to existing employment sites in rural areas.

Reason – There is considerable pressure in some smaller settlements for the redevelopment or conversion of existing employment uses to other uses, notably residential. In order to maintain a reasonable balance between jobs and homes, existing employment sites should be offered a degree of protection.
6.6 Existing Employment Areas

6.6.1 As well as the provision of sufficient new employment land, achieving the District’s economic objectives is dependent on protecting and enhancing existing employment sites, including designated Employment Zones.

6.6.2 The UDP seeks to protect and enhance the District’s most sustainable and valued employment areas through their identification as Employment Zones and the application of policies within the areas to favour employment use, whilst allowing some mixed use development in appropriate locations. A number of these zones are coming under pressure from other forms of development and significant areas of former employment land have been lost to other uses, notably housing. Employment Zones currently provide a range of sites and premises of differing quality, including smaller and cheaper accommodation, which provide an important resource supporting the District’s economy, helping local firms to expand and relocate. Many of the firms in these areas provide local services to other firms and are essential to the smooth running of the economy. Whilst the redevelopment for housing of outworn employment areas which do not meet current needs accords with national planning policy guidance\(^\text{23}\), it is important to ensure that the supply of employment land and premises is maintained.

6.6.3 Responses to the Issues & Options consultation indicate support for a review of Employment Zones to identify those where employment uses should be retained and those where mixed use development is more appropriate. Policies relating to employment zones should not be too restrictive about the types of development which are acceptable.

6.6.4 All Employment Zones are being reviewed to ensure their continuing suitability for employment use. Where employment is still considered to be the most appropriate use, continued designation as an Employment Zone will be proposed. A number of new Employment Zones will also be identified where an existing employment allocation is virtually complete or where a designation is considered necessary to protect an existing employment use. Details of proposed Employment Zones will be set out in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD and will be identified on the proposals maps. Within Employment Zones it is proposed to strengthen policies to protect existing employment from redevelopment for other uses, unless specific requirements are met. The preferred option is to include the following policy:

**Policy CS 19**

**Employment Zones**

*Employment Zones identified on the Proposals Maps should continue to be occupied primarily by employment uses. Proposals for development or re-development for employment uses in these areas will generally be supported. Non-employment uses will only be acceptable where the specific criteria set out in policy EMP1 in the Development Control Policies DPD are met.*

\(^{23}\) PPG3 Update, paragraph 42a, ODPM, January 2005.
Rejected Option – Employment Zones

1. Allow a wider range of uses in Employment Zones.

Reason – It is important that a wide range of locations and types of sites and premises are available to meet a variety of employment needs. Employment Zones ensure that a wide-ranging provision is maintained. The policy does not prevent other uses in these areas but ensures that particular safeguards are met before non-employment uses are allowed.

6.7 Supporting the Local Economy

6.7.1 The Issues & Options consultation asked how, in addition to making land available for development, the LDF can help to implement the economic strategy for the District. Responses considered that an important role for the LDF is to make the District a better place to live and work by supporting improvements to the environment, the range of cultural and leisure activities, the road network and the quality and reliability of public transport and by providing homes in sustainable locations, in order to attract investment. It was also considered that the land allocation strategy could better support the development of clusters by encouraging certain types of activity to locate in one area, providing this approach is applied flexibly.

6.7.2 Economic strategy and action is determined by the Council with its major partners in the Wakefield District Partnership including first, the development agency for Wakefield, and Yorkshire Forward, the regional development agency. The investment planning process at the sub-regional level is becoming increasingly important. The West Yorkshire Investment Plan sets out the main priorities for the five West Yorkshire districts.

Clusters

6.7.3 The District’s priorities in terms of growth sectors have been identified in the West Yorkshire Investment Plan 2004 as food and drink, creative and digital industries and advanced manufacturing. Textiles, printing, retail, warehousing/distribution/logistics and glass packaging are also significant employers. Results from the Annual Business Inquiry 2002 show that Wakefield has the highest sub-regional proportion of employment in Construction; Distribution, Hotels and Restaurants; and Transport and Communications sectors.

6.7.4 The District already has the Chemicals Industry Regional Centre of Excellence based in Castleford. There is also possible scope for developing the Wakefield logistics cluster and a feasibility study for a centre of excellence in logistics is proposed. Although the agricultural sector is small, food and drink processing is well represented and some cluster activity has already taken place involving Yorkshire Forward and some local food and drink manufacturers. The LDF can support cluster development by meeting needs for land or property, infrastructure and access to quality labour pools.

Skills

6.7.5 Low educational attainment and workforce skills are significant issues for the District. Over 39% of the workforce have no qualifications compared to 29% nationally. The District also suffers from losing talented young people to universities outside the District who do not return following completion of their studies. Only 12.5% of the 16-74 age group are qualified to degree level or higher compared to 19.5% for England. The West Yorkshire Learning and
Skills Council and Wakefield College are actively involved in providing training opportunities to improve skill levels, but there is a need to build up knowledge-based employment in cultural and creative industries, high technology, and other office-based employment, both in the public and private sectors. District partners have produced a Skills Action Plan 2005 to co-ordinate action around raising workforce skill levels.

**Business Development**

6.7.6 Business formation is improving and Wakefield has the highest rate of business start-ups, as a percentage of business stock, in West Yorkshire. Wakefield’s stock of business per capita, however, is amongst the lowest. Self-employment rates in the District are below sub-regional, regional and national averages. Mid-Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce & Industry and Wakefield College have a number of initiatives aimed at improving entrepreneurial skills and enterprise and local partners have produced a *Wakefield District Enterprise Action Plan 2005*.

**Promoting the District**

6.7.7 The Northern Way Growth Strategy aims to promote the North through a joint campaign in key international markets. One of the priorities for *Fast Forward* is promoting and marketing a new image for Wakefield District. The aim is not only to attract inward investment but to promote the District’s own strong cultural identity, based around the Yorkshire Sculpture Park, the National Coal Mining Museum, Nostell Priory house and the proposed Hepworth Gallery, to improve the ‘quality of place’ for District residents and to attract people to live in and visit the area.

6.7.8 To lend support to these aims where they have a spatial or land use dimension, the preferred approach is to include the following policy in the Core Strategy:

---

**Policy CS 20**

**Supporting the Local Economy**

The Council and its partners will work together to improve the economic performance of the District in line with the aims of the Community Strategy. Activities and proposals for development which help to create a dynamic local economy and accord with the spatial development strategy, the development principles and other LDF policies will be supported, particularly where they:

a. promote the development of clusters of economic activity;
b. help to increase the level of skills and educational attainment of the District’s workforce;
c. support business start-ups and enterprise;
d. promote the District at a place to invest; or
e. provide new facilities for tourists.

---

**Rejected Option – Supporting the Local Economy**

No options were considered as the proposed policy is based on the economic priorities for the District established in the Community Strategy and principles established in the Core Strategy. However, changes to the wording will be considered.
7 Transport and Travel

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 A number of trends have been observed during recent decades:

- following many years when road traffic growth in the District was well below levels elsewhere in the sub-region and nationally, over the last 5 years road traffic has grown more rapidly (associated with economic growth) leading to congestion, longer journey times, reduced reliability for bus services, increasing costs to businesses, worsened road safety, air quality problems and poor environmental conditions for pedestrians and cyclists;
- rising car ownership levels have accompanied the dispersal of homes, jobs and services, trends which make public transport services less viable and lead to a downward spiral with increasing car dependence and isolation for those without access to cars;
- the decreasing use and availability of public transport and the centralisation of essential services have led to the growing isolation of those without access to a car, particularly in rural communities;
- increasing carbon dioxide and greenhouse gas emissions which contribute to global warming and pollution in town centres and along main roads.

7.1.2 Ensuring that homes, jobs, shops and services are accessible by good quality, safe and convenient transport is essential to achieving sustainable development. Satisfying travel needs for individuals and businesses whilst reducing the need to travel, particularly by car, and promoting less environmentally damaging forms of transport is also essential to sustainability. Increasing the proportion of journeys made by public transport, cycling, and walking benefits all sections of society by providing a means of reducing delay, costs, pollution, accidents, conserving resources and sustaining balanced communities that might otherwise become restricted to those with access to a car.

7.1.3 These issues are reflected in the key national travel objectives – promoting more sustainable transport choices, improving access to major trip generators by non-car modes, and reducing the need to travel, especially by car. Making places more accessible is part of the Community Strategy, Fast Forward, challenge, ‘Improving our places’, whilst spatial objectives 3 and 4 aim to minimise the need to travel and improve accessibility by non-car modes.

7.1.4 The urban renaissance strategy, Wakefield – A Strategic Framework for the District, also emphasises the importance of good quality transport. It sees car dependence and the lack of public transport as one of the core problems facing the District and advocates better use of the rail and waterways networks, integration of rail and bus services, greater emphasis on walking and cycling and the removal of private cars from city and town centres. Continued investment in transport is essential for economic growth and regeneration.

7.1.5 RSS and new Draft RSS provide the regional framework for transport issues. RSS, published in December 2004, includes the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) which sets out regional transport policies as well as priorities for investment and transport management. These will be reviewed and updated in new RSS. The RTS provides the context for the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan (LTP) which includes the long-term transport strategy for the county and a five year action plan. The LTP is a statutory requirement and is used by the Department for Transport (DfT) to allocate funds for local transport improvements. It is prepared by a partnership of the five West Yorkshire local authorities and Metro. The first LTP covered the
five years 2001/02 to 2005/06. A provisional second LTP (known as LTP2) for the years 2006/07 to 2010/11 was submitted to Government in July 2005. Further work will be undertaken to develop the provisional LTP2 into a final version for submission by March 2006.

7.1.6 The transport improvements needed to support the long-term aspirations for the region extend beyond the funding and timing scope of LTP2. The partnership has established a vision and long-term objectives for transport to provide direction for LTP2 and subsequent five year action plans. The longer term vision for transport in West Yorkshire is for:

A transport system that facilitates a competitive and efficient labour market, enabling the sub-region to address issues of under-performance and to compete internationally, and also meets social and environmental obligations.

and the objectives are:

To develop and maintain an integrated transport system that supports economic growth in a safe and sustainable way and enhances the overall quality of life for the people of West Yorkshire.

- **Delivering Accessibility** – to improve access to jobs, education and other key services for everyone;
- **Tackling Congestion** – to reduce delays to the movement of people and goods;
- **Safer Roads** – to improve safety for all highway users;
- **Better Air Quality** – to limit transport emissions of air pollutants, greenhouse gases and noise;
- **Effective Asset Management** – to improve the condition of the transport infrastructure.

7.1.7 Meeting these objectives will require the agencies with responsibility for different aspects of transport – the Department for Transport, the Highways Agency, Network Rail, Wakefield Council, Metro and the rail and bus operators – to work together to deliver an integrated transport system which meets the needs of communities and businesses.

7.1.8 The LDF also has an important role to play in implementing transport objectives. Within the framework provided by the RTS and LTP2 the LDF needs to incorporate a strategy and policies to ensure that the location of new development supports transport objectives. To this end, the transport objectives for the Core Strategy should be to:

- develop a transport system that meets the needs of communities and businesses;
- encourage modal shift away from private cars and promote the use of more sustainable modes of travel – public transport, walking and cycling – by making them more accessible and attractive to use;
- reduce the need to travel by providing jobs and services closer to where people live;
- ensuring that new development takes place in locations which are accessible by non-car modes – locating major development in city/town centres and around public transport nodes;
- control the amount of car parking provided in new developments, compatible with its type and location, by employing maximum parking standards;
- promote healthy lifestyles through increasing travel choice;
- reduce the environmental impact of travel, conserve energy and reduce air pollution by limiting the growth in road traffic;
- provide transport improvements through the development process;
- safeguard land for highways and other transport proposals.
7.2 Transport and Development

Transport and the Location of Development – Accessibility

7.2.1 The key relationship between transport and different land uses – housing, employment and services – is expressed as ‘accessibility’ - how easily people can move between where they live and the places they need to get to in their daily lives. Improving accessibility is about tackling the barriers that people, particularly those from disadvantaged groups and areas, face in accessing jobs and services. Accessibility and good communications are also essential for fostering economic growth, for improving the attractiveness of the District for inward investment and for increasing the competitiveness of its business and industry. Accessibility is not just about transport and can be influenced by decisions on the location, design and delivery of other services and by people's perceptions of personal safety.

7.2.2 The Government is advocating a more systematic approach to measuring accessibility than has been the case in the past so that differences in accessibility between locations can be compared and those with poor accessibility can be identified. More details are given in Appendix 8 ‘Accessibility Planning’.

7.2.3 Improvements to the transport system to increase accessibility will largely be delivered through the LTP but the LDF has a major role to play in improving accessibility. All new development has the potential to create additional travel demands and the location of new development will influence how many journeys are made, how long they are and what means of transport are used. Locating different land uses close together can reduce the number and length of journeys and can make walking and cycling more attractive, whilst concentrating developments which generate lots of journeys in city and town centres and in high quality public transport corridors means it is more likely that people will choose to use public transport to travel.

7.2.4 Accessibility to jobs and services in the larger urban areas of the District is generally good, but it continues to be a problem in the smaller towns, villages and rural areas, particularly in the South East of the District. Overcoming these problems is a key concern for the LDF.

7.2.5 By concentrating most new employment, housing, shopping, leisure facilities and services in the town centres and the urban areas of the District, where it is accessible by public transport, walking, and cycling, and by seeking to retain and improve the range of services available in local service centres and villages, the LDF spatial development strategy aims to improve accessibility. The Core Strategy should include a policy which ensures the main travel generators are accessible by sustainable transport modes, that new development is located where public transport is or can be made available and the need to travel is minimised by providing jobs and services closer to where people live. This should help maximise the use of existing public transport facilities and services, safeguard accessibility for people without access to a car and provide for a greater proportion of the travel demand generated by development to be catered for by alternative modes to the private car.

7.2.6 The LDF will need to give particular attention to accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling when identifying future development sites. Development sites should be located where public transport services already exist or can be provided commercially. Accessibility should also be a key consideration when planning applications are determined.

7.2.7 The proposed approach to measuring accessibility, based on RSS, outlined in the Issues & Options Report was generally supported in the consultation responses, subject to a number of caveats. Different measures of accessibility are thought to be needed for rural and urban areas. The effects of a proposed development must be taken into account when assessing
the accessibility of individual sites. Ensuring sites are accessible must not exclude consideration of accessibility by car. Accessibility criteria must be applied flexibly to take account of market needs to secure inward investment.

7.2.8 Further work on measuring and comparing accessibility is being undertaken by YHA in relation to new RSS and by the LTP partnership for the submission version of the final LTP2 in March 2006 – see Appendix 8 ‘Accessibility Planning’. The LDF will include proposed accessibility measures which will be used to assess different options for land allocations, in the sustainability appraisal process and in relation to individual planning applications.

The Impact of New Development on Travel

7.2.9 It is important that the impact of new development on transport networks and travel patterns is assessed so that measures to accommodate and manage travel needs in a sustainable way and to improve accessibility can be identified and implemented to meet the transport objectives outlined above.

7.2.10 Where a development proposal will have significant transport implications the Council will require a ‘Transport Assessment’ to be prepared and submitted alongside a planning application. It should assess the impact of the proposed development on the need to travel and on the road and public transport networks. It should identify accessibility to the site by all forms of transport and the need for any improvements to these networks to accommodate new travel in the most sustainable manner, consistent with the shift away from car use.

7.2.11 It is important that developers make a contribution towards transport improvements to deliver sustainable transport solutions as part of their development. Transport Assessments will help determine what is needed in each case. This could include making a contribution to wider area improvements planned by the Council or other agency. The principle of contributions is established in policy CS3 and this is amplified in policy CS21. Details about the nature and scope of contributions that will be sought and the basis on which contributions will be assessed will be set out in a separate SPD.

7.2.12 The need for the LDF to set out the basis on which developer contributions to transport improvements will be assessed, to provide consistency and clarity, was generally supported in responses to the Issues & Options consultation. Contributions should cover improvements to public transport as well as to highways and traffic management. Some expressed the view that contributions should clearly relate to the impact of the proposed development.

7.2.13 It is also important to encourage responsible car use and promote the use of alternative modes where these are appropriate. Developers will therefore be required to submit a ‘Travel Plan’ with a planning application for major travel generating activities which are likely to have significant transport implications. Travel Plans show what arrangements will be made to encourage new occupiers and their employees to use public transport, walking and cycling rather than using private cars, and to encourage more environmentally friendly delivery and freight movements. They should include specific targets for each mode of travel. A Travel Plan can form part of a Transport Assessment.

7.2.14 There was widespread support in responses to the Issues & Options consultation for the LDF to set out when Travel Plans will be required and their scope. It was also pointed out that monitoring and enforcement are essential to ensure their success.

7.2.15 Policy CS 21 ‘Transport and Development’ establishes the broad parameters for Travel Plans. Detail of when they will be required, their scope and the mechanisms for delivery and enforcement will be set out in a separate SPD.
7.2.16 The preferred option is to include the following policy relating to accessibility, the location of new development and its impact on travel:

Policy CS 21

Transport and Development

Development will be supported which seeks to meet essential travel needs by the use of transport modes other than the car whilst reducing the need to travel. In particular:

1. Planning applications for development which will have significant transport implications must be accompanied by a Transport Assessment which considers the impact of the proposal on the overall amount of and need to travel and the impact on the road and public transport networks. It should set out proposed improvements to these networks to accommodate new travel in the most sustainable manner.
   a. development should be located where it can be served by public transport, walking and cycling;
   b. development should be located where the traffic generated can be accommodated by existing highways and will not create or add to problems of safety, congestion or damage to the environment;
   c. residential development should be located within walking distance of essential local facilities and public transport services;
   d. development which generates a large number of passenger movements should be located in city and town centres or at other locations which provide convenient access on foot, by cycle and public transport;
   e. new development should make best use of existing transport networks and have regard to future transport investment proposals, to enhance the viability of public transport services;
   f. development should seek to improve accessibility for those without access to a car and those from disadvantaged groups and areas.

The standards of accessibility to be achieved for different types of development and different locations will be set out in the LDF.

2. Developers will be required to make a contribution towards transport improvements to deliver sustainable transport solutions as part of their development in accordance with the development principles in policy CS3 and detailed requirements set out in an SPD.

3. Developers proposing major travel generating activities which are likely to have significant transport implications will be required to submit a Travel Plan with a planning application showing the arrangements to be made to encourage the use of public transport, walking and cycling and more environmentally friendly delivery and freight movements. Detailed requirements will be set out in an SPD.
Rejected Option – Transport and Development

1. Do not include the policy as it repeats statements of national and regional planning policy.

Reason – It is important to include the policy as it shows how the LDF will support and relate to objectives and principles in RSS and the LTP. The final version of the policy will also refer to local accessibility measures, when these are established.

2. Include the accessibility criteria in current RSS which set minimum standards for the provision of public transport services in new development.

Reason – The accessibility criteria in current RSS are likely to be superseded by the new work referred to in paragraph 7.2.8.

7.3 Walking and Cycling

7.3.1 Nationally 50% of journeys are under two miles and most are done in cars. For most people these journeys could be made on foot or bicycle, with benefits for health, fitness and the environment. Encouraging more people to switch from cars to cycling and walking would make a major contribution to meeting national targets for reducing emissions of pollutants, carbon dioxide and greenhouse gases and the number of deaths from heart disease and strokes. A central aim of national, regional and local transport strategies is to meet an increasing proportion of travel demand by walking and cycling, both for shorter journeys and as part of longer journeys by public transport. The principal barriers to walking and cycling are safety, security, lack of adequate parking and changing facilities, and a need to change attitudes.

7.3.2 LTP2 includes proposals to encourage a greater use of cycling and walking by dealing effectively with the barriers, improving safety, promoting the associated benefits and integrating with public transport, with the aim of reducing journeys by car and contributing to the relief of congestion.

7.3.3 The Council and its partners have developed the Wakefield Cycling Strategy to complement the West Yorkshire Cycling Strategy in the LTP and to place cycling into a more specific Wakefield context. The strategy sets out objectives and targets for cycling, provides the basis for considering all highway, maintenance and cycling schemes as well as the allocation of resources.

7.3.4 Land use and transport planning, including the LDF, are key to achieving the following:

- developing a high quality network of walking and cycling routes for Wakefield District;
- providing measures that give priority to pedestrians and cyclists over the private car;
- ensuring that new development proposals are located and designed to be cycle and pedestrian friendly, improve accessibility for cyclists and do not sever cycle routes;
- protecting disused railway lines and other potential cycle routes from development;
- promoting the integration of cycling/walking and public transport to facilitate cycle use and walking as part of longer journeys;
- providing cycle parking at places used by the public, including transport interchanges;
- adopting guidelines for cycle parking standards applicable to existing and new developments.
7.3.5 The LTP Cycling Strategy includes details of the national and county-wide cycle route network. Proposed additions to the network in Wakefield District will be identified on the LDF Proposals Maps and in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD. Where appropriate, links in the network should be provided as part of development proposals. In addition, the Council is developing a network of off-road cycle tracks, shared use footways (for use by pedestrians and cyclists) and on-road facilities such as cycle lanes principally to encourage more cycle commuting. The LTP includes proposals to provide cycle routes to/through Wakefield city centre and alternative cycle routes close to the congested A638 Doncaster Road and A61 Barnsley Road.

7.3.6 Integrating cycling and walking into longer journeys by public transport will be developed in partnership with the public transport operators and will include the provision of further secure cycle parking facilities at bus and railway stations, the development of cycle park and ride and improvements to the carriage of cycles on public transport vehicles. Cycle routes that link to strategic public transport interchanges will also be developed.

7.3.7 The Council is working with schools to introduce further Walking Buses, Safe Routes to School and other schemes to help reduce congestion. Schools are encouraged to draw up Travel Plans to reduce congestion and improve safety. It is also working with the Primary Care Trusts on the Healthy Transport Project promoting Health Walks and events to encourage people to take more exercise.

7.3.8 The needs of pedestrians are given high priority in city and town centres. Pedestrianization has helped to upgrade environmental conditions and reduce pedestrian/vehicular conflict and pollution. Schemes have been implemented in Wakefield, Castleford, Pontefract, Ossett, Normanton and Hemsworth and will be extended and introduced elsewhere as appropriate.

7.3.9 Developing a network of public footpaths and bridleways is essential to provide opportunities for walking and cycling for recreation in the countryside. Opportunities to extend the network of countryside paths and cycle routes will be taken, including the use of disused railway lines. These former lines need to be protected from development to enable their future use, though attention will need to be paid to their value as wildlife habitats and corridors. The Council has adopted a Disused Railway Strategy which addresses these issues. All public rights of way should be legally defined, properly maintained and well publicised.

7.3.10 Opportunities provided by new development proposals will be taken to introduce new and improved routes and facilities for cyclists and pedestrians. Wakefield has recently adopted minimum standards for secure cycle parking in different types of development. These are set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance. Layouts should provide facilities for cyclists and segregated connections to the footpath, cycle track or highway network, providing direct access by cycle and on foot to destinations within the development. Transport Assessments should demonstrate that the needs of cyclists and pedestrians have been taken into account (using cycle and pedestrian audits). Planning conditions and obligations will be employed, where appropriate, to ensure the provision of appropriate facilities is secured.

7.3.11 The preferred approach is to include the following policy on walking and cycling:

---

Policy CS 22

Walking and Cycling

The Council will work with its partners to overcome the barriers to increasing the number of journeys by cycle and on foot and to increase leisure opportunities for walking and cycling by:

a. developing a high quality, segregated, safe cycle route network for Wakefield District;
b. giving priority to cyclists and pedestrians over the private car, particularly in city/town centres and residential areas;
c. ensuring that new developments make proper provision for cyclists and pedestrians, including safe cycle parking and links to footpath and cycle route networks;
d. promoting the integration of cycling and walking with public transport as part of longer journeys;
e. introducing or extending pedestrianization schemes in city and town centres, where appropriate;
f. protecting disused railway lines and other potential cycle and footpath routes from development.

Developers will be expected to incorporate appropriate facilities for cyclists, pedestrians and people with special needs in their development proposals, in accordance with the development principles in policy CS3 and detailed requirements set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance or a successor SPD.

Rejected Option – Walking and Cycling

No options were considered as the proposed policy reflects fundamental aims to increase the number of journeys by cycle and on foot in national and regional transport policy and in the LTP, though detailed changes to the wording could be considered.

7.4 Public Transport

7.4.1 Public transport has a vital role to play in meeting the travel needs of the District, particularly for people without the use of a car, and provides the principal means of reducing reliance on the car. Dependence on public transport is relatively high in Wakefield District where the level of car ownership is below the national average. Greater use of public transport is an essential in reducing accidents, pollution, fuel consumption and congestion which affect individuals, business and the environment. Encouraging greater use of public transport as an alternative to the car is a main theme of both the RTS and LTP. It will require:

- more frequent, reliable and faster public transport services, both bus and rail;
- new and improved public transport infrastructure – waiting, park and ride and interchange facilities;
- improved information and ticketing systems;
- land use policies which encourage development in areas of high public transport accessibility;
- education to improve travel awareness.
Access to public transport is important for pensioner households, households with children under five, for school children and young people and for women.

7.4.2 The urban areas of the District benefit from a reasonably well integrated and comprehensive public transport network. However, improvements are needed in Wakefield city and other urban areas to tackle congestion and to enable public transport to operate more efficiently. To help resolve problems, priority is being given to buses in managing the use of available road-space. In rural areas, access to public transport can be more difficult. At the same time reliance on public transport has become more necessary for those without the use of a car as local facilities have closed. The South East of the District is relatively remote from the main urban centres. Of particular concern in this area is the need to improve public transport accessibility to job opportunities.

7.4.3 LTP2 recognises that a major improvement in the quality of public transport is essential if its objectives are to be met. The Bus Strategy in LPT2 aims to improve reliability, ticketing, cleanliness of buses and perceptions of personal safety. It will improve integration with other modes of transport. LTP2 funded measures will include giving priority to buses through traffic management measures, bus interchanges, better waiting and information facilities. The main proposal in Wakefield District is the Castleford Interchange Integrated Transport Scheme which comprises a new combined bus/rail interchange, pedestrianization of a further part of Carlton St., and improved pedestrian links to the town centre.

7.4.4 In rural areas more different approaches are needed to improve public transport services. In the South East of the District, Neighbourhood Renewal Funding has been used to support Community Transport over a three year period. LTP2 provides an opportunity for improved partnership working in this area.

7.4.5 The Yorkshire Bus Initiative (YBI) is a key part of the strategy for buses. It is a partnership between the West Yorkshire LTP Partnership, bus operators, South Yorkshire authorities and the City of York Council. The objective is to change the quality of buses by investing in infrastructure, vehicles and priorities on the core network. It also aims to address accessibility by improving social networks, and interchanges with the core network. It is reflected in the LTP2 investment programme and the West Yorkshire authorities have submitted a major scheme bid to further accelerate delivery of YBI. The YBI includes improvements to the north of Wakefield city centre which will be implemented as part of the North Wakefield Gyratory System highway scheme (see paragraph 7.5.11). The YBI network is shown on the Core Strategy ‘Key Diagram’.

7.4.6 Improved rail services have an important contribution to make to increasing travel choice, reducing dependency on the car and tackling problems of congestion. The Rail Strategy in LTP2 seeks to improve network performance and attract more peak commuters. These include increasing peak capacity, providing additional and better car parking capacity at stations for commuters, improving transport integration at stations, improving the quality of stations and trains and enhancing strategic links between main urban centres.

7.4.7 The major rail scheme in the District is proposed improvements to Wakefield Westgate Station as part of the Wakefield Westgate Key Development Area, encompassing the land surrounding the station. It involves the construction of new station buildings, new lifts to the existing pedestrian bridge and increasing the station capacity to remove a bottleneck and allow improved rail services on the East Coast Main Line between Leeds and Doncaster and on the Leeds-Sheffield route, which are regional transport priorities. The increased platform capacity should also permit the reintroduction of services to/from Pontefract and Knottingley.
7.4.8 The Council works with Metro, the SRA/Network Rail, bus and train operators and neighbouring authorities to implement proposals to improve public transport services and facilities in line with the priorities established in RSS and the LTP2. It is important that there is an integrated approach to land use planning and the provision of public transport. The likely availability and use of public transport is an important factor in determining the location of new development in order to reduce dependence on the car. In planning for major development there needs to be early consultation with public transport operators to give them the best opportunity to plan their resources to deliver effective new or enhanced public transport services. Developers will be asked to contribute to planned public transport improvement schemes where their development proposals would increase the need for, or benefit from, the particular scheme. Details of how contributions will be assessed will be set out in an SPD.

7.4.9 The preferred approach is to include the following policy on public transport:

**Policy CS 23**

**Public Transport**

The Council will work with its partners, particularly Metro and transport providers, to secure an integrated, safe and attractive public transport network which serves the travel needs of the District by:

a. improving the frequency and reliability of public transport services (both bus and rail) where deficiencies are identified;

b. improving the quality of transport infrastructure and interchange facilities;

c. giving priority to buses in the use of road-space through traffic management measures;

d. giving priority to rural areas and the South East of the District where public transport accessibility is poor and to urban areas where congestion reduces public transport efficiency;

e. directing its own investment programmes to support and enable improvements to public transport in accordance with priorities set out in the LTP.

Developers will be required to contribute to planned public transport improvement schemes where their development proposals would increase the need for, or benefit from, the particular scheme, in accordance with the development principles in policy CS3 and detailed requirements set out in an SPD.

**Rejected Option – Public Transport**

No options were considered as the proposed policy reflects fundamental aims to improve the quality and attractiveness of public transport contained in national and regional transport policy and in the LTP, though detailed changes to the wording could be considered.

7.5 The Highway Network

7.5.1 Whilst priority is given to the use of alternatives to the car, it is essential that the highway network is maintained and improved to enable people to move around safely and conveniently. A high quality highway network is essential to economic growth and to support regeneration.
7.5.2 The function of the national strategic highway network (motorways and trunk roads) is to provide efficient and convenient long distance travel by road. The Highways Agency seeks to protect the network for this purpose by opposing the location of development likely to generate high volumes of personal journeys close to junctions.

7.5.3 In addition to the national network, the Council has identified a Highway Network in the District consisting of a hierarchy of the roads based on their primary function. The network is shown on the 'Key Diagram'. It provides the framework for traffic management, highway investment and controlling the location of development to ensure that development and investment are directed where they will reinforce the spatial development strategy, encourage regeneration and environmental improvement, relieve congestion and give priority to public transport and will help to create sustainable development. Traffic is encouraged to use the highest appropriate category of road to minimise the environmental impact of through traffic and heavy goods vehicle movements through traffic management schemes and Traffic Regulation Orders.

7.5.4 The hierarchy is:

- **Category 1** – Motorways and Trunk Roads which carry inter-regional traffic;
- **Category 2** – Principal Roads which link the main urban areas and which connect these centres to Category 1 roads and to major centres in neighbouring districts;
- **Category 3** – Mixed Priority Roads which link smaller urban areas and other settlements to main urban areas and to the Category 1 and 2 networks, and serve the needs of traffic and pedestrians.

7.5.5 Improvements to the highway network are required to support regeneration initiatives and allow demand management to influence travel choices into main centres. Investments over the long-term identified in LTP2 include:

- support for the regeneration of Wakefield City Centre;
- addressing the legacy of sub-standard infrastructure in the former coalfields areas;
- demand management measures.

7.5.6 A number of major highway schemes are proposed to improve the network which are intended to serve a variety of functions. The individual schemes are listed below and the proposed road lines are shown and protected on the LDF Proposals Maps. Different schemes are at different stages of development:

7.5.7 Regional highway schemes to be implemented during LTP2:

- Hemsworth – A1 Link Road
- Glasshoughton Coalfields Link Road

7.5.8 Schemes in LPT2 submitted for Major Project Funding:

- A61 North Wakefield Gyratory System/Wakefield Inner Ring Road

7.5.9 Schemes where further evaluation is needed to be implemented after LTP2:
7.5.10 The Hemsworth – A1 Link Road and Glasshoughton Coalfields Link Road are needed to open up major new land for employment development by linking sites to the strategic road network. The former will also help to improve cross-boundary links from the coalfield and Dearne areas in Barnsley through Wakefield District to the A1 and M62.

7.5.11 The A61 North Wakefield Gyratory System/Wakefield Inner Ring Road scheme involves introducing a one-way clockwise circulatory system on the A61 Leeds Road/Northgate and Bradford Road/Wentworth Street with a lane for buses and cycles. Completion of the Inner Ring Road supports regeneration and economic growth and includes road links around Wakefield Westgate station and the adjacent key development site. The North Wakefield Gyratory is part of the Yorkshire Bus Initiative which is a regional priority. The integrated nature of the proposed scheme will help reduce the need to travel, particularly by car and has the potential to reduce congestion and air quality problems, improve the environment for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users and improve access. The objectives of the scheme are consistent with the priorities in the Community Strategy, Fast Forward.

7.5.12 The South East Link Road will remove through traffic and improve road safety and environmental problems from a number of settlements but further evaluation is needed to ensure that it provides value for money. The Wakefield Eastern By-pass would remove much of the through traffic from central Wakefield, alleviating heavy congestion and poor safety and environmental conditions along A638 Doncaster Road, A642 Aberford Road and A61 Leeds Road and routes through the city, and allowing scope for further measures to give priority to public transport, pedestrians and road safety.

7.5.13 In addition to the above schemes the Highways Agency is undertaking a review of proposals to improve the M1 and M62 Motorways and A1 following completion of the South & West Yorkshire Multi-Modal Study (SWYMMMS). Options being considered include an additional lane, traffic management and demand management measures.

7.5.14 The Core Strategy needs to support proposed improvements to the strategic highway network. The preferred option is to include the following policy:

---

**Policy CS 24**

**The Highway Network**

1. The Highway Network forms an essential part of a balanced and integrated transport system for the District. The network will be used to:

   a. ensure development proposals have access to the appropriate category of road;
   b. manage traffic effectively by relieving congestion and giving priority to buses in the use of road-space;
   c. allocate resources.

Traffic will be encouraged to use the highest appropriate category of road to minimise the impact of traffic on communities and the environment.

2. The Council will work with its partners to secure improvements to the Highway Network where these are consistent with the priorities identified in the RSS and LTP, and support the LDF spatial development strategy and sustainable development.
Rejected Option – The Highway Network

1. Do not support further improvements to the highway network as this only relieves congestion temporarily and generates more traffic.

Reason – Whilst the emphasis is on investment in sustainable forms of transport, limited improvements to the highway network are still needed to accommodate future traffic growth and allow the network to function efficiently.

7.6 Freight

7.6.1 The ability to move goods when needed is essential for a successful economy. It is particularly important given Wakefield District’s strategic position on the national motorway, rail and waterway networks and the advantage this gives for logistics, warehousing and distribution. Efficient access for goods and services is also a key factor in supporting the vitality of urban areas.

7.6.2 The great majority of freight in West Yorkshire is carried by road, particularly on the strategic routes (M1, M62 and A1). These are congested at peak times causing delays for business. A further problem is caused by Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) travelling on unsuitable roads. The movement of freight by road causes problems of noise, vibration, road safety, poor air quality, disturbance to local communities and damage to structures, so that the continued growth of heavy lorry traffic is unsustainable.

7.6.3 The aim for the future is to achieve an integrated and sustainable system of freight distribution which makes the most efficient use of all modes, maximising the use of rail and water, in preference to road and minimising the impact of freight distribution on the environment. The Regional Freight Strategy (2004) and the West Yorkshire Freight Study (2003) provide the context for progressing freight initiatives proposed in LTP2. Their success depends on a high degree of co-operation and commitment from the prospective partners including local authorities, freight operators and the local community and the infrastructure providers – Network Rail, British Waterways and the Highways Agency.

7.6.4 Rail and water are currently under-utilised as means of carrying freight mainly because of their cost relative to road haulage. However, there is scope for more use of rail and water borne freight in the carriage of bulk materials, aggregates and large volumes of non-perishable goods. The Aire & Calder navigation already carries a significant freight tonnage and but better use could be made of the inland waterway network in the District. Similarly, greater use can be made of the regional rail/road transfer facility at Wakefield Europort, offering services to Europe, and opportunities should be taken to link major freight movement origins and destinations to the rail network. At the same time, the strategic highway network needs to be protected to ensure that freight movements have higher priority than cars. One of the constraints on the growth of rail and water use is the shortage of wharves and other rail/road transfer facilities.

7.6.5 Land use planning can have a significant impact on distribution through policies and decisions on patterns of development and transport infrastructure. The spatial development strategy encourages the creation of sustainable development but there is a need for a specific policy in the Core Strategy relating to sustainable freight transport which:
• aims to locate developments which generate high volumes of freight traffic close to inter-modal transfer facilities, rail freight facilities and wharves;
• identifies and protects existing and proposed sites which are suitable for inter-modal transfer facilities, rail freight facilities and the loading and unloading of water-borne freight;
• supports the development of new inter-modal transfer facilities, rail freight facilities and wharves;
• encourages the use of rail or water for freight movements from new developments particularly in the transport of bulk materials;
• protects existing rail freight connections to major industrial sites and promotes the development of new rail sidings.

7.6.6 The preferred option is to include the following policy:

Policy CS 25

Policy CS25—Freight

The Council and its partners will seek to achieve an integrated freight distribution system which makes the most efficient and effective use of road, rail and water transport. In particular:

a. developments which generate large volumes of freight traffic or involve the transport of bulk materials should make use of rail or water for freight movements wherever practical. They should include as part of the development, or be located close to, inter-modal transfer facilities, rail freight facilities or wharves;

b. sites which are used or suitable for inter-modal transfer facilities, rail freight facilities and the loading and unloading of water-borne freight will be protected for these uses;

c. the retention of rail freight connections to existing industrial sites will be encouraged and the development of new inter-modal transfer facilities, new rail sidings and rail freight facilities and new wharves will be supported.

Where road haulage is involved in the transport of large volumes of freight or the carrying of bulk materials, planning conditions and obligations will be used to define and agree suitable traffic routes and the need for other necessary environmental and traffic management controls.

Rejected Options – Freight

1. Do not promote the use of rail and water for the movement of freight .

Reason – It is recognised that road will continue to play the major role in the movement of freight but it is important to encourage the use of rail and water where possible in the interests of reducing congestion and minimising the impact of traffic on the environment.

2. Do not seek to safeguard sites which are used or suitable for inter-modal transfer facilities, rail freight facilities and the loading and unloading of water-borne freight from other forms of development.

Reason – Though future demand for these types of facility is uncertain, opportunities are limited and suitable sites need to be protected from other forms of development in the interests of long term planning.
7.7 Demand Management

7.7.1 Demand management, particularly of road traffic, forms part of an integrated transport policy aimed at encouraging alternative modes to the car and reducing congestion levels. A number of measures are available to help manage demand. In the long term, consideration will be given to area-wide road user charging as part of a national scheme. In the short and medium term other measures can be introduced. In doing so, the potential impact on economic development and regeneration needs to be considered. It will be important to balance measures which encourage the use of alternative modes to the private car and those that deter inefficient use of the car. Demand management measures need to be co-ordinated with improvements to public transport services. To be effective these have to be introduced at a regional or even a national level and require joint working between all the relevant agencies, including the Council.

7.7.2 Managing travel demands is an important factor in relieving congestion but land use policies in the LDF also have an important role to play. The location of development, housing densities and the layout and design of development in general influence the number of journeys and the chosen mode of transport, which in turn has an impact on congestion and accessibility.

Car Parking

7.7.3 The availability of car parking has a major influence on people’s choice of means of transport and is one of the key elements in managing the demand for car use. Reducing the amount of parking in new development is essential to promoting sustainable travel choices and tackling congestion, whilst ensuring that the vitality of town centres is not threatened. The LDF has an important role to play in setting the policy framework for car parking, determining appropriate standards of provision and controlling the amount and location of car parking in new development.

7.7.4 Current RSS recommends that local authorities develop an integrated strategy on parking, including a consistent approach to parking standards, to avoid competitive provision between different centres. RSS states that parking policies should include:

- the use of maximum parking standards through planning controls for new developments in step with location and land use type;
- progressive reduction in long stay parking (other than at railway stations to serve rail users) and transfer of some spaces to short stay, subject to consideration of possible implications for traffic congestion;
- reduction of on-street parking to maximise pedestrianization with high quality walking and cycling networks and environmental improvements;
- park and ride facilities where appropriate – coupled with increased use of public transport through service level improvements.

7.7.5 To reduce congestion by transferring trips from car to alternative modes, a strategy for managing overall car park supply and demand, including private car parks, has been developed in LTP2. The strategy includes:

- continuing to reduce the number of long stay spaces in urban areas;
- continuing to convert long stay spaces to short stay;
- outward extension of city centre control zones;
• continuing to increase long stay parking charges in main urban centres (prices to reflect local circumstances and impact on mode choice); and
• use of additional revenue to fund initiatives linked to park and ride and improvements to car park infrastructure e.g. security.

LTP2 also includes proposals for providing additional and better car parking capacity at stations for commuters.

7.7.6 There was limited support in replies to the Issues & Options consultation for the approach to car parking. The general view is that plans to reduce long term parking, other than at railway stations, should only occur once improvements to public transport services are in place. Also the continuing viability of town centres must be protected.

7.7.7 Wakefield has adopted maximum car parking standards which are set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance (see paragraph 7.3.10). Different maximum values apply depending on the level of accessibility in each case. Consideration will need to be given to whether these standards need to be revised in the light of any new regional standards in new RSS and whether a new Supplementary Planning Document needs to be prepared. This will be addressed in future reviews of the Local Development Scheme. Issues relating to parking in Wakefield city centre will be considered in the Central Wakefield Area Action Plan DPD. A separate strategy is also being developed covering all aspects of car parking in the city centre.

7.7.8 Through its Town Centre Partnerships the Council aims to ensure that public car parking provision in the city and town centres is managed to support the above aims, whilst meeting the needs of traders and shoppers. Priority will be given to short stay parking to maximise the use of available parking spaces and safeguard the attractiveness and viability of shopping and commercial centres. Long stay parking will be restricted to sites on the peripheries of the town centres adjacent to the main radial corridors. Monitoring the quality, quantity and type of car parking is one of the town centre health checks proposed in PPS6. In residential areas in and adjacent to town centres parking spaces for residents will be safeguarded to minimise the environmental and safety problems arising from commuters and shoppers parking in residential streets.

7.7.9 The existence of public car parks and the capacity of the highway system are taken into account when assessing the need for parking provision associated with new development. In some cases, where public car parking exists or where additional parking would prejudice the efficient operation of the highway network, reduced or no parking provision may be appropriate subject to accessibility requirements being catered for by alternative means.

7.7.10 The provision of car parking spaces and the need for measures to satisfy travel needs by other modes are issues to be addressed in a Travel Plan or Transport Assessment. Where appropriate, the Council will negotiate a planning obligation to ensure necessary measures are taken to satisfy travel needs in a sustainable manner. In this way the Council can locate and manage car parking to assist traffic flow and minimise adverse environmental impacts whilst ensuring the economic functioning of centres.

Park and Ride

7.7.11 Park and ride facilities situated on major public transport corridors promote the use of public transport to access main urban areas, improve access to jobs and services in central areas and, by reducing the number of cars, help to use highway space more efficiently and reduce the need for town centre parking. If introduced as part of a demand management strategy,
including measures which give priority to public transport in the use of road-space, park and ride can help to alleviate problems of air quality, safety and congestion and improve accessibility in a manner that is equitable and socially inclusive.

7.7.12 There was widespread support in responses to the Issues & Options consultation for identifying suitable park and ride sites on the LDF Proposals Maps, and for more long stay car parking at railway stations. Park and ride sites need to be chosen carefully to ensure they will be used and that they themselves do not generate additional car journeys.

7.7.13 A study has been undertaken to review the development of park and ride provision in West Yorkshire to identify sites with the greatest potential that could be developed through a phased LTP programme. A number of potential sites have been identified in Wakefield District. It will be necessary to consider with bus and rail operators and METRO whether it is now appropriate to identify specific park and ride sites on the LDF Proposals Maps, to accompany planned improvements in public transport.

7.7.14 The preferred option is to include the following policy in the Core Strategy:

**Policy CS 26**

*Policy CS26 – Demand Management*

The Council will work with relevant national, regional and sub-regional agencies to develop a co-ordinated approach to the management of travel demand. In relation to car parking it will continue to:

- limit the amount of car parking in new development through the application of maximum parking standards, as set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance or a successor SPD;
- seek reduced car parking provision on city/town centre sites where public car parking or alternative modes of transport are available;
- seek to reduce long stay parking (other than at railway stations to serve rail users) and to transfer spaces to short stay, where appropriate;
- introduce park and ride facilities on major public transport routes in association with public transport service improvements and measures which give priority to public transport in the use of road-space.

For major developments, the provision of car parking and the need for measures to satisfy travel needs by non-car modes should be addressed in a Travel Plan or Transport Assessment.
Rejected Options – Demand Management

1. Set out the timetable for the introduction of a road charging scheme.

Reason – Road charging in Wakefield could only be introduced as part of a national scheme. There is still considerable uncertainty about how such a scheme might operate and its potential impact.

2. Allow more generous maximum parking standards in new development.

Reason – This option would not help to reduce congestion and would not be in line with policies in the LTP, RSS and national planning policy guidance.

3. Make maximum parking standards more stringent than in current SPG.

Reason – The policy seeks to apply stricter standards in city/town centres where public car parking or alternative modes of transport are available but to apply stricter standards everywhere might deter investment, undermine the viability of services or lead to more on-street parking.

7.8 Disused Railways and Waterways

7.8.1 Policy CS 22 above seeks to protect disused railway lines from development to enable their future use as footpaths or cycleways. However, there may also be opportunities to reinstate former railway lines and waterways for commercial or leisure uses. Alternatively, these linear corridors might provide an opportunity to extend the transport network to accommodate future requirements with minimal disruption to adjoining activities and communities. The possibility of reinstating the former Barnsley Canal is currently being investigated by Wakefield and Barnsley councils. It is therefore necessary to protect former railway lines and waterways from other forms of development.

7.8.2 The preferred option is to include the following policy in the Core Strategy:

Policy CS 27

Disused Railways and Waterways

Disused railway lines and waterways will be protected from other forms of development to safeguard their potential as extensions to the transport network for commercial or leisure purposes.

Rejected Option – Disused Railways and Waterways

1. Do not protect these routes as potential extensions to the transport network.

Reason – This option would represent a missed opportunity for providing new footpaths, cycle routes and other transport links and would not make best use of existing infrastructure.
8 Retailing and Town Centre Uses

8.1 General Policy Approach

Urban Areas

8.1.1 Promoting the growth of retailing and other town centre uses – leisure and entertainment, offices, arts, culture and tourism facilities and housing, the latter particularly in mixed-use, multi-storey developments – is important for maintaining the vitality and viability of existing centres and for supporting the process of urban renaissance. The Community Strategy, Fast Forward, and spatial objectives 6 and 8 aim to create attractive, successful and accessible city and town centres across the District with a range of high quality retail, cultural and leisure opportunities available to enhance the quality of life for residents and visitors. The spatial development strategy supports these aims by concentrating most new development in city/town centres.

8.1.2 Government policy for town centres, emphasises the need to:

- develop a hierarchy and network of centres;
- assess the need for further main town centre uses and ensure there is the capacity to accommodate them;
- focus development in, and plan for the expansion of, existing centres as appropriate, and identify appropriate sites in LDFs.

8.1.3 Policy CS1 seeks to encourage development of an appropriate type and scale in city and town centres whilst policy CS6 promotes new housing and policy CS16 commercial offices in these same locations.

8.1.4 As far as retailing and town centre leisure uses are concerned, it is considered that the policies in the UDP remain broadly consistent with national planning policy guidance though there is a need to establish a hierarchy of centres. The hierarchy needs to be based on up to date information, possibly including a revision of the West Yorkshire Retail Study, which was last updated in 1998. This will enable the retail/town centre chapters in the UDP to be replaced by a DPD. The Local Development Scheme proposes that the policies and reasoned justification in Chapter 7 of Volume 2 of the UDP and related site specific proposals in Volumes 3, 4 and 5, be saved for longer than three years and that a separate DPD on retailing be prepared. Details of the proposed DPD will be included in future reviews of the Local Development Scheme. Proposals for development in Wakefield city centre will be in the Central Wakefield Area Action Plan, which is in preparation and builds on proposals for key sites contained in the UDP First Alteration.

8.1.5 In the interim before the proposed Retail and Town Centres DPD is in place, planning applications for retailing and other city/town centre uses will be considered in the light of saved UDP policies, PPS6 and the emerging Central Wakefield AAP.

8.1.6 A sequential approach will be used to assess sites for new retail development. Retail proposals will generally be acceptable where they are located within the retail policy areas of city and town centres. Where retail development cannot be accommodated within retail policy areas, sites on the edge of these areas should be used first before out-of-centre sites are considered. In the case of edge of retail policy area sites and out-of-centre proposals, it will be necessary for developers to demonstrate the need for the development and the likely impact on other
centres. PPS6 states that a similar site selection approach should be used for other city/town centre uses, with first priority given to city/town centre sites, in preference to edge of centre sites or finally to sites outside centres.

8.1.7 Developing new cultural activities in Wakefield city and town centres will help to implement ‘The Freedom to Be’, the Wakefield District Cultural Strategy 2003-2015. The strategy aims to improve the range and quality of cultural and leisure opportunities across the District and to improve residents’ access to cultural facilities, services and activities available in the District and wider region. It also seeks to increase employment opportunities in the cultural sector for local people and to develop a strong identity for the Wakefield District as a centre of cultural excellence, building on existing facilities.

8.1.8 One of the main reasons for locating activities which attract large numbers of people like shops, cultural and leisure facilities within existing centres is to enable more people to access them by sustainable modes of transport – public transport, cycling and walking. It is therefore essential that new developments are accessible by these means.

8.1.9 Key to improving the attractiveness of the city and town centres of the District is ensuring that all new developments are well designed and of high quality and improving the quality of the streets and spaces around and between buildings – the public realm. The need to improve the quality of design and townscape are addressed in spatial objective 9 are identified as essential to successful urban renaissance. Policies CS2 and CS4 in chapter 4 of the Core Strategy and policy BED1 in the Development Control Policies DPD relate specifically to design and these will be important considerations in all new development proposals.

8.1.10 Outside city and town centres it is important to establish a network of local centres within the larger urban areas to meet people’s day-to-day needs, particularly in deprived areas which are often deficient in local services. This is in line with spatial objective 3. The UDP does not identify local centres but it is intended to do so in the proposed Retail DPD. They will be the focus for local shopping and other local services, such as health centres and other small scale community facilities, consistent with the scale and function of the centre.

Services in Smaller Settlements

8.1.11 In local service centres and villages local shops are an important element of local services which help to maintain the vitality of the rural economy, minimise the need to travel and make settlements sustainable. A number of respondents to the Issues & Options consultation indicated the need for a policy to retain local services, including village pubs, shops and post offices, where the loss would cause an unacceptable reduction in local services, unless it can be demonstrated to be not viable financially. Proposals for additional local shopping provision should be supported where they are of a scale and type appropriate to the settlement and will help to maintain its viability. However, larger scale convenience and comparison retail provision will not be acceptable in these settlements.

8.1.12 The preferred option is to include the following policy in the Core Strategy:
Policy CS 28

Retailing and Town Centre Uses

1. Proposals which enhance the range and quality of retail, leisure, office, cultural and tourist facilities or increase the vitality and viability of existing city and town centres will be supported where:
   a. in the case of retail, they are located within the retail policy areas defined in the Area Action Plan for Central Wakefield and on the Proposals Maps for other town centres;
   b. in the case of other uses, they are located within Wakefield city centre defined in the Area Action Plan for Central Wakefield or within other town centres defined on the Proposals Maps;
   c. they are of a scale and nature appropriate to the size and function of the centre;
   d. they can be accessed conveniently by public transport, bicycle and on foot;
   e. they are well designed and of high quality;
   f. they provide additional employment opportunities;
   g. they make best use of underused or vacant sites and buildings; and
   h. they accord with RSS and national planning policy.

2. In local centres within the larger urban areas, proposals which help to meet people’s day-to-day needs for local shopping and other services will be supported where they are consistent with the size and function of the centre.

3. In local service centres and villages, proposals which maintain or extend the range of local services available, including proposals to extend existing shops, will be supported where they:
   a. are located within the settlement; and
   b. are of a scale and type appropriate to the size and function of the settlement.

4. Outside these locations proposals for retailing and leisure uses will be considered in the light of identified need and the sequential approach.

In every case the scale and location of proposals should accord with the spatial development strategy, the development principles, other LDF policies and PPS6.

In all locations, proposals which result in the loss of an existing facility or service will not be supported unless satisfactory alternative provision is made or the facility can be demonstrated to be not viable financially.
Rejected Options – Retailing and Town Centre Uses

1. Allow a more dispersed pattern of development with more extensive retail development in local service centres and villages and opportunities for development outside settlement boundaries.

Reason – A policy of this nature might be more attractive commercially but could threaten the vitality and viability of other centres. It would also be contrary to national and regional planning policy.

2. Develop a hierarchy and network of centres and assess the need for further main town centre uses and ensure there is the capacity to accommodate them, in line with the requirements of PPS6.

Reason – These will be included in a future Retail and Town Centres DPD.

8.1.13 A further objective of PPS6 is to promote town centre management, by creating partnerships to develop, improve and maintain town centres, and to manage the evening and night-time economy. This is already happening in Wakefield District. A number of town centre partnerships have been established and are putting in place programmes of improvements. In the case of Wakefield city and the Five Towns these improvements are an integral part of urban renaissance. Monitoring of the vitality and viability of town centres is also taking place.

8.2 Mixed Use Development

8.2.1 The promotion of mixed use development is one of the main aspects of Government and RSS policy for maintaining the vitality and diversity of existing city/town centres and giving people the opportunity to live close to jobs and services, so reducing the need to travel and helping to create sustainable communities.

8.2.2 Responses to the Issues & Options consultation generally supported the idea of a policy promoting mixed use development in Wakefield city centre and town centres as this would provide flexibility and encourage investment. The use of the term ‘Special Policy Area’ to denote areas where change may be expected was also generally supported. However, concerns were expressed about the need to specify the types of use which will be appropriate in particular locations and for mixed use development to adhere to other policies e.g. the location of retail development.

8.2.3 Policy CS 29 seeks to promote mixed use development in centres whilst ensuring that other policy concerns are addressed. Sites where proposals for a specific mix of uses will be encouraged in Wakefield city centre will be identified in the Central Wakefield Area Action Plan. In other parts of the District, the designation ‘Special Policy Area’ (SPA) will be used to show where change involving a number of land uses can be expected. SPAs will be shown on the Proposals Maps and the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD will identify the mix of uses which will be acceptable in each case. It will be necessary to ensure that the proposed uses support the spatial development strategy and accord with RSS and national planning policy.

8.2.4 Several of the District’s urban areas are characterised by older industrial areas located close to their centres. Many of these areas are designated as Employment Zones in the UDP. The review of these Zones, referred to in the Economy and Employment chapter, will reveal where it is no longer considered necessary to favour employment uses and where alternative, mixed uses can be encouraged, subject to certain safeguards to protect existing and future occupants.
It is proposed that these zones be termed ‘Mixed Use Zones’. They will be shown on the Proposals Maps and policy EMP2 to guide development is included in the Development Control Policies DPD.

**8.2.5** The **preferred option** for the Core Strategy is to include the following general policy on mixed use development:

---

**Policy CS 29**

**Mixed Use Development**

*Proposals for mixed use development will be encouraged:*

a. in Wakefield city centre and other town centres where they comply with policy CS28(1);

b. in Special Policy Areas identified on the Proposals Maps where they comply with the types of use specified for individual areas in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD;

c. in Mixed Use Zones identified on the Proposals Maps where they comply with policy EMP2 in the Development Control Policies DPD.

*In all cases proposals should accord with the spatial development strategy, development principles and other policies in the LDF, policies in RSS and national planning policy.*

---

**Rejected Options – Mixed Use Development**

1. Do not specify where mixed use development will be encouraged.

*Reason – In identifying where mixed use development will be encouraged, the policy does not exclude the possibility of appropriate mixed use schemes being built in other locations.*

2. State which types of use will be allowed in mixed use development.

*Reason – It is difficult to cover all eventualities in a general policy. The appropriate types of use will differ from site to site. The appropriate range of uses in each Special Policy Area will be set out in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD. In other places, proposed uses must be consistent with other policies and guidance.*
9 Community Facilities and Services

9.1 In addition to retail, leisure and cultural facilities considered in the last chapter, the provision of community services is essential to the quality of life of District residents. These include education, health, social and other community services. The Council is the key provider of education, community and social services. The Mid Yorkshire Hospitals NHS Trust is the main provider of hospital services whilst the West and East Wakefield Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) are responsible for providing primary care services – GPs, dentists, local health centres – and ensuring that services are accessible.

9.2 It is important that good quality services are provided locally. This reduces the need for people to travel long distances to obtain essential services, particularly benefiting the less mobile and more deprived members of society. This aim is supported by the spatial development strategy which encourages local facilities and services of an appropriate scale to be provided in all but the smallest settlements. Working in partnership with other providers and the voluntary sector, the Council will seek to ensure that community facilities and services are provided in the most effective and accessible way. In rural communities, services must be protected as much as possible, as their loss can have a major impact on communities.

9.3 It is important that proper provision is made for additional community services and facilities needed as a result of proposals for new development. Developers will be expected to contribute towards the necessary improvements or additional provision required and the Council will negotiate to secure a planning obligation relating to the provision of community facilities, in accordance with the principles set out in policy CS3. Here, this applies particularly to the provision of additional school facilities at both primary and secondary level. Details of how developer contributions will be assessed will be set out in a Supplementary Planning Document.

9.4 The preferred option is to include the following policy in the Core Strategy:

**Policy CS 30**

**Community Facilities and Services**

1. The Council will work with its partners, appropriate agencies and the voluntary sector to secure the provision of good quality community services and facilities which meet the needs of local communities and are accessible by public transport, cycling or on foot. In particular, provision will be sought which will benefit the less mobile or more deprived members of society.

2. The provision of services and facilities should be on a scale appropriate to the type and size of settlement with higher level services located in the larger urban areas to ensure that needs are met in the most effective and accessible way.

3. Proposals which will result in the loss of an existing community service or facility will not be supported unless satisfactory alternative provision is made.

4. Developers will be expected to make an appropriate contribution towards necessary improvements or additional provision for community services and facilities arising from their development proposals, in accordance with policy CS3.
Rejected Option – Community Facilities and Services

1. Refer to the types of facility which are needed in different places.

Reason – It is not possible to be more specific about where new facilities are needed, because of rapidly changing needs and methods of delivering services. The policy aims to establish the principle of local, accessible service provision with developers making an appropriate contribution to costs.
10 Leisure, Recreation and Open Space

10.1 The chapter on Retailing and Town Centres dealt with major leisure uses which attract large numbers of people and should, where possible, be located within city and town centres. This chapter considers the provision of other leisure and recreation facilities and open space. The provision of high quality, well maintained facilities improves health and well being, promotes social inclusion and community cohesion and is essential to the quality of life of District residents. To be sustainable, suitable facilities must be provided locally, whilst ensuring those which attract larger numbers of visitors are accessible by walking, cycling and public transport. On occasions leisure or recreation facilities need to be provided where a particular attraction or feature is located. In these cases attention has to be paid to possible conflicts with environmental objectives. Open spaces are often threatened by competing land uses, and it is important that they are offered appropriate protection.

10.2 Spatial objective 8 aims to provide a range of high quality, accessible recreational and leisure opportunities across the District whilst objective 9 seeks to protect, maintain and enhance open spaces. Both are essential to making the District an attractive place to live and work in and visit and are key to achieving urban renaissance.

10.3 The UDP First Alteration includes policies to guide the location of new leisure development, including countryside leisure, and to protect valued open spaces but it does not identify all sites which need to be protected or identify locations where deficiencies in provision exist.

10.4 In recent years the Council has adopted a Sport & Recreation Strategy and a Greenspace Strategy and is carrying out a Greenspace Audit of sites. These strategies and associated audits will provide assessments of the existing and future needs of communities for open space, sports and recreational facilities, as required under national planning policy guidance, and will form the basis for reviewing leisure and recreation policies and proposals in the UDP First Alteration. They will help to identify greenspace and recreation facilities of most value to the community which need to be protected and, where appropriate, enhanced. They will also identify areas of the District which are deficient in specific types of greenspace and recreation facilities where new facilities need to be provided.

10.5 The Local Development Scheme proposes that the policies and reasoned justification in Chapter 8 of UDP Volume 2 and the specific open space and playing field allocations in UDP in Volumes 3, 4 and 5 be saved for longer than 3 years and that a separate DPD on Leisure, Recreation and Open Space be prepared. Details of the proposed DPD will be included in future reviews of the Local Development Scheme.

10.6 The LDF will support proposals and activities that protect, retain or enhance existing recreational and amenity assets, or lead to the provision of additional assets. Before the proposed Leisure, Recreation and Open Space DPD is in place, planning applications for new leisure or recreation facilities and those which would result in the loss of any existing facility or open space, will be considered in the light of saved UDP policies, policies in RSS, PPG17, the Sport & Recreation Strategy and Greenspace Strategy, in consultation with the Council’s Environment Services, Sport England and other agencies.

10.7 New developments create additional need for both recreational facilities and open space. Where existing local facilities are inadequate, new developments must provide new or improved facilities to meet this need. The required amount of open space must be provided within the site boundary, unless the Council has approved off-site provision or funding in lieu of provision. Developers will be expected to contribute towards the necessary improvements or additional

provision required and the Council will negotiate to secure a planning obligation relating to the provision of recreation facilities and open space, in accordance with the principles set out in policy CS3. Local standards will be defined in the Leisure, Recreation and Open Space DPD or in an SPD.

10.8 The preferred option is to include the following policy in the Core Strategy:

**Policy CS 31**

*Leisure, Recreation and Open Space*

1. The Council will work with its partners, appropriate agencies and the voluntary sector to secure the provision of good quality, well maintained leisure, recreation and open space facilities which meet the needs of local communities. In particular, provision will be sought which makes good identified deficiencies or will benefit deprived groups and communities.

2. The provision of leisure and recreation facilities and open space should be on a scale appropriate to the type and size of settlement. Wherever possible those which attract large numbers of people should be located in the larger urban areas and be accessible by walking, cycling and public transport.

3. Proposals which will result in the loss of an existing leisure or recreation facility or open space will not be supported unless satisfactory alternative provision is made or the asset is no longer needed.

4. Developers will be expected to make an appropriate contribution towards necessary improvements or additional provision for recreation facilities and open space arising from their development proposals, in accordance with the principles in policy CS3 and standards set out elsewhere in the LDF.

**Rejected Option – Leisure, Recreation and Open Space**

1. Include reference to areas within the District where there is an open space surplus or shortage and the types of open space and recreation use that are needed.

Reason – These issues will be addressed in a future Leisure, Recreation and Open Space DPD.
11 Community Safety

11.1 Previous chapters have considered the need to provide accessible, good quality health services, recreation facilities and open space to promote healthy, sustainable communities. This chapter looks specifically at community safety and security. There was support in the Issues & Options consultation for a policy on secure design but security requirements must be balanced against the need for high quality design and accessibility.

11.2 Crime and the fear of crime are amongst the most important concerns of local communities. One of the challenges in the Community Strategy, Fast Forward, is ‘Feeling and being safer,’ which is reflected in spatial objective 11. The Council and its partners have also produced the Wakefield District Community Safety Strategy. Community safety is essential to creating sustainable communities and is one of the key objectives of sustainable development identified in national planning policy. The Government has also guidance\(^{(27)}\), showing how planning can contribute to crime reduction and community safety.

11.3 The design of buildings and spaces can make a significant contribution towards reducing the scope for crime, and for creating more pleasant and reassuring environments in which to live. Removing or reducing opportunities for crime should be the aim when designing all public areas in housing estates, town centres, employment areas and in all transport schemes.

11.4 Policy CS2 in this Core Strategy shows that creating safe communities is an important part of sustainable development whilst policy BED3 in the Development Control Policies DPD states that reducing opportunities for crime is essential to good design. Wakefield's Local Development Scheme also includes a proposed Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Designing for Community Safety to be prepared jointly by West Yorkshire Police and the West Yorkshire planning authorities showing how good design can be used in residential layouts to reduce crime.

11.5 All new development must take account of the need to reduce opportunities for crime in accordance with these policies. Account must also be taken of the principles in the national guidance, Secured by Design\(^{(28)}\). In addition the preferred option is to include the following policy in the Core Strategy:

**Policy CS32**

**Community Safety**

The design of all development and transport proposals must take account of the need to reduce the opportunities for crime and promote safe living environments, in accordance with policies in the LDF, the Community Strategy and national guidance.

---

28 Secured by Design is the UK Police initiative supporting the principles of designing out crime. See web-site: www.securedbydesign.com
Rejected Options – Community Safety

1. Include more specific reference to the principles of and requirements for community safety.

   Reason – These issues are addressed in other documents referred to in the text. A more detailed policy (BED3) is included in the Development Control Policies DPD.

2. Leave community safety issues to be addressed by the Community Strategy and other strategies.

   Reason – This would represent a missed opportunity for the LDF to contribute to achieving key community objectives.
12 Green Belt and Safeguarded Land

12.1 Green Belt

12.1.1 The Wakefield District Green Belt serves a number of purposes which are consistent with national planning policy guidance. In particular, it helps to maintain the character and identity of individual settlements and to make a clear distinction between town and country, in support of spatial objective 9. The spatial development strategy aims to create sustainable communities by concentrating new development in urban areas and local service centres. The Green Belt’s role is to help reinforce this strategy by strictly controlling development in the open countryside.

12.1.2 The Green Belt will keep land open and free from development over a long period, extending beyond the proposed period for the initial LDF, in order to give assurance that boundaries will endure. The Green Belt boundary was established in the Local Plans of 1987. A number of changes were made in the 1994 UDP, mainly to meet an unexpected demand for employment land, and some further minor alterations were made through the UDP First Alteration to meet regeneration objectives and where there were difficulties in interpreting the boundary.

12.1.3 It is considered that all land currently included in the Green Belt serves the purposes of Green Belt and there is no need for a general review of the boundary. In line with guidance in PPG2, only in exceptional circumstances will land be taken out of the Green Belt in the LDF. Exceptional circumstances could exist where there is an over-riding need to accommodate development of the following types which cannot be met elsewhere and where Green Belt land offers the most sustainable option:

a. regeneration schemes which bring community benefits;
b. long term housing sites;
c. strategic employment sites.

In these circumstances a localised review of the Green Belt could be carried out in line with current RSS policy P2 (b).

12.1.4 Most responses to the Issues & Options consultation agree that there is no need for a general review of the Green Belt boundary and that in line with Government policy changes should only be made in exceptional circumstances to meet an identified need. However, some want to see a thorough review whilst others want no changes to the boundary under any circumstances.

12.1.5 Wherever possible, Green Belt boundaries should be drawn along clear physical features on the ground such as roads, tracks, footpaths, streams and hedgerows. Because of the large scale of the UDP Proposals Maps it has not been possible always for the Green Belt to follow exactly actual features on the ground, resulting in difficulties in interpreting the boundary in some instances. Advances in mapping techniques will enable the Green Belt boundary to be interpreted more accurately for the LDF, but this will require some minor alterations in places to enable the boundary to follow a more suitable, recognised feature than at present. Consultation on the detailed Green Belt boundary will take place as part of the preferred options for the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD, and the final boundary will be shown on the LDF Proposals Maps. To help minimise difficulties of interpretation, the precise line of the Green Belt boundary follows the urban side of the boundary line as shown on the Proposals Maps.

12.1.6 The main purpose of the Green Belt is to keep land open by placing a permanent restriction on inappropriate development. Most types of development can only be permitted in very special circumstances. Policies in the Development Control Policies DPD set out the types of use which can be considered in the Green Belt and the criteria which must be met.

12.1.7 The preferred option is to include the following policy in the Core Strategy:

**Policy CS 33**

**Green Belt**

1. The boundaries of the Green Belt, defined on the LDF Proposals Maps, should remain unchanged for the period to 2021. Only in exceptional circumstances where there is an over-riding need to accommodate development which can not be met elsewhere and where Green Belt land offers the most sustainable option will land be taken out of the Green Belt through a local review in line with current RSS policy P2(b), when a relevant DPD is prepared or reviewed.

2. Most types of development in the Green Belt are inappropriate and will only be permitted in very special circumstances. Development proposals will be considered in the light policies GB1 to GB7 in the Development Control Policies DPD, other relevant LDF policies and national planning policy guidance.

**Rejected Options – Green Belt**

1. Do not allow any changes to be made to the Green Belt boundary before 2021.

   **Reason** – Because of the drive to promote sustainable development and to make best use of previously developed land in urban areas, land will only need to be released from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances. However, some Green Belt land may be needed for particular purposes e.g. to facilitate regeneration or meet a longer term need for housing or employment.

2. Undertake a review of all Green Belt boundaries now.

   **Reason** – One of the key features of the Green Belt is its permanence. There is no policy justification for a wholesale review at present and the emphasis should be on maintaining the boundary wherever possible and proposing changes only in exceptional circumstances.

12.2 Protected Areas of Search for Long Term Development (Safeguarded Land)

12.2.1 The Issues & Options consultation asked whether the UDP designation ‘Protected Area of Search for Long Term Development’ (PAS) should be excluded from the LDF and, if so, what should happen to the land. A majority are in favour of returning PAS land to the Green Belt. However, others consider that PAS fulfils an important function in safeguarding the permanence of the Green Belt and point out that the courts have ruled that, as when taking land out of the Green Belt, there have to be exceptional circumstances why land should be added to it.
12.2.2 The preferred option in the LDF is to assess all PAS sites from the UDP alongside other potential development sites against a set of criteria to determine which, if any, should be proposed for development in the period up to 2021. Most of the remaining PAS sites which are not required for development will be retained in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD and shown on the Proposals Maps for long term development. A policy equivalent to UDP policy OL4 (policy SL1) is included in the Development Control Policies DPD to control development on PAS sites. Only in exceptional circumstances will a proposal be made to add PAS land to the Green Belt where the land is clearly not suitable for long term development and is considered suitable for inclusion in the Green Belt.

Rejected Options – Protected Areas of Search for Long Term Development (PAS)

1. Delete PAS designation from the proposals maps and add sites that border the Green Belt to the Green Belt.

Reason – As when taking land out of the Green Belt, there have to be exceptional circumstances why land should be added to it.

2. Delete PAS designation from the proposals maps and leave land unallocated.

Reason – Leaving PAS land unallocated may make it more vulnerable to development pressures and undermine the original intention of releasing it for development only in the long term.
13 Environment

13.1 Introduction

13.1.1 Ensuring that the environmental quality of Wakefield District is maintained and where possible enhanced is a major concern for the LDF, reflecting one of the five challenges in the Community Strategy, Fast Forward - 'improving our places', that is, creating and maintaining quality environments that are clean, safe, healthy, accessible and pleasant. These aims are reflected in spatial objectives 9, which seeks to protect and enhance the historic character of settlements, 10, which ensures that the District's natural environment is conserved and protected, and 11, which promotes a clean, attractive and safe environment.

13.1.2 In the past, assessing proposed development often involved a trade-off between economic or social benefits and loss of environmental assets. Now sustainable development demands that environmental enhancements are secured alongside economic and social benefits. The importance of making the most of the District’s environmental assets and securing necessary improvements as a key element of urban renaissance is stressed in the document, Wakefield: a Strategic Framework for the District. Policies in the LDF can help to achieve the desired improvements.

13.1.3 There was general support in the Issues & Options consultation for the proposed approach to policies to conserve, protect and enhance the natural and built environment. The Issues & Options Report proposed a series of detailed changes and additions to the raft of environment policies in the UDP First Alteration. The responses to these proposals have been taken into account in the Preferred Options Report for the Development Control Policies DPD. However, the Core Strategy also needs to include strategic policies relating to the environment which provide the context for the more detailed policies used to guide development and decisions on planning applications.

13.1.4 Strategic environmental issues can be considered under three headings:

- Protection and Enhancement of the Historic and Natural Environment, Landscape Character and Bio-Diversity
- Environmental Impact
- Efficient Use of Natural Resources

13.2 Protection and Enhancement of the Historic and Natural Environment, Landscape Character and Bio-Diversity

13.2.1 Wakefield has numerous and extensive historic and natural assets. They make a significant contribution to the identity of the District and to the quality of life of its residents and act as a major attraction for visitors. The range of assets includes both statutory designations and sites and areas of local importance:

- sites of international and national importance for bio-diversity or geology – Special Areas of Conservation or Sites of Special Scientific Interest;
- statutory and local areas of wildlife and ecological value – Sites of Scientific Interest, Local Nature Reserves, Ancient Woodland, Wakefield Nature Areas, any species protected by law, or species recognised as being of principal importance for the conservation of bio-diversity in England;
- the open countryside and its landscape character;
- woodland, trees and hedgerows;
- lakes, rivers and watercourses;
- sites of recreational and amenity value;
- archaeological sites and areas of archaeological interest – Scheduled Ancient Monuments and sites on the Sites and Monuments Record;
- buildings and areas of historic and architectural interest – Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas;
- historic parks and gardens, historic landscapes and historic battlefields;
- the character and identity of individual settlements;
- footpaths, cycle routes and public rights of way.

13.2.2 The Council is committed to the protection and enhancement of these assets. Only in exceptional circumstances where a developer can demonstrate that the need for the development clearly outweighs the need to retain a particular feature and where appropriate mitigation and/or compensatory measures can be provided will permission be granted. Development can also provide opportunities for sensitively located and carefully designed new landscapes and habitats. Planning conditions and obligations will be used where appropriate to create new assets and manage existing ones.

13.2.3 Protecting and enhancing these assets and ensuring their proper management involves partnership working between the Council, national agencies like English Heritage, English Nature, the Countryside Agency and the Environment Agency, and many local civic and environmental organisations. The LDF can make a contribution to achieving the objectives of the Wakefield District Local Bio-diversity Report which includes action plans to protect key habitats and species. Developers should consult the Wakefield District Bio-diversity Action Plan to see how their proposal should protect and enhance bio-diversity.

13.2.4 Detailed policies to protect, enhance and manage these assets when development proposals which affect them are considered, are included in the Development Control Policies DPD, whilst individual designations will be contained in the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD and shown on the Proposals Maps.

**Wildlife Habitat Network**

13.2.5 Mixed views were expressed about the proposal in the Issues & Options Report to replace the UDP ‘Green Corridor’ designation with a ‘Wildlife Habitat Network’. Some considered that Green Corridor policies had not been implemented adequately and were concerned that the new approach would be weakened by removing reference to outdoor recreation. However, it is considered that there is value in a designation dealing specifically with nature conservation. Policies on recreation will be dealt with separately in the LDF. The proposed network will connect sites of ecological and geological conservation within the District and provide links into adjoining districts. Within this network nature conservation interests will be protected wherever possible and opportunities will be taken to create new habitats and better manage the landscape so as to improve bio-diversity and landscape quality. The network will be shown on the Site Specific Policies and Proposals DPD.

**Landscape Character**

13.2.6 The 1996 Countryside Agency/English Nature publication, *The Character of England; Landscapes, Wildlife and Natural Features*, provided the initial framework identifying unique landscape character areas across the country, which was further refined in separate regional volumes. The Council has undertaken a Landscape Character Assessment and it is proposed
that this, together with work carried out for the urban renaissance programme, forms the basis for ensuring that the character of the countryside and other open landscapes throughout the District is protected and enhanced.

Trees

13.2.7 Trees, woodland and hedgerows make an essential contribution to the local environment and are vital to maintaining the ecological balance of an area. Wakefield District is deficient in tree cover compared to the rest of England and it is therefore important to ensure that trees are conserved and protected when new development takes place. Particular priority will be given to the protection and planting of trees and woodland in areas where there is a marked absence of trees and/or woodlands. Policies are included in the Development Control Policies DPD to implement these proposals.

13.2.8 It is also important that opportunities are taken to enhance and expand the District’s tree cover. Where there is potential to create urban or rural woodland, for amenity or recreational purposes, the Council will seek to ensure that planting is sympathetic with the existing topography and landscape character. The planting of native species will be preferred. The Council has a number of plans and strategies aiming to provide protection and seek enhancement to trees, including the Wakefield District Bio-diversity Action Plan, the Tree Strategy and the Woodland Strategy. Developers will be expected to take these documents into account when proposing development.

13.2.9 The following strategic policy is proposed as the preferred option for protecting the District’s historic and natural assets:
Policy CS 34

Protection and Enhancement of the Historic and Natural Environment, Landscape Character and Bio-Diversity

1. The Council will work with its partners and relevant agencies to protect, enhance and manage the District’s historic and natural environment, its landscape character and bio-diversity.

2. The Council has identified a Wildlife Habitat Network connecting sites of ecological and geological conservation within the District and linking to adjoining districts, where nature conservation interests will be protected and habitat creation and landscape management will be encouraged to improve bio-diversity and landscape quality.

3. Opportunities will be taken to increase tree cover in the District. Priority will be given to planting trees and woodland in areas where there is a marked absence at present, where this would complement and enhance bio-diversity and landscape character. The planting of native species will be preferred.

4. All development proposals must conserve, enhance and, where appropriate, manage the historic and natural environment, landscape character and bio-diversity in order to maintain and improve environmental quality.

5. Proposals for development which adversely affect protected sites of ecological, geological, historic or archaeological value will not be permitted unless there is an over-riding need for the development in the public interest which clearly outweighs the conservation value of the site. Where development is permitted adequate mitigation and/or compensatory measures must be provided.

6. Planning conditions and obligations will be used, where appropriate, to protect, enhance and manage the District’s historic and natural environment, its landscape character and bio-diversity. Detailed requirements are set out in the Development Control Policies DPD.

Rejected Options – Protection and Enhancement of the Historic and Natural Environment, Landscape Character and Bio-Diversity

1. Retain Green Corridors instead of the proposed Wildlife Habitat Network.

Reason – It is considered that there is value in a designation dealing solely with the protection of habitats and species. The Green Corridors include the promotion of recreation, which can sometimes be in conflict with nature conservation aims.

2. Protect only nationally and internationally recognised sites and areas and allow a more flexible approach to development on other sites.

Reason – Many sites of local significance and character are key to local amenity, contribute to quality of life and are worthy of protection and enhancement.

13.3 Environmental Impact

13.3.1 Policy CS2 sets out the broad range of issues which need to be considered to ensure that development is sustainable, including assessing the potential impact of a development on existing neighbours, future occupants, the locality and the wider environment. This section considers the need for more detailed policies particularly relating to climate change, flood
risk, air quality and contamination. Two of the challenges in the Community Strategy, *Fast Forward*, are, *Feeling and being safer*, and *Improving our places* – creating and maintaining quality environments that are clean, safe, healthy, accessible and pleasant. These are reflected in spatial objective 11 which seeks to promote and maintain a clean, attractive and safe environment for residents.

13.3.2 There is extensive national planning policy guidance on environmental impact as well as policies in RSS. Detailed policies are contained in the Development Control Policies DPD to address specific issues in relation to individual planning applications.

**Climate Change**

13.3.3 The impact of the natural environment on people’s lives is likely to increase in future because of climate change. Wetter winters are likely to increase the risk from flooding in some places while hotter and drier summers are predicted to have serious consequences for water resources and the natural environment, particularly wetland habitats. Current RSS policy S5 requires local authorities, agencies and others to take account of the predicted impacts of climate change on land use in their area and plan for the successful adaptation to the resulting effects. All new development should take account of climate change and show how potential adverse effects can be mitigated to ensure that buildings and associated infrastructure are capable of withstanding the impact e.g. minimising the risk of flooding and subsidence.

**Flood Risk**

13.3.4 Climate change is already having a significant impact on the increased risk of flooding in some places. The Environment Agency publishes Flood Zone maps, which are updated regularly, showing areas at high (1 in 100 year), medium (1 in 1,000 year) and low (< 1 in 1,000 year) risk of flooding. National planning policy guidance requires a sequential approach to be adopted to identifying sites for development in plans and when determining planning applications to take account of flood risk. There is a presumption against development in areas at highest risk of flooding. The Council, together with Calderdale and Kirklees Councils, the Environment Agency and the YHA, has completed a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) of the three districts which identifies in more detail the degree of flood risk in different locations. Together these sources will assist with identifying sites for development in the LDF. Developers will be expected to fund the cost of measures needed to reduce or alleviate the risk of flooding in their development proposals.

13.3.5 Development can exacerbate the problems of flooding in downstream areas by impeding the flow or storage of flood water or by causing increased run-off. Development will not be permitted if it would cause or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere unless appropriate alleviation measures are in place. Where such measures are necessary for development to proceed, they would normally be fully funded by the developer and secured by planning condition or obligation.

13.3.6 In order to achieve a sustainable method of discharge of surface water and reduce the risk of flooding and pollution, sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) should be employed where practicable. SUDS may take the form of soakaways, swales, lagoons, permeable paving, green roofs, reed beds and retention ponds, depending on the nature of the development and the area. Some also offer opportunities for environmental and landscape enhancement improving bio-diversity and local amenity. Even where sustainable urban drainage techniques alone cannot provide total surface water drainage solutions, they can be beneficially used in conjunction with conventional piped systems.

13.3.7 The Council will support the Environment Agency in promoting SUDS. Developers will normally be expected to fund SUDS and their future management, which will be secured by planning condition or obligation.

Air Quality

13.3.8 There is also increasing concern about air quality, particularly in the M1 corridor and in town centres. A number of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) have been designated where pollution levels may exceed guidelines set by the Government. Town centres and urban areas are the places where the LDF spatial development strategy is aiming to concentrate most new development, so that without action air quality in these areas might deteriorate. The Council’s Environmental Health Service is preparing an Action Plan to address pollution levels in AQMAs, but it is important that new development incorporates energy efficient building techniques and promotes the use of public transport, walking and cycling as alternatives to the car, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and reduce pollution levels.

Contaminated Land

13.3.9 In line with Government policy, the Council actively encourages the re-use of previously developed land and buildings to ensure the efficient use of scarce land resources. This includes the re-use of sites which have been contaminated by previous activity, but it is important to ensure that any contamination is dealt with as part of the re-development process, to ensure there are no adverse effects on future occupants or the environment. The Council has a duty to regulate the re-development process but there is also a duty for developers to ensure the safe development of their site. When dealing with applications which affect sites where contamination is suspected the Council will follow Government guidance (31). The Council has also issued a guide for developers (32).

13.3.10 The preferred approach is to include the following policy in the LDF Core Strategy:

---

31 Planning Policy Statement 23: Planning and Pollution Control (PPS23), Annex 2, ODPM, 2004
32 A Local Authority Guide to Submitting Planning Applications for Development on Contaminated Land, WMDC.
Policy CS 35

**Environmental Impact**

The Council will work with its partners, particularly the Environment Agency, to ensure that development proposals do not give rise to an unacceptable level of risk from the operation of natural forces and human activity for existing and future occupants, the wider community and the environment. Proposals must take particular account of the need to:

a. mitigate the potential adverse effects of climate change;

b. avoid or ensure adequate protection from the risk of flooding on-site and elsewhere, making use of sustainable urban drainage systems wherever practicable;

c. avoid or mitigate the effects of pollution from noise, lighting, vibration, odour, emissions, dust and hazardous activities;

d. ensure that land and buildings are free from contamination which might adversely affect human health or the environment;

e. protect amenity, privacy and safety.

Detailed requirements will be set out in the Development Control Policies DPD or an SPD. Planning permission will not be granted unless it is demonstrated that any adverse effects can be overcome by appropriate alleviation and mitigation measures secured by planning condition or obligation.

Rejected Option – Environmental Impact

1. Be less prescriptive, relying on Government guidance and commercial judgement about risk.

Reason – It is important that developments assess and take account of the risks arising from different sources. It is unlikely that market forces would deal with these adequately. There is a need for a policy which brings together some of the main risk sources and ensures that appropriate measures are in place to deal with them, in broad terms.

13.4 Efficient Use of Natural Resources

13.4.1 Making prudent use of natural resources is one of the Government’s four aims for sustainable development and is one of the key themes of current RSS. It is also reflected in spatial objective 11. Making efficient use of natural resources, particularly the burning of fossil fuels, is one of the main means of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and reducing the impact of climate change. The Government has agreed to reduce carbon dioxide and greenhouse gas emissions by 12.5% below 1990 levels over the period 2008 - 2012 and to move towards the domestic goal of a 20% cut in carbon dioxide emissions below 1990 levels by 2010, with a long term target of a 60% cut by 2050. RSS policy S5 requires local authorities, agencies and others to include policies and proposals in their plans and programmes to help reduce the region’s greenhouse gas emissions by at least 20% below 1990 levels by 2010 and by at least 25% below 1990 levels by 2015.
13.4.2 It will therefore be important for the LDF Core Strategy to contain policies which help to secure a more prudent and efficient use of natural resources. Other policies are included in the Development Control Policies DPD to address specific issues in relation to individual development proposals. The topic can be considered under two main headings:

- sustainable construction and resource conservation;
- utilising renewable energy resources and technologies.

13.4.3 A third area, minimising the environmental consequences of waste production and maximising the re-use of waste materials, is covered under the chapter dealing with waste.

**Sustainable Construction and Resource Conservation**

13.4.4 It is important that new developments make use of sustainable construction techniques and make efficient use of resources wherever possible. RSS policy S6 encourages the use of energy efficient measures in the design and layout of new development and promotes sustainable construction techniques. Policy CS2 in this Core Strategy states that to be sustainable, development must be energy-efficient, minimise the use of scarce resources and adopt sustainable construction principles. Policy REN3 on energy conservation is included in the Development Control Policies DPD Preferred Options Report. The Council has adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance which similarly encourages energy efficient development and sustainable construction.

13.4.5 Some of the measures which should be considered by developers include:

- installing water saving measures and devices;
- fitting and/or making future provision for installing heating and power systems that have low or zero carbon dioxide and greenhouse gas emissions;
- constructing buildings that are naturally ventilated and capable of enduring higher day and night time temperatures without the need for air conditioning systems;
- using materials that have low/zero carbon dioxide and greenhouse gas emissions – wood rather than concrete.

13.4.6 New development allows the opportunity to design water conservation measures into buildings to reduce the demand for water and reduce surface water run-off, including the use of water saving devices and systems, use of rain water and ‘greywater’ recycling. However, reduced run-off could have an adverse impact on bio-diversity so the aim should be to reduce water consumption whilst managing recycling of water to ensure no adverse impact on the water environment and bio-diversity.

13.4.7 All new and converted buildings should demonstrate a high degree of energy efficiency through location, layout, aspect, internal design and the use of improved insulation.

**Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation**

13.4.8 The promotion and use of renewable energy resources is now a key element of regional and national planning policy guidance and is an important aspect of sustainable development. The Government’s target is for 10.4% of electricity to be from renewable sources by 2011. RSS policy R6 states that development plans should include measures to help secure the renewable energy generation target of 74 MW for West Yorkshire by 2010. Increasing use of

---

renewable energy will help in achieving targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions, nationally and regionally. Meeting the renewable energy target in RSS can be achieved through permitting the development of renewable energy sources and through ensuring that new development contributes to the introduction of renewable energy.

13.4.9 PPS22 advises that development plans should contain policies that are designed to promote and encourage the development of renewable energy resources and should contain policies setting out the key criteria used to judge applications. PPS22 also states that development plans may include policies that require a percentage of the energy used in new residential, commercial or industrial developments to come from on-site renewable sources. Policies of this type are seen to be the most effective way of ensuring that sub-regional targets are met.

13.4.10 There was widespread support in responses to the Issues & Options consultation for policies about renewable energy, and energy conservation. It was generally agreed that there should be a renewable energy target for the District and that policies should set criteria for the development of renewable energy sources. The suggestion that larger new developments should generate a percentage of their energy requirements from on-site renewable sources also received report from some respondents, though others opposed the idea.

13.4.11 The Government Office have appointed consultants to undertake a Sub-Regional Renewable Energy Assessments & Targets Study (SRREAT) to assist local authorities in setting local targets and forming development criteria to help implement the targets. Initial indications are that the scope for developing new renewable energy sources in Wakefield District is relatively small, and an interim renewable energy generation target of 10.7 MW by 2010 is suggested in the study.

13.4.12 Renewable energy generation schemes will be encouraged where appropriate but the best way of meeting targets in this District is through encouraging the use of on-site renewable energy sources. Given the likely scale of new development, the potential contribution from this source is considerable. It could take various forms including localised wind generators or solar panels and photo-voltaic cells incorporated into buildings. Larger new developments should provide at least 10% of their predicted energy requirement from on-site renewable energy technology. Detailed criteria to be used to judge applications for renewable energy resources and for ensuring that all new development contributes to meeting renewable energy targets are included in policy REN1 and REN2 in the Development Control Policies DPD.

13.4.13 The preferred option is to include the following policy in the LDF Core Strategy:
Policy CS 36

**Efficient Use of Natural Resources**

1. Development proposals should ensure that efficient use is made of natural resources, including water, materials, daylight and energy, through their layout, design and construction, by incorporating conservation measures and by making best use of renewable resources.

2. In order to achieve the interim renewable energy generation target for the District of 10.7 MW by 2010, and to contribute to the regional target, the Council and its partners will:
   
   a. support the development of new sources of renewable energy generation where there is no adverse environmental impact on nearby communities and where there is no significant conflict with other relevant LDF policies;
   
   b. encourage the generation and use of renewable energy in all new developments. All larger developments will be expected to incorporate on-site renewable energy generation capacity.

Detailed requirements are set out in the Development Control Policies DPD.

---

**Rejected Options – Efficient Use of Natural Resources**

1. Do not refer to resource conservation measures – rely on the Building Regulations and national guidance.

   *Reason – The proposed policy helps emphasise the importance of this issue for sustainable development and the requirement for all involved in the development process of the need to address these issues.*

2. Do not include a specific renewable energy generation target.

   *Reason – Without a specific target it will be difficult to measure the success of the policy and how the District is contributing to the sub-regional target in RSS.*

3. Include criteria about the location of new sources of renewable energy generation and details of circumstances where developers will be expected to incorporate on-site renewable energy generation capacity.

   *Reason – More detail might help clarify precise requirements but the Core Strategy is concerned with general principles. Detailed requirements will be set out in the Development Control Policies DPD.*
14 Waste Management

14.1 Waste has traditionally been seen as a by-product of living, to be disposed of by the cheapest possible method, normally direct to landfill without pre treatment. In the drive to achieve sustainable development, this approach is no longer acceptable and it is essential that the greater emphasis is placed on avoiding waste production in the first place, then managing waste produced in the most sustainable way, making use of waste as a resource and only disposing of the residue that has no value.

14.2 The first Regional Waste Strategy (RWS), issued in 2003, set out the significant challenges facing the region in meeting recycling and other national waste management targets. Waste policies in current RSS are based around the RWS and national policy guidance set out in PPG10. The Government has recently issued new policy guidance on waste which sets the context for new RSS. Together PPS10 and new RSS provide the strategic framework for developing policies in the LDF to achieve sustainable waste management.

14.3 The spatial strategy for waste management in the region is being implemented with the help of the Regional Technical Advisory Body (RTAB) which advises on waste planning issues and offers technical advice on the implementation and review of the RSS policies. The Council’s Municipal Waste Management Strategy provides the local framework for managing municipal waste.

14.4 PPS10 states that planning authorities should produce planning strategies that:

- help deliver sustainable development through driving waste management up the waste hierarchy, addressing waste as a resource and seeing disposal as the last option, but one which must be adequately catered for;
- enable sufficient and timely provision of waste management facilities to meet the needs of local communities;
- help implement the national waste strategy and supporting targets, and are consistent with obligations required under European legislation;
- help secure the recovery or disposal of waste without endangering human health and without harming the environment, and enable waste to be disposed of in one of the nearest appropriate installations;
- reflect the concerns and interests of communities, the needs of waste collection authorities, waste disposal authorities and business, and encourage competitiveness;
- recognise and give significant weight to the specific locational needs of some types of waste management facilities when considering planning applications in the Green Belt;
- ensure the layout and design of new development supports sustainable waste management.

14.5 PPS10 also advises that the LDF Core Strategy should include waste policies in line with the RSS and ensure opportunities are provided for waste management facilities to meet the District’s needs for the next ten years. Other Development Plan Documents should identify sites and areas suitable for new or enhanced waste management facilities and should include criteria-based policies against which applications for waste management facilities should be assessed.

14.6 The LDF Issues & Options Report raised significant issues concerning the future management of wastes in the District. Respondents to the consultation on the report indicate support for promotion of the waste hierarchy and access to more re-recycling facilities across the District. There is support for raising awareness on recycling for private householders and commercial sectors; provision of small scale recycling points and ‘bring’ sites; kerbside collection of recyclables; and more composting. New initiatives are needed to incorporate opportunities for recycling into design of new development. There are mixed views about the acceptability of producing energy from waste by mass-burn incineration as a means of waste management but there is little support for continued disposal to landfill.

14.7 The Council’s aim for sustainable waste management is that an adequate range of waste management facilities should be provided to ensure that waste is treated and disposed of in a sustainable and environmentally acceptable way, whilst balancing the economic, social and environmental needs of the District. The drive away from landfill disposal towards more sustainable means of dealing with waste arisings, through promotion of waste management, brings a requirement to improve the number and range of facilities in the District. A range of new facilities will be needed to deal with the tonnages of waste identified in new RSS arising from the following waste streams:

- municipal;
- commercial and industrial;
- construction and demolition;
- hazardous.

14.8 To assist with the management of municipal waste the Council is developing a Private Finance Initiative. Part of this involves identifying suitable sites for new waste management facilities. When identifying sites and locations for all types of new waste management capacity the Council will consider the options identified in PPS10:

- opportunities for on-site management of waste where it arises;
- a broad range of locations including industrial sites, looking for opportunities to co-locate facilities together and with complementary activities (reflecting the concept of resource recovery parks), giving priority to the reuse of previously-developed land before greenfield sites.

14.9 New building design and layout can contribute to effective waste management. All new development should make adequate provision for the storage, re-cycling and collection of waste both during the construction phase and following occupation. Developers should ensure that the production of construction waste is minimised and that use is made of re-cycled materials wherever possible. Developers will be expected to demonstrate how they have met these requirements as part of planning applications.

14.10 The Council intends to prepare a separate Development Plan Document dealing with Waste as soon as practical. This will be consistent with current national and regional policy guidance as well as taking account of local circumstances. It will set out the strategy and spatial context for the provision of waste management facilities for the next ten years and will include development control policies to replace those in the current UDP, as well as any site specific allocations.

14.11 For the Core Strategy, the preferred option is to include the following policy:
Policy CS 37

Waste Management

1. The Council will work with partners including the Environment Agency, regional bodies, other local authorities, the waste industry and community groups to ensure the integration of strategies and proposals for sustainable waste management at the local, sub-regional and regional level.

2. In accordance with national and regional guidance, the Council will promote and implement the waste management hierarchy, favouring first waste reduction, then re-use, recycling and composting, above disposal.

3. The Council will seek to provide sites for waste management facilities to deal with all forms of waste arisings, which best meet environmental, social and economic needs, based on the following general principles:
   - moving the management of all waste streams up the waste hierarchy;
   - promoting opportunities for on-site management of waste where it arises;
   - achieving the objectives and targets of the Regional Waste Management Strategy and the Council’s Municipal Waste Management Strategy;
   - achieving regional, sub-regional and local authority self-sufficiency, at the lowest practicable level for the waste stream concerned;
   - promoting opportunities to co-locate facilities together and with complementary activities (reflecting the concept of resource recovery parks);
   - giving priority to the reuse of previously-developed land before greenfield sites.

4. Support will be given to initiatives and facilities which will encourage and promote waste reduction and the reuse of materials and products. When proposing new development, developers should:
   i. ensure that the production of waste is minimised during construction and that use is made of re-cycled materials wherever possible;
   ii. make appropriate provision within developments to enable the storage, re-cycling and collection of wastes during the construction phase and following occupation.

Developers should demonstrate how they have met these requirements as part of making a planning application. Detailed requirements will be set out in the Waste DPD. Planning conditions and obligations will be used, where appropriate, to ensure that requirements are met.

Rejected Options – Waste Management

1. Retain the criteria-based approach as the means of promoting new waste management facilities.

Reason – Sustainable waste management requires an approach which includes the identification of sites to accommodate new facilities to ensure national and regional targets are met. The criteria-based approach would not comply with national and regional planning policy guidance.

14.12 Policy CS37 will replace policies OL11 and OL23 in the UDP First Alteration. Policies OL12 and OL13 will be saved until replaced by the proposed Waste DPD.
15 Minerals

15.1 The Protection of Mineral Reserves Other Than Coal

15.1.1 Primary minerals are important to the local economy providing essential raw materials for industry and employment. Mineral resources are relatively scarce in the District and Wakefield relies on imports from other areas for the majority of aggregate minerals used. It is important that known mineral reserves are not sterilised by other forms of development. Mineral reserves occur mainly in areas designated Green Belt and this will generally achieve the degree of protection required. However, certain uses acceptable under Green Belt policy could prejudice the possibility of mineral extraction (for example, uses involving new buildings).

15.1.2 The minerals policies in the UDP First Alteration reflect current Government guidance and RSS in relation to the provision and protection of mineral resources. At present, the UDP protects permitted reserves and also safeguards known deposits of minerals, other than opencastable coal, from sterilisation for future working. Opencast coal reserves are much more widespread and it is not possible to identify particular reserves.

15.1.3 The preferred approach for the Core Strategy is to continue to protect mineral reserves and to include the following policy:

Policy CS 38

The Protection of Mineral Reserves Other Than Coal

Mineral reserves identified on the Proposal Maps and in the Sites Specific Policies and Proposals DPD, or which are the subject of an existing planning permission, will be protected from development that could result in their sterilisation.

Rejected Option – The Protection of Mineral Reserves Other Than Coal

1. Do not protect known mineral reserves because of the potential impact on the environment caused by extraction.

Reason – This could result in the sterilisation of important assets and would not be in the best interests of sustainable development. Problems associated with extraction can be dealt with when considering a planning application.

15.2 Provision of Minerals Other Than Coal

15.2.1 National minerals policy guidance and new Draft RSS require the District to contribute to the regional supply of minerals, including aggregates. The Core Strategy aims to deliver national and regional objectives and policies for minerals planning.
Primary Aggregates

15.2.2 The Government provides guidance\textsuperscript{36} for the production of aggregates from land-won and other sources. In 2003 the ODPM published revised national and regional guidelines for the provision of aggregates in England for the period of 2001 to 2016. For the Yorkshire and Humber region the production requirements are 73 Metric tonnes (Mt) of sand and gravel and 220 Mt of crushed rock supplies. The apportionment figures for West Yorkshire are 5.51 Mt and 17.8 Mt respectively. These requirements are included in new Draft RSS. Mineral planning authorities must work together to demonstrate how the sub-regional aggregates apportionment for crushed rock and sand & gravel are to be met.

15.2.3 RSS policy direction for sand and gravel production is based on the ability of the producing area to absorb the environmental impacts of extraction. Phase two of the Yorkshire & Humber Sand & Gravel Study will seek to identify potential areas for future extraction and to indicate areas warranting more detailed investigation. New Draft RSS requires mineral planning authorities to take this study into account when identifying reserves.

15.2.4 Permitted reserves of sand and gravel are very low in West Yorkshire. In Wakefield District there is currently one major sand and gravel site with permitted reserves which is anticipated to be sufficient to cover the first part of the plan period. Future potential remains in un-worked areas of the lower Calder Valley in the western and the northern parts of the District. The preferred approach is to identify broad areas of search on the LDF Proposals Maps to safeguard deposits, which may become of economic importance in the future, where phased extraction may be considered, particularly maximising use of water-borne methods of haulage to local wharf and the local rail and/or motorway network. Mineral Consultation Areas will be established to alert prospective applicants of non-minerals development to the existence of non-energy mineral resources.

15.2.5 To the east of the district the Lower Magnesian Limestone provides potential for crushed rock production. The Regional Aggregates Working Party (RAWP) figures indicate there are adequate reserves (25.7Mt) of crushed rock sources both within West Yorkshire and elsewhere within the region for the period 2001 to 2016 to enable the required provision to be met. The preferred approach is therefore not to identify specific sites for extraction, but to safeguard known areas of minerals resources for potential future extraction, subject to environmental acceptability.

Secondary Aggregates

15.2.6 Government policy aims to maximise the opportunities where wastes can be recycled and materials can be recovered for use as secondary aggregates. The region performs poorly in this area at present but Government guidance assumes that 128 Mt of alternative materials may be sourced within the region between 2001 and 2016.

15.2.7 Respondents to the Issues & Options consultation have supported the policy for further use of secondary aggregates provided that that environmental, including residential amenities in the District, are protected.

15.2.8 New Draft RSS encourages mineral planning authorities to maximise the contribution made by substitute/secondary materials wherever possible and to identify suitable sites/facilities for recycling, reprocessing and the transfer of materials. The opportunities for establishing recycling centres where sorting, processing and treatment of materials may occur close to sources and local markets are limited by availability of large sites with good transport links.

\textsuperscript{36} Minerals Planning Guidance 6: Guidelines for Aggregates Provision in England (MPG6).
15.2.9 Policy CS37 above establishes the need for developers to recycle construction and demolition wastes. The preferred option is to adopt criteria based policies, linking with waste management policies, to ensure that any proposed sites for recycling to provide secondary aggregate materials do not conflict with other land uses and can operate in an environmentally acceptable way.

Other Minerals

15.2.10 Other minerals which occur in the District in economic quantities include the fireclays and brick clays and sandstones within the Coal Measures series and the Basal Permian Sands. Current extraction is mainly confined clays for local brick making. Existing permitted reserves and working sites indicate the extent of current mineral interest in non-aggregate minerals. In some cases, e.g. fireclay, economic minerals may be won alongside energy minerals, whilst in other cases the extension to existing workings may be more sustainable and economically acceptable than working new sites. The preferred approach is not to identify areas for future working of other minerals but to treat proposals for the extraction of other minerals on their own merits, against policies in the Development Control Policies DPD.

15.2.11 It is recognised that the extraction of all types of mineral can cause environmental damage and disturbance to neighbouring properties either through the extraction process itself or from traffic generation. It is necessary to ensure that any proposal for extraction is acceptable environmentally and that controls are in place to minimise disturbance whilst extraction is in progress. It is also necessary to ensure that a satisfactory restoration scheme is agreed before work begins.

15.2.12 The preferred option is to include the following policy in the Core Strategy for the provision of aggregates and other minerals. A more detailed policy (MIN1) is included in the Development Control Policies DPD:

Policy CS 39

The Provision of Minerals Other Than Coal

1. In conjunction with other authorities, the Council will seek to maintain a contribution towards the regional and sub-regional supply of aggregate minerals, to meet targets set out in RSS.
2. The contribution to the supply of alternative materials for use as secondary aggregates will be maximised by encouraging opportunities for recycling, processing and transfer of materials to be taken wherever practicable and environmentally acceptable.
3. Broad areas of search for aggregate minerals will be identified where known resources shall be safeguarded and protected for possible future extraction.
4. The environmental impact of mineral working will be minimised particularly through promotion of the use of rail or water transportation above road haulage for movement of minerals, wherever possible.
5. Environmental schemes of management shall be used to ensure minerals sites are worked in a sustainable way, to a programme of phased extraction where practicable, and with high quality schemes of restoration and aftercare.
6. Planning conditions and obligations will be used to ensure that the environmental impact of mineral extraction is minimised and that a satisfactory restoration scheme is in place. Detailed requirements are set out in the Development Control Policies DPD.
Rejected Option – The Provision of Minerals Other Than Coal

1. Include a policy which seeks to severely limit mineral extraction beyond existing commitments.

Reason – The District is required to contribute to the regional supply of minerals where this can be achieved in a way which is environmentally acceptable. It is considered that policy CS39 above and policy MIN1 in the Development Control Policies DPD will provide adequate protection to ensure that proposals are acceptable environmentally.

2. Identify specific sites where recycling and processing of secondary materials can occur. Sites should not be in residential areas.

Reason – It is not appropriate at this stage to identify the extent and location of potential sites. A criteria based approach, linked to waste management policies is favoured.

3. Policies for the restoration of minerals and waste sites should encourage specifically new wildlife habitats in order to fulfil the aims of the Bio-diversity Action Plan, geological conservation, the need for public access and the extended aftercare management of sites.

Reason – The proposed policy will enable the bio-diversity objectives to be fulfilled through restoration and aftercare, where appropriate. Individual site characteristics and after-use will influence the degree to which these are achieved.

15.3 Coal

15.3.1 The Issues & Options Report noted that the Coal Measures Series provides an abundance of resources across the District. However, closure of the last deep mine at Prince of Wales Colliery, Pontefract, means that only parts of the Kellingley Colliery complex encroach within the District. Deep mining and colliery spoil disposal are unlikely to be significant developments in the future. Any future potential for coal extraction lies in the shallow coalfield.

15.3.2 Those responding to the Issues & Options consultation generally suggest that shallow coal as a mineral resource which remains accessible should not become sterilised by new development.

15.3.3 The potential for shallow coal extraction by opencast methods is likely to occur in advance of other development taking place, either during reclamation of a brownfield site and/or remediation of a former colliery working or tip sites or as part of greenfield development. Shallow coal extraction can provide an opportunity to work other economic minerals, such as fireclay and brick clay; and it is important to avoid unnecessary sterilisation of coal and associated mineral reserves by other forms of development where these can be extracted, within a reasonable timescale and in an environmentally acceptable way. Proposals must also comply with Government guidance\(^{37}\).

15.3.4 The preferred option for the Core Strategy is to include a policy which applies national planning policy guidance in MPG3 to Wakefield:

\(^{37}\) Minerals Planning Guidance 3: Coal Mining and Colliery Spoil Disposal (MPG3).
Policy CS 40

Coal Mining

The Council will apply the principles of sustainable development to coal extraction, whether opencast or deep-mine, and to colliery spoil disposal. There will normally be a presumption against development unless the proposal would meet the following tests:

a. the proposal must be environmentally acceptable, or can be made so by planning conditions or obligations; or
b. it must provide local or community benefits which clearly outweigh the likely impacts to justify the grant of planning permission;
c. any proposal within or likely to affect a protected site must meet the additional tests set out in MPG3 and should be the subject of the most rigorous examination;
d. any proposal to extract coal or deposit spoil within the Green Belt must meet the additional test set out in MPG3 and should be tested against the highest environmental standards;
e. planning conditions and obligations will be used to ensure the site is well operated and restored to the highest standards. Detailed requirements are set out in the Development Control Policies DPD.

Rejected Options – Coal Mining

1. Coal resources need to be identified and protected from sterilisation by other forms of development.

Reason – It is not possible to show the full extent and location of winnable shallow coal minerals which occur across the District.

2. Require the prior extraction of coal on development sites to enable land to be stabilised and treated.

Reason – The policy does not preclude the potential for mineral extraction taking place in advance of development on sites where shallow coal exists, or where remediation of previous workings is required, subject to the principle of environmental acceptability.

15.4 Other Energy Minerals

Coal Bed Methane

15.4.1 The occurrence and exploitation of coal bed methane, particularly in former mine workings, is a potential source of natural energy which has been identified by respondents to the Issues & Options Report. There are current agreements and several planning permissions in place for abstraction of coal mine methane for purposes of local electricity generation.
15.4.2 The Government has issued draft guidance which provides advice to mineral planning authorities and the industry on how to ensure that the development of oil and gas resources can take place with full and proper protection of the environment. In line with latest guidance, it is appropriate for the Core Strategy to recognise the potential for developments to use coal bed methane, subject to the merits and environmental acceptability of individual proposals.

15.4.3 Other than where planning permission has already been granted for coal bed methane developments, it is not possible to know the extent of any commercial reserves until exploration and appraisal have taken place. The preferred approach is to apply the criteria in policies CS39 and MIN1 to development proposals for coal bed methane extraction.
Appendix 1 The New Development Plan System

1.1 In September 2004 the Government introduced changes\(^{39}\) to the way in which local planning authorities prepare the development plan for their area. The content and format of plans will also be different. Wakefield’s Unitary Development Plan First Alteration (UDP), which was adopted by the Council on 17\(^{th}\) January 2003, will be replaced by a Local Development Framework (LDF)\(^{40}\).

1.2 Whereas the UDP was a single document, the LDF will be made up of a number of separate Local Development Documents (LDDs) some of which will be part of the statutory development plan (known as Development Plan Documents (DPDs)) whilst others will be non-statutory Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), replacing current Supplementary Planning Guidance. DPDs will progressively replace the adopted UDP. SPDs include site development briefs and guidance on topics such as affordable housing.

1.3 Also, under the new system, the Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire & the Humber to 2016, issued by the First Secretary of State in December 2004, now forms part of Wakefield’s statutory development plan, alongside the UDP. The development plan is the basis upon which all planning decisions are made. New RSS is being prepared by the Yorkshire & Humber Assembly (YHA); a draft will be issued for consultation in January 2006. In future, new RSS, together with Development Plan Documents in the Council’s LDF, will comprise the development plan for the District. The strategy and policies in the LDF must generally conform to those in RSS. Figure 2 ‘Wakefield Local Development Framework and Development Plan’ shows the relationship between the various documents.

1.4 Under the new arrangements there must also be a clear link between the LDF and Wakefield’s Community Strategy, Fast Forward. The LDF will address the spatial elements of Fast Forward, especially those which relate to the use and development of land. It will also need to take full account of the land-use consequences of other policies and programmes of the Council and stakeholders, and will not be restricted to matters which are implemented through the planning system.

The Local Development Scheme

1.5 To keep people informed about progress in preparing the new LDF the Council has prepared a ‘Local Development Scheme’ (LDS) which sets out the programme for producing Local Development Documents over the next three years. The LDS provides summary details of the content of each document which will make up the initial LDF, their relationship to each other and the timetable for their preparation. It includes “consultation milestones” to make clear to the public about opportunities to get involved with the plan-making process and to let them know the likely dates for community engagement.

1.6 The LDS for 2005 has been approved by the First Secretary of State and adopted by the Council and came into effect on 1\(^{st}\) July 2005. The LDS can be viewed on the Council’s web-site at www.wakefield.gov.uk/ldf. It includes proposals to prepare the following documents:

**Development Plan Documents**

- Core Strategy
- Site Specific Policies & Proposals
- Development Control Policies

---

40 See Glossary of Terms in Appendix 9 ‘Glossary of Terms’
1.7 Progress on the LDS programme will be reviewed annually as part of the LDF Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) (see paragraph 1.12) and the scheme will be revised, as necessary, to reflect the need for new or amended Local Development Documents to keep the LDF up to date. A new LDS is due to be issued early in 2006.

1.8 In the period between commencement of the new development plan system and the completion of the first Local Development Documents, the legislation allows local authorities to ‘save’ automatically policies and proposals in existing development plans for a period of three years, until September 2007.

1.9 Current planning policies and proposals for the District are contained in the UDP. The UDP is considered still to be relevant and up-to-date and its policies and proposals will be ‘saved’ initially until April 2008, to allow the first LDDs to be completed. Some UDP policies and proposals will be saved for longer to be replaced in later DPDs not programmed in the current LDS. Until replaced the UDP policies and proposals will form part of the LDF and, along with the RSS, will continue to be the statutory development plan for Wakefield Metropolitan District. The full UDP text and maps can be viewed on the Council’s web-site at www.wakefield.gov.uk/udp. Alternatively, copies can be obtained from the Council.

1.10 Stakeholder and community involvement is a fundamental requirement of the new planning system. The Council has to prepare a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which explains how the community and organisations can take part in preparing the LDF and in decisions on planning applications. It will explain when consultation and engagement will take place, who will be consulted and what will be done to engage different groups and the general public at each stage. The SCI is a Local Development Document and must be subject to public consultation and a public examination.

1.11 The SCI is linked closely to the Council’s Community Engagement Framework. The Council consulted on an Initial Draft SCI and then on a Draft SCI earlier in 2005. Changes were made as a result of comments received and the amended SCI was submitted to the First Secretary of State in July 2005. The submission SCI can be viewed on the Council’s web-site at www.wakefield.gov.uk/ldf. The Secretary of State appointed an independent Inspector to hold a public examination to consider the soundness of the SCI and any representations made. As part of the examination the Inspector held a hearing on 1st December 2005. The Inspector has made binding recommendations about changes he thinks are necessary and the final SCI will be adopted by the Council early in 2006. Future consultation on the LDF will be carried out in accordance with the SCI.
**Monitoring**

1.12 Once Local Development Documents are adopted it will be necessary to monitor whether their policies and proposals are being implemented as intended and how effective they are in meeting the LDF vision and objectives. The Council is required to publish the results of its monitoring in an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The report must be submitted to the Secretary of State by the end of December each year, reflecting the situation at the end of the previous March and will be available publicly. The first AMR was published in December 2005.

1.13 The AMR assesses:

- whether the policy targets set out in Local Development Documents are being met, or are on the way to being met, and, if not, the reasons why;
- what impact LDD policies are having on other targets set at national, regional or local level;
- whether any policies need to be replaced to meet sustainable development objectives;
- what action needs to be taken if policies need to be replaced or altered to reflect changes in national or regional policy.

As a result of monitoring, the Council will consider what changes, if any, need to be made to any LDDs.

1.14 The Government has issued guidance\(^{41}\) on the scope and content of AMRs which includes a number of LDF Core Output Indicators that each authority should monitor. Appendix 2 ‘Core Strategy Policies - Links to Objectives, Initial Sustainability Appraisal and Monitoring’ shows how these national core output indicators will be used to monitor proposed Core Strategy policies.

1.15 The AMR will also assess progress in preparing the LDF over the year compared to the targets set out in the LDS. If the Council is falling behind schedule or has failed to meet a target, the AMR will set out the reasons for this. If the timetable needs to be changed, or if a new document is to be produced, the LDS will be amended and resubmitted to the First Secretary of State for consideration.

---

Figure 2 Wakefield Local Development Framework and Development Plan
### Appendix 2 Core Strategy Policies - Links to Objectives, Initial Sustainability Appraisal and Monitoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Policies</th>
<th>LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Spatial Objectives</th>
<th>Findings of Initial Sustainability Appraisal at Issues &amp; Options Stage</th>
<th>National LDF Core Output Indicators*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS1 – Principles Determining the Location of Development</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Option SD1 – This strategy follows latest guidance of developing within existing urban areas, and should have local economic and social benefits. Needs of rural communities are also addressed by this option. Environmental benefits will come as a result of less development of greenfield sites. This option is sustainable.</td>
<td>2a (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), 2b, 2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS2 – Sustainable Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS3 – Development Criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS4 – High Quality Design</td>
<td>1, 9, 11</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS5 – The Scale of Additional Housing</td>
<td>2, 5</td>
<td>Option H4 – Social objectives generally positive, although this does depend on the provision of services and employment opportunities to match the scale of new build. It is likely adverse environmental impacts would require mitigation.</td>
<td>2a (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), 2b, 2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS6 – The Distribution and Location of Housing</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
<td>Option H5 – This option supports the hierarchy principles laid down in SD1. Therefore this option is considered sustainable. Option H6 – This option is only sustainable if brownfield sites are used, and windfall sites are restricted. Option H7 – If the correct mix of housing is provided this option is sustainable.</td>
<td>2a (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), 2b, 2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS7 – Housing Allocations</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td>2a (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), 2b, 2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS8 – Phasing</td>
<td>2, 5</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS9 – Greenfield Windfall Housing Sites</td>
<td>3, 5, 9</td>
<td>Option H14 – Not as sustainable as preventing all greenfield windfall development but more sustainable than not limiting greenfield windfall infill sites at all.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS10 – Brownfield Windfall Housing Sites</td>
<td>3, 5, 11</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS11 – Housing Mix</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS12 – Affordable Housing</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
<td>Three options (H19-21) considered for the proportion of affordable housing to be provided – 25%, 40% and 50%. The higher the proportion, the more sustainable.</td>
<td>2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS13 – Affordable Housing on Exception Sites</td>
<td>3, 5</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td>2d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS14 – Existing Housing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS15 – Scale of Employment Land</td>
<td>2, 7</td>
<td>Option EC5 – Impacts of this option will be dependent on the types of new business and their scale. Control of these factors would make this option broadly sustainable. In all cases it is likely mitigation would be required for adverse environmental impacts.</td>
<td>1a, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS16 – Location of Employment Development</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
<td>Option EC6 – This option is broadly sustainable in the short to medium term, however becomes less so after time.</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Policies</td>
<td>LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Spatial Objectives</td>
<td>Findings of Initial Sustainability Appraisal at Issues &amp; Options Stage</td>
<td>National LDF Core Output Indicators*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In part addresses a missing option identified in Initial Sustainability Appraisal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS17 – The Rural Economy</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
<td>Option DC12 – This option will help to maintain the vitality and viability of rural communities. This option is broadly sustainable, however it will be likely that environmental mitigation will be required.</td>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS18 – Protection of Existing Employment Sites in Rural Areas</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td>1e, 1f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS19 – Employment Zones</td>
<td>3, 7</td>
<td>Option EC13 – Employment zones should be protected from change to mixed-use if the current or intended use is linked to heavily polluting industries. It is too uncertain to indicate exactly how sustainable this option is.</td>
<td>1e, 1f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS20 – Supporting the Local Economy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS21 – Transport and Development</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>Option T2 – Use of RSS accessibility criteria. This option is sustainable. Option T3 – Requiring developers to contribute to transport improvements will help meet a number of sustainability objectives, by encouraging alternatives to private car use. It could be more specific in outlining the types of measures envisaged. This option is sustainable.</td>
<td>3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS22 – Walking and Cycling</td>
<td>3, 4, 8</td>
<td>Addresses missing options identified in Initial Sustainability Appraisal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS23 – Public Transport</td>
<td>4, 7</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS24 – The Highway Network</td>
<td>2, 4, 7</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS25 – Freight</td>
<td>2, 4, 7</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS26 – Demand Management</td>
<td>4, 6</td>
<td>Option T4: Maximum car-parking standards in SPG7 are sustainable and in accordance with national and regional guidance. The success of this option will depend on how the public respond to car parking restrictions when determining their movements. Option T6: Park and ride sites along public transport corridors need to be implemented with other measures to ensure that road capacity created is not filled by new car users. If town centre parking is restricted, and sites chosen carefully to minimise environmental impacts this option is sustainable.</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS27 – Disused Railways and Waterways</td>
<td>4, 10, 11</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS28 – Retailing and Town Centre Uses</td>
<td>3, 6, 8</td>
<td>In part addresses a missing option identified in Initial Sustainability Appraisal.</td>
<td>4a, 4b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS30 – Community Facilities and Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Option DC10 – This option has multiple sustainability advantages as it protects the environment, but also allows local communities to have necessary development. Option DC11 – This option will help to maintain the vitality and viability of rural communities and is therefore sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Policies</td>
<td>LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Spatial Objectives</td>
<td>Findings of Initial Sustainability Appraisal at Issues &amp; Options Stage</td>
<td>National LDF Core Output Indicators*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS29 – Mixed Use Development</td>
<td>Option EC14 – Success of creating mixed use zones from employment zones will depend on implementation. E.g. putting housing close to inappropriate industry could cause amenity and health issues. However, this option meets a number of sustainability objectives. Option MU2 – With this option there is the potential to build mixed-use developments in other areas. This will allow for a greater degree of synergy between residential and employment uses. This option is sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS31 – Leisure, Recreation &amp; Open Space</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS32 – Community Safety</td>
<td>DC18 – Whilst directly addressing one of the sustainability objectives, this option indirectly provides a number of other benefits to the community. This option would promote the principles of sustainable development and is sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS33 – Green Belt</td>
<td>Option GB1 – This is the do-nothing scenario, as national and regional guidance on Green Belts has not changed since the UDP. Whilst it generally meets a number of environmental objectives, it may locally affect provision of jobs and housing. Overall this option is sustainable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS34 – Protection and Enhancement of the Historic and Natural Environment, Landscape Character and Bio-Diversity</td>
<td>General policy – no direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised. Detail dealt with in DC Policies DPD.</td>
<td>8 (i), (ii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS35 – Environmental Impact</td>
<td>General policy – no direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised. Detail dealt with in DC Policies DPD.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS36 – Efficient Use of Natural Resources</td>
<td>Option DC6 – The option has multiple environmental benefits, although landscape may be at risk from some forms of renewable energy generation. This option is sustainable. Option DC7 – Success of this option in fully meeting the sustainability objectives depends on the percentage of renewable energy stipulated. The ‘spirit’ of this option is sustainable. Option DC29 – This option directly addresses a number of sustainability objectives. Costs of such measures need to be considered in order to ensure that they do not adversely affect economic growth and affordability of housing. This option is sustainable.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS37 – Waste Management</td>
<td>Option DC4 – This option to identify specific sites for waste management will meet multiple sustainability objectives. Site selection is crucial however in order to minimise environmental and traffic impacts. This option is broadly sustainable. No direct equivalent to rest of policy at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised. Detail dealt with in Waste DPD.</td>
<td>6a, 6b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Policies</td>
<td>LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Spatial Objectives</td>
<td>Findings of Initial Sustainability Appraisal at Issues &amp; Options Stage</td>
<td>National LDF Core Output Indicators*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS38 – The Protection of Mineral Reserves Other Than Coal</td>
<td>2, 11</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td>5a, 5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS39 – The Provision of Minerals Other Than Coal</td>
<td>2, 11</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised. Detail dealt with in DC Policies DPD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS40 – Coal Mining</td>
<td>2, 11</td>
<td>No direct equivalent at Issues &amp; Options therefore not appraised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Core Strategy Policies – Links to Objectives, Initial Sustainability Appraisal and Monitoring

**NATIONAL LDF CORE OUTPUT INDICATORS * **

**BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT**

1a Amount of land developed for employment by type.
1b Amount of land developed for employment, by type, which is in development and/or regeneration areas defined in the local development framework.
1c Percentage of 1a, by type, which is on previously developed land.
1d Employment land supply by type.
1e Losses of employment land in
   (i) development/regeneration areas and
   (ii) local authority area.
1f Amount of employment land lost to residential development.

**HOUSING**

2a Housing trajectory showing:
   (i) net additional dwellings over the previous five year period or since the start of the relevant development plan document period, whichever is the longer;
   (ii) net additional dwellings for the current year;
   (iii) projected net additional dwellings up to the end of the relevant development plan document period or over a ten year period from its adoption, whichever is the longer;
   (iv) the annual net additional dwelling requirement; and
   (v) annual average number of net additional dwellings needed to meet overall housing requirements, having regard to previous year's performance.
2b Percentage of new and converted dwellings on previously developed land.2c Percentage of new dwellings completed at:
(i) less than 30 dwellings per hectare;
(ii) between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare; and
(iii) above 50 dwellings per hectare.

2d Affordable housing completions.

TRANSPORT

3a Percentage of completed non-residential development complying with car-parking standards set out in the local development framework.
3b Percentage of new residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of a GP, hospital, primary and secondary school, employment and a major health centre.

LOCAL SERVICES

4a Amount of completed retail, office and leisure development respectively.
4b Percentage of completed retail, office and leisure development respectively in town centres.
4c Percentage of eligible open spaces managed to green flag award standard.

MINERALS

5a Production of primary land won aggregates.
5b Production of secondary/recycled aggregates.

WASTE

6a Capacity of new waste management facilities by type.
6b Amount of municipal waste arising, and managed by management type, and the percentage each management type represents of the waste managed.

FLOOD PROTECTION AND WATER QUALITY

7. Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the Environment Agency on either flood defence grounds or water quality.

BIODIVERSITY

8. Change in areas and populations of bio-diversity importance, including:
   (i) change in priority habitats and species (by type); and
(ii) change in areas designated for their intrinsic environmental value including sites of international, national, regional, sub-regional or local significance.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

9. Renewable energy capacity installed by type.
### Appendix 3 District Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Indicator</th>
<th>Wakefield</th>
<th>Y&amp;H</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 2003</td>
<td>318,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ONS mid year population estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Population Change 1993-2003</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Projections, 2003-2028 - % change</td>
<td>+9.0</td>
<td>+7.4</td>
<td>+11.1</td>
<td>2003 based sub-national population projections, ONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% BME Population</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>Census 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density per hectare</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claimant Count Unemployment, April 2005 - %</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>ONS (NOMIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Unemployment - % of claimants aged under 24</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of population with no qualifications</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Activity Rate, 2003/04 - %</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>Local Area LFS, Mar 2003-Feb 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual pay - Gross (£) - For full-time employee jobs, 2004 – workplace</td>
<td>£23,592</td>
<td>£23,786</td>
<td>£27,597</td>
<td>Annual Survey of Hours &amp; Earnings, ONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deprivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of population with a limiting long term illness</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>Census 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Super Output Areas (SOAs) in the local authority area that rank within the most deprived 10% of SOAs in the country</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indices of Deprivation 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average House Price, 2004</td>
<td>£118,638</td>
<td>£127,749</td>
<td>£181,330</td>
<td>Table 585 Housing market: mean house prices based on Land Registry data, by district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Stock</td>
<td>140,554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council Tax Records 31/03/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Unfit Dwellings</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Owner Occupied</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>Census 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Vacant Dwellings</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size – persons</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of households without car/van</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of residents commuting by car</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of residents travelling over 10km to work</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4 National, Regional and Local Policy Context

National Planning Policy

4.1 One of the Government’s main objectives is to build sustainable communities. At the heart of sustainable development is the simple idea of ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and for future generations. The Government has set four aims for sustainable development in its strategy, *A Better Quality of Life, a Strategy for Sustainable Development in the UK*. These are:

- Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment.
- Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone.
- Effective protection of the environment.
- The prudent use of natural resources.

4.2 These aims have been further developed into an action plan to build successful, thriving and inclusive communities in, *Sustainable Communities: Building for the Future* (known as the ‘Communities Plan’). The intention is to create communities in which people want to live and:

- are economically prosperous;
- have decent homes at a price people can afford;
- safeguard the countryside;
- enjoy a well-designed, accessible and pleasant living and working environment;
- are effectively and fairly governed with a strong sense of community.

4.3 Planning has a significant role to play in helping to create sustainable communities. Recent legislation requires regional and local plans to be prepared with a view to contributing to the achievement of sustainable development and this is the over-riding aim of national planning policy.

4.4 The Government sets out its national planning policy aims in a series of Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) which are being replaced by Planning Policy Statements (PPSs). PPGs and PPSs provide the high level policy guidance for the preparation of LDFs. Details can be found on the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister’s (ODPM) web-site at: www.odpm.gov.uk/planning.

4.5 National policy states that planning should facilitate and promote sustainable and inclusive patterns of urban and rural development by:

- making suitable land available for development in line with economic, social and environmental objectives to improve people’s quality of life;
- contributing to sustainable economic development;
- protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment, the quality and character of the countryside, and existing communities;
- ensuring high quality development through good and inclusive design, and the efficient use of resources; and,
- ensuring that development supports existing communities and contributes to the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities with good access to jobs and key services for all members of the community.

---

42 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
The LDF will be a means of ensuring that new development in Wakefield District is sustainable and will help to build sustainable communities.

It is intended that the LDF should explain and apply, but not repeat, national planning policy. Where the LPF does not directly address a particular issue the local planning authority will rely on any relevant national policy. Relevant national planning policy is taken into account when planning applications are determined.

Regional Spatial Strategy

The Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire & the Humber to 2016 (RSS), issued by the First Secretary of State in December 2004, will provide the initial regional policy context for the preparation of the Council's LDF. Recent legislative changes, mean that the RSS now forms part of Wakefield's statutory development plan, alongside the UDP. New RSS is being prepared by the Yorkshire & Humber Assembly (YHA); a draft will be issued for consultation in January 2006. The strategy and policies in the LDF must generally conform to those in current and new RSS.

Current RSS supports national planning policy guidance on creating sustainable development based around four strategic themes:

- Economic regeneration and growth
- Promoting social inclusion
- Urban and rural renaissance
- Conserving and enhancing natural resources.

It gives priority for regional regeneration initiatives and programmes to South Yorkshire and the Coalfields and includes a spatial strategy which:

- aims to concentrate development in the region’s main urban areas (Wakefield city in this district);
- provides for smaller scale development in coalfield and market towns;
- gives priority to the re-use of previously developed land and buildings;
- states that new housing development in smaller towns and villages should be to meet local needs or support local services and should not increase long-distance commuting.

RSS includes the number of houses to be provided in each local authority area, the regional transport strategy, sub-regional targets for renewable energy production and waste recycling and policies on a range of topics such as climate change and sustainable construction. These will all be updated in the new RSS.

New Draft RSS will propose overall regional policies providing high-level direction and providing the rationale for sub-area policies (see paragraph A4.15), housing requirement figures and the approach to employment land. They will be based around the Regional Settlement Hierarchy comprising:

- Regional Centres
- Sub-Regional Centres
- Principal Service Centres

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
4.12 The policies endorse the generally accepted national approach to managing growth and change to create more sustainable communities:

- concentrating most new development in cities and major towns, transforming them into attractive, safe places where people want to live and work;
- spreading the benefits and opportunities arising from growth to excluded communities;
- enhancing natural and built assets;
- improving accessibility to housing, employment and services;
- diversifying urban and rural economies to help job creation;
- reducing greenhouse gas emissions and adapting to the impact of climate change.

4.13 Key spatial priorities include:

- transforming conditions in the older industrialised parts of the region, including West Yorkshire;
- spreading the benefits of continued growth of the Leeds economy;
- support for the rural economy and local service centres;
- improve key north-south and east-west transport connections.

4.14 Regional and Sub-Regional Centres (including Wakefield) will be the prime focus for housing, employment, shopping, leisure, education, health and cultural activities and facilities, whilst Principal Service Centres (Castlford and Pontefract in this District) will be the focus for local development and services. A smaller category of Local Service Centres is proposed, though these will not be identified individually in RSS. In these centres the priority will be to retain and improve services and facilities by allowing very limited development to meet local needs. In rural areas the priority is to protect and enhance settlement and landscape diversity and character and to create vibrant communities by retaining and improving services, supporting economic diversification and meeting locally generated housing need.

4.15 The Core Strategy settlement hierarchy and spatial development strategy proposed in the main body of the report support and conform to the proposed regional development strategy outlined above. More details about new Draft RSS, can be found on the YHA web-site at www.yhassembly.gov.uk.

The Leeds City Region

4.16 New RSS will place greater emphasis on strategies and policies for different parts of the region. These sub-areas are intended in particular to help in drawing up policies on the distribution of new development – economy, housing, transport – and the role of principle centres. One of the sub-areas identified is the Leeds City Region which comprises the five West Yorkshire Districts plus Barnsley in South Yorkshire, York and parts of the North Yorkshire Districts of Craven, Harrogate and Selby.

4.17 New RSS envisages that the Leeds City Region will continue to be the major engine for economic growth and employment in the region. Its economic success is crucial to implementing the overall regional strategy. The sub-area strategy proposes that the area takes the greatest share of new development in future, including new housing. This is in line with the overall regional strategy of concentrating most new development in the main regional and sub-regional centres. A key aim is to make the existing urban areas more attractive places
for housing. Within the Leeds City Region, it is intended that most development should take
place in the south of the sub-area where regeneration needs are greatest, with an degree of
restraint in the northern part where pressures for new development, particularly housing, are
strongest. The will also be a need to increase accessibility between the different centres in
the sub-area, necessitating significant improvements to public transport services and
infrastructure.

4.18 Though sub-areas will be used to develop strategy, implementation will depend on existing
local structures, such as those involving the West Yorkshire Districts working together. West
Yorkshire offers the greatest potential for further economic growth in the region but growth
needs to be sustainable and the benefits need to be spread more evenly to address inequalities
within and between communities. To realise potential, there needs to be closer collaboration
between sub-regional partners to maximise competitive advantages and produce a more
socially equitable and sustainable spatial balance.

Local Policy Context

4.19 As noted in the main body of the report the main local policy context for the LDF is provided
by the Community Strategy, Fast Forward, which begins with a vision of Wakefield’s aims
and aspirations:

In 25 years time Wakefield District will be a place:

- Moving forward motivated by pride and its heritage.
- Where our people look after themselves and each other so that they are safe and healthy,
  having the skills and confidence to take more control over their lives.
- With places that are attractive to live, learn, work and invest in and where our diverse
towns and villages work together to promote the well being of the whole of the District.
- Where together with the younger people of the District we will ensure that the work we
do now will stand the test of time.

4.20 A number of key challenges are identified which need to be tackled if the vision is to be
realised:

- Feeling and being safer – dealing with issues that make people feel unsafe now and
  starting a series of actions to tackle underlying causes.
- Looking after ourselves – not simply dealing with disease and infirmity but aiming to
  meet fundamental needs and contributing to a healthy life and a caring community.
- Developing a dynamic local economy – encouraging investment and business growth
  by developing a new entrepreneurial spirit and raising and developing new skills.
  Supporting the development of cultural industries and service sectors, which are national
  growth sectors. Making it possible for town centres to undergo an urban renaissance
  and reconnecting coalfield communities.
- Investing in our people - promoting a culture of lifelong learning, encouraging continuous
  improvement and achievement, providing accessible and inclusive services for all and
  raising aspirations.
- Improving our places - creating and maintaining quality environments that are clean,
  safe, healthy, accessible and pleasant.

4.21 More details of these are given in Fast Forward. Under each challenge a number of priorities
have been identified. To ensure that progress is made on all the challenges an approach has
been adopted that is based on clear principles:
Engaging with and reflecting the needs of local communities.
Developing cohesive communities.
Leading to sustainable improvements.

4.22 Different parts of the District have distinctive characteristics and different needs and aspirations which should be reflected in the actions proposed. The priorities set out under the challenge of ‘developing a dynamic local economy’ recognise the need to develop co-ordinated approaches at a sub-district level based around regeneration:

- **The Urban Renaissance of Wakefield City**

  Look to transform the city centre as part of the urban renaissance project turning the city into a more attractive and accessible centre. Culturally focused projects at the Wakefield Waterfront, Marsh Way and Westgate and the creation of public spaces in the centre will be components of the redevelopment.

- **The Five Towns Initiative**

  We will develop a strong urban renaissance vision linked to new developments at Castleford and use the motorway as a catalyst for development and investment to promote growth in cultural, environmental and manufacturing industries in the Five Towns.

- **Reconnecting the Coalfield Communities in the South East**

  The major efforts already being undertaken will be continued to deal with the difficult problems in the South East. This will include neighbourhood renewal and reversing a process of abandonment of some housing areas, improving accessibility and tackling low skills and educational attainment together in an integrated regeneration programme.

4.23 The LDF vision, objectives, strategy and policies need to be closely linked to the vision, challenges and priorities identified in Fast Forward. Appendix 5 ‘Core Strategy Objectives - Links to Higher Level Strategies’ shows how the preferred objectives for the Core Strategy link to the five challenges in Fast Forward, the four themes in current RSS and the Government’s four aims for sustainable development. This demonstrates that the LDF Core Strategy is clearly rooted in and conforms with higher level strategies and objectives.

**Other Strategies**

4.24 The LDF will also need to take account of the spatial implications of other plans, strategies and programmes at regional, sub-regional and local level. In turn, the LDF should influence future reviews of these documents. They include:

**Regional –**

- *Advancing Together* – the overarching regional strategy document
- Regional Sustainable Development Strategy (RSDF)
- Regional Economic Strategy (RES)
- Regional Housing Strategy (RHS)
Sub-regional –

- West Yorkshire Investment Plan
- West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2

Local –

- Wakefield District Housing Strategy 2004-2008
- Regenerating the Wakefield District Strategy Report 2003-2006
- Wakefield District Greenspace Strategy 2004-2009
- Wakefield District Tree and Woodland Strategy 2004-2009
- Wakefield District Sport and Recreation Strategy 2002-2005
- The Freedom to Be, Wakefield District Cultural Strategy 2003-2015
- Wakefield District Community Safety Strategy 2005-2008
- Wakefield District Local Bio-diversity Report
- Strategy for the Management of Municipal Waste in Wakefield
- Castleford Town Centre Strategy 2002-2012
- Wakefield Cycling Strategy 2002
- Wakefield Council Corporate Plan
- Urban renaissance and regeneration initiatives, strategy for city/town centres – Town Centre Partnerships
- The Green Corridor Strategic Framework and Spatial Plan 2005
- Wakefield and District Housing strategy and programmes
- Waste Public Finance Initiative (PFI)
- Street Lighting PFI
- Neighbourhood Action and Enforcement
- Parish Plans
## Appendix 5 Core Strategy Objectives - Links to Higher Level Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government's Sustainable Development Aims</th>
<th>Regional Spatial Strategy Themes</th>
<th>Fast Forward Vision</th>
<th>LDF Core Strategy Objectives</th>
<th>LDF Core Strategy Overarching Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of high and stable levels of economic growth and employment</td>
<td>Economic regeneration and growth</td>
<td>We are part of a dynamic local economy</td>
<td>3. To meet the needs of the District by building on its strengths and the opportunities provided through good links with the wider Leeds City Region, enabling it to play a prominent role in the creation of sustainable communities, in line with the strategy and policy framework provided by the Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire &amp; the Humber.</td>
<td>1. To ensure that all new development, activities and uses of land adhere to and promote the principles of sustainable development and enhance the quality of life for District residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban and rural renaissance</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. To make it easier to travel around the District and the wider Leeds City Region and to access local services and amenities using sustainable transport modes (walking, cycling, public transport), by increasing transport choice and improving public transport accessibility.</td>
<td>2. To locate development where it will provide the opportunity for people to satisfy their day-to-day needs for employment, shopping, education, leisure, health and other services locally or in places which minimise the need to travel and are accessible safely and conveniently by non-car modes of travel – walking, cycling, public transport. This will be achieved by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. To provide sufficient good quality housing of the appropriate sizes, types, tenures and affordability to meet the identified needs of the District, in line with the housing requirement of RSS, by promoting efficient use and improvement of the existing housing stock and providing new housing in sustainable locations.</td>
<td>a) concentrating most new development within urban areas, with major developments located in the largest settlements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social progress which recognises the needs of everyone</td>
<td>Promoting social inclusion</td>
<td>We are safe and feel safer</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) focusing development activity in Wakefield city and other town centres, taking advantage of existing services and high levels of accessibility;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) allowing small scale development in local service centres, villages and rural areas which meets identified local needs or maintains the viability of local services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We are healthy and look after ourselves</td>
<td></td>
<td>As above,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We are skilful and confident by investing in our people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Government's Sustainable Development Aims

#### Regional Spatial Strategy Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDF Core Strategy Objectives</th>
<th>LDF Core Strategy Overarching Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. To provide a range of high quality, accessible cultural, recreational and leisure opportunities across the District to improve the quality of life for residents and visitors.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To protect and enhance the historic heritage, character and identity of the individual settlements of the District by:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) ensuring that the scale and location of development in each settlement is in keeping with its size, form and character;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) ensuring that the buildings and open spaces which create character are protected, maintained and enhanced;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) ensuring high quality, sustainable, design in all new development;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) retaining the Green Belt to make a clear distinction between town and country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. To ensure that the District's natural environment, including wildlife habitats and landscape character, is conserved and protected and that new development identifies, protects and enhances important assets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. To promote and maintain a clean, attractive and safe environment by reducing waste, avoiding pollution, ensuring efficient use of resources and promoting high quality design in all new development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fast Forward Vision

- We live in attractive environments by improving our places

#### Table 5 Core Strategy Objectives – Links to Higher Level Strategies
Appendix 6 Defining / Classifying Settlements

Sources of Guidance

Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing (PPG3)

6.1 PPG3 states that the focus for additional housing should be existing towns and cities and that when identifying sites to be allocated for housing highest priority should be given to previously developed land and buildings in ‘urban’ areas. ‘Villages’ will only be suitable locations to accommodate significant additional housing where it can be demonstrated that the housing will support local services which would become unviable without some modest growth or additional houses are needed to meet local needs, such as affordable housing.

Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (PPS7)

6.2 PPS7 states that away from larger urban areas, most new development should be focused in or near to ‘local service centres’ where employment, housing (including affordable housing), services and other facilities can be provided close together. These centres should be identified in the LDF as the preferred location for such development. The LDF should also set out policies for allowing some limited development in, or next to, rural settlements that are not designated as local service centres, in order to meet local business and community needs and to maintain the vitality of these communities.

Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)

6.3 RSS issued in December 2004 includes a settlement hierarchy of ‘main urban areas’, ‘coalfield/market towns’ and ‘smaller towns and villages’. The spatial strategy and policies are based around the sequential approach and aim to concentrate development in the region’s main urban areas, provide for smaller scale development in coalfield and market towns and state that new housing development in smaller towns and villages should be to meet local needs or support local services and should not increase long-distance commuting.

6.4 Work has been undertaken by North Yorkshire County Council to define a more detailed, wide-ranging, functional classification to help with the development of appropriate policies in the new RSS that reflect the distinct characteristics of different settlements in the region. The adopted approach looked at four aspects of each settlement. Each was considered against a range of criteria, based on data collected, and was classified in terms of its location, service role, function (which could cover more than one category) and prosperity. The results provide an initial understanding of the characteristics of settlements across the region and identify linkages.

6.5 It is not yet certain how the full classification will be used in new RSS but the service role aspect provides a useful classification of: ‘regional centre’, ‘sub-regional centre’, ‘principal service centre’, ‘local service centre’ and ‘basic service centre’.

Wakefield Metropolitan District Local Development Framework, January 2006
### Figure 3 Settlement Appraisal

#### Wakefield Metropolitan District Local Development Framework, January 2006

This table represents the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report. The table contains various data points related to different settlement appraisal criteria. Each criterion is listed in the leftmost column, and the corresponding criteria rating is displayed in the subsequent columns. The ratings are indicated by symbols, possibly representing different levels or categories of assessment.

**Table Data:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table is designed to provide a comprehensive overview of the settlement appraisal, allowing for an easy comparison of different criteria across various settlements or areas within the framework.
Appendix 7 Housing

Housing Completions

7.1 Table 6 ‘Dwellings Completed July 1996 – March 2005 by Settlement’ shows the number and annual rate of dwellings completed in each of the urban areas and local service centres proposed in the spatial development strategy during the period of the UDP First Alteration – July 1996 to March 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Windfall Sites</th>
<th>UDP Housing Allocations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>Brownfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>270   31</td>
<td>893   102</td>
<td>1,056 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleford (inc. Glasshoughton)</td>
<td>149   17</td>
<td>666   76</td>
<td>559   64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontefract</td>
<td>31    3</td>
<td>186   21</td>
<td>907   104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Featherstone</td>
<td>10    1</td>
<td>56    6</td>
<td>86    10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemsworth</td>
<td>24    3</td>
<td>173   20</td>
<td>44    5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horbury</td>
<td>27    3</td>
<td>256   30</td>
<td>48    5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knottingley</td>
<td>16    2</td>
<td>54    6</td>
<td>39    4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanton</td>
<td>167   19</td>
<td>116   13</td>
<td>830   95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossett</td>
<td>224   26</td>
<td>275   31</td>
<td>150   17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Elmsall/South Kirkby</td>
<td>117   13</td>
<td>150   17</td>
<td>381   44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley/Outwood</td>
<td>117   13</td>
<td>134   16</td>
<td>20    2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ackworth (Moor Top)</td>
<td>48    6</td>
<td>106   12</td>
<td>71    8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofton</td>
<td>24    3</td>
<td>5     1</td>
<td>109   12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzwilliam/Kinsley</td>
<td>7     1</td>
<td>36    4</td>
<td>96    11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryhill/Havercroft</td>
<td>86    10</td>
<td>29    3</td>
<td>216   25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton</td>
<td>210   24</td>
<td>62    7</td>
<td>8     1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>226   25</td>
<td>359   41</td>
<td>180   21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,753</strong>   <strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,556</strong>   <strong>406</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,800</strong>   <strong>549</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Dwellings Completed July 1996 – March 2005 by Settlement

7.2 The number of dwellings completed in the District in 2004-05 was 1,042.
**Existing Commitments**

7.3 In March 2005, commitments in the form of existing planning permissions or land allocations in the UDP which have not yet been taken up, amounted to 5,998 dwellings. The UDP housing allocations will need to be re-assessed to make sure that they are still likely to be developed, fit with the spatial development strategy and meet current criteria for sustainable development. Suitable allocations will be carried forward into the LDF.

**Windfall Allowance**

7.4 New draft Government guidance\(^{45}\) suggests that in metropolitan areas where land use changes are frequent it is appropriate to determine a realistic windfall allowance based on past rates of windfall completion on previously developed sites. No allowance should be made for windfall housing on greenfield sites. Table 6 ‘Dwellings Completed July 1996 – March 2005 by Settlement’ above shows that windfall completions on brownfield sites averaged 406 per annum between July 1996 and March 2005. There is no indication that rates of windfall housing are decreasing and with the emphasis on providing additional housing in urban areas it is likely that the rate will remain high in future. It is therefore proposed that a rate of 300 dwellings per annum be adopted in the LDF. The rate of windfall completions will be monitored through the Annual Monitoring Report.

**Demolitions**

7.5 The current rate of demolitions allowed for in the gross housing requirement is 150 per annum. This is based on best available information but it will need to be re-assessed to make sure it reflects known and likely rates of housing clearance in future.

7.6 Table 7 ‘Need for Additional Housing Allocations in the LDF’ below shows what the gross additional need for housing land allocations is for the period 2004-2016 after making an allowance for the above factors. This is based on current information. A more robust analysis will be needed for the submission version of the Core Strategy DPD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total gross dwelling requirement 2004-2016 (1,320x7 + 1,380x5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dwellings completed April 2004 to March 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Existing commitments March 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Allowance for future windfall housing (new build and conversions) 2007-2016 (300 x 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings to be accommodated on new LDF housing allocations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Need for Additional Housing Allocations in the LDF

7.7 A separate Housing Technical Paper will be published giving additional background information on housing.

---

\(^{45}\) Planning for Housing Provision: Consultation Paper, ODPM, July 2005
Appendix 8 Accessibility Planning

8.1 'Accessibility planning' involves an assessment of how easily people can get to places of work, healthcare facilities etc. It provides a framework for developing solutions to accessibility problems, helping people to access jobs and essential services conveniently and sustainably and promoting social inclusion. The Government expects local transport authorities to take the lead at the local level, working in partnership with others, including local planning authorities, to ensure that barriers to mobility and accessibility are identified and improvements made.

8.2 A number of different means of measuring and comparing accessibility are being developed by national, regional and local agencies as part of the accessibility planning process:

- Current RSS includes criteria for public transport accessibility to be achieved for different types of land use in different locations. Local authorities are urged to adopt or adapt these to identify suitable development sites in plans and to identify improvements to the public transport system to increase accessibility.
- The West Yorkshire LTP Partnership is developing an accessibility mapping package. It currently provides strategic information about bus travel time accessibility and will be developed to include rail journey times, walk times and journey cost. This is being used, along with the national package ‘Accession’, to map public transport accessibility in relation to new land uses.
Appendix 9 Glossary of Terms

**AMR**  
Annual Monitoring Report – a report which the Council is required to prepare showing progress in preparing Local Development Documents compared to targets in the Local Development Scheme, and monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of its policies and proposals in Local Development Documents.

**DPD**  

**LDD**  
Local Development Document – comprising two main types, Development Plan Documents and Supplementary Planning Documents, which together form the Local Development Framework.

**LDF**  
Local Development Framework – the portfolio of Local Development Documents which sets out the planning policy framework for the District.

**LDS**  
Local Development Scheme – a three year project plan setting out the Council’s programme for the preparation of Local Development Documents, reviewed annually in the light of the Annual Monitoring Report.

**LTP**  
West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan – the statutory long-term transport strategy for the county and five year action plan which is used by the Department for Transport (DfT) to allocate funds for local transport improvements. Prepared by a partnership of the five West Yorkshire local authorities and Metro. The second LTP (known as LTP2) for the years 2006/07 to 2010/11 will be submitted in March 2006.

**RSS**  
Regional Spatial Strategy – the statutory replacement for Regional Planning Guidance prepared by the Yorkshire & Humber Assembly and issued by the First Secretary of State in December 2004. It forms part of the Council’s statutory development plan. New Draft RSS will be issued for consultation in January 2006.

**SCI**  
Statement of Community Involvement – sets out the Council’s vision and strategy for the standards to be achieved in involving the community and stakeholders in the preparation of all Local Development Documents and in decisions on planning applications.

**SPD**  
Supplementary Planning Document – a Local Development Document which is part of the Local Development Framework but does not form part of the statutory development plan. Supplementary Planning Documents elaborate upon policies and proposals in a Development Plan Document or the saved Unitary Development Plan and include development briefs and guidance documents.

**SPG**  
Supplementary Planning Guidance – guidance which elaborates upon policies and proposals in the Unitary Development Plan. Supplementary Planning Guidance can not be ‘saved’ but can still be relevant if related to a policy or proposal in a saved plan or a Development Plan Document. Supplementary Planning Guidance will need to be replaced by Supplementary Planning Documents.

**UDP**  
Unitary Development Plan First Alteration – the statutory development plan for the District adopted by the Council in January 2003 which will be ‘saved’ initially for three years from the date of commencement of the new planning system. Its policies and proposals will be replaced eventually by new Development Plan Documents.