

A NEW VISION FOR DEVELOPING WAKEFIELD DISTRICT

Site Specific Proposals  
Development Plan Document

**Options Assessment  
Tables Technical Paper**



# Local Development Framework

Site Specific Proposals  
Development Plan Document

**Options Assessment  
Tables Technical Paper**

## INFORMATION

This document is available to view and download on the Council's website at: [www.wakefield.gov.uk/ldf](http://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 Local Development Framework about any aspect of this document please contact the Spatial Policy Group on (01924) 306620 or 306536.

**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 Spatial Policy Group on (01924) 306495.**

دیکھو سنو

اگر آپ کو اس لیفلٹ کی کاپی آڈیو کیسٹ، بڑی  
لکھائی، بریل یا کسی اور زبان میں اس کا ترجمہ  
چاہیے تو ہمیں اس نمبر پر فون کریں:

(01924) 306495



Yorkshire Planning Aid provides a free, independent and professional planning advice service to individuals and groups within the Yorkshire and Humber region who cannot afford professional fees. The organisation may be able to assist groups and individuals who would like support and advice in order to get involved in this consultation process.

Contact the Regional Co-ordinator on 0113 2378486.

Email [ykco@planningaid.rtpi.org.uk](mailto:ykco@planningaid.rtpi.org.uk) for further information.

## Information

The options assessment tables summarise the key information used to assess each option. The options are set out in the same order as they appear in the Preferred Options Report

# CONTENTS

<b>Preferred Options Report Section Reference</b>	<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>4 HOUSING PROPOSALS</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>EMPLOYMENT PROPOSALS</b>	
	<b>5A Employment Zones</b>	<b>52</b>
	<b>5B Employment Sites</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>6 COMMUNITY FACILITIES</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>7 TRANSPORT PROPOSALS</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENT AND OPEN LAND PROPOSALS</b>	
	<b>8A Protection of Bio-Diversity</b>	
	<b>8B Green Belt</b>	<b>74</b>
	<b>8C Open Land within Built-Up Areas</b>	<b>81</b>
	<b>8D Protected Area of Search for Long Term Development</b>	<b>82</b>
	<b>8E Land Reclamation</b>	<b>94</b>
	<b>8F Mineral Safeguarding Areas</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>9 SPECIAL POLICY AREAS</b>	<b>97</b>

# Options Assessment: Housing Proposals

## Plan Period 2007 - 2021

### Key

SH	Settlement Hierarchy :-	SRC	Sub-Regional City	LSC	Local service centre		
		PT	Principal Town	V	Village		
		UA	Urban area				
B	Brown Field	R	Supports the Regen Strategy	Ec	Economic sustainability		<sup>1</sup> remaining areas not included in proposed sites
G	Green Field	S	In scale with the settlement	S	Social sustainability		
				En	Environmental sustainability		<sup>2</sup> excluding areas with planning permission
W	Within Urban Area			EnT	Transport and Environment		
E	Urban Extension						
D	Detached from Urban Area						
				FZ	Flood zone status		

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En				
<b>Preferred Options</b>																
<b>Wakefield</b>																

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
SEW5	Walton Lane, Sandal (W91)	Housing Allocation	7.18 has 215 d	SRC	G	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Site was found to be feasible in terms of constraints – current housing allocation. Access, impact on the local highway network and substitute playing field arrangements are major considerations.	1	6	<b>Preferred Option</b>  215	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Mitigation required regarding access and replacement playing fields.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
W2A	Former Wakefield Power Station Site, Doncaster Road	Employment Zone  A- housing, ind and warehousing	23.78 has 220d pp granted after March '07 (particular scheme)	SRC	B	W	√	√	√√	√√	√√	x	Highway issues are not capable of being resolved for the full scheme. Flood zones, HSE consultation zones and landfill gas zones affect the site. AQMA.	2 3a 3b	5	<b>Preferred Option</b> (modified) 220d	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Major constraint – highway network impact and vehicular access is surmountable for a reduced scheme. Planning permission granted for 220d – flood zone issues resolved. Barnsley Canal restoration safeguarding and potential route of Eastern Outer Loop road also affect the site.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
<b>W4</b>	Warburton's, Westgate End	Unallocated	0.74 has 22 d (particular scheme)	SRC	B	W	√	√	-	√√	√√	√	Site access, flood zones. AQMA.	2 3a	6	<b>Preferred Option 22</b>	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>Planning permission refused 14/03/06 (highways) but capable of being resolved. Housing units could be excluded from the flood zone 3a part of the site.</p>
<b>W42</b>	Durkar Lane, Crigglestone (SEW34)	PAS	9.77 has 391d+	LSC	G	W	-	√	?	?	√√	X	Local highway network and local drainage difficulties. AQMA.	1	5	<b>Preferred Option Up to 391d</b>	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>Restricted development would help overcome constraints.</p>

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
<b>W103 A</b>	North of Ruskin Avenue (NWS48)	PAS and unallocated	7.47 has 299d+	SRC	G	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	x	Access difficulties. Smaller no. of units may be more acceptable. Bowling Beck flood problems. Within Wakefield AQMA. Of concern to HA- no of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J41 of M1.	1	6	<b>Preferred Option</b> Up to 299d	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Greenfield site within the urban area. However, proposals for this site need to be considered in a comprehensive manner. In relation to vehicular access developers will need to demonstrate the capacity of the site that can be accommodated. The scale of development in terms of density and / or site area may need to be limited to restrict traffic generation.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )		Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En		FZ			
W107	Land at Dewsbury Road, Wakefield	Special Policy Area, Green Corridor	10.56 has 387d	SRC	G	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	x	Advise Transport Assessment. Adjacent to Wakefield City AQMA. Of concern to HA- no of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J40 of M1.	1	5	Preferred Option 387d	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Masterplan proposals 387 housing units + 29,000 sq ft B1 industrial units on the adjoining site. Transport assessment will address J40, Dewsbury Road access and travel plan issues.
W121	Former Flanshaw Children's Centre	Unallocated	1.9 has 76d+	SRC	B	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	√	Close to Wakefield City AQMA. May be private water pipes on site. Metro: reasonable location.	1	5	Preferred Option 76	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Brownfield site within the urban area.
<b>Castleford</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
N6	Former Lambson's Chemicals Site	Employment Zone	21.56 has 1337 d	PT	B	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	-	Contamination probably surmountable. Flood zones affect part of site. HSE consultation zones implications surmountable. AQMA.	2 3a 3c	6	<b>Preferred Option</b> 1337	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>Brown field regeneration site within the urban area and close to the town centre. Flood zone 2 covers much of site. SFRA zones 3c and possibly 3a can be excluded from the hard development area. HSE zones can be resolved.</p> <p>Will involve reclamation of contaminated land. Flood zone mitigation required. Improvements at access points on A6032. Attention to pedestrian links needed off-site via other funding. Off site mains required.</p> <p>Planning permission granted.</p>

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En				
N42	N42 St Andrews Road, Fryston	Special Policy Area	2.35 has 93d+	PT	G	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	-		6	Preferred Option 93	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>See Castleford Riverside Special Policy Area</p>
N101	N101 Castleford Tigers	Unallocated	3.83 has 153d+	PT	B	W	√	√	-	√√	√√	-		6	Preferred Option 6	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>Development will be conditional upon the removal of the HSE consultation zones. It will require PPS25 sequential and exception tests and will be the subject of a transport assessment incorporating a travel plan.</p> <p>See Castleford Riverside Special Policy Area</p>

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En				
N115	N115 Pemberton Drive	Unallocated	2.18 has 87d+	PT	G	W	√	√	-	√√	√√	-		5	<b>Preferred Option 87</b>	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  See Castleford Riverside Special Policy Area
N143	N143 Saxon Way, Airedale	Special Policy Area	6.05 has 242d+	PT	B	W	√	√	-	√√	√√	-		5	<b>Preferred Option 242</b>	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  See Castleford Riverside Special Policy Area

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En				
N151	N151 Former C6 Solutions	Employment Zone	37.03 has 1000-1200d	PT	B	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	-	Flood zones, HSE consultation zones, highway impact, contamination.	5	<b>Preferred Option</b> C6 Masterplan indicates 1000-1200 in the plan period to 2021.	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>Development will be conditional upon the removal of the HSE consultation zones. It will require PPS25 sequential and exception tests and will be the subject of a transport assessment incorporating a travel plan.</p> <p>See Castleford Riverside Special Policy Area</p>

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En				
N152	N152 Fryston Colliery (part)	Special Policy Area	5.80 has 150d	PT	B	W/E	√	√	√	√√	√√	-/x	Highway impact.	4	<b>Preferred Option</b> 150	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>The proposal will be the subject of a transport assessment.</p> <p>See Castleford Riverside Special Policy Area</p>
<b>Pontefract</b>																

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
N1	Former Prince of Wales Colliery																
	C Land at TA Centre	Green Corridor, Unallocated	0.71 has 28d	PT	B	W	√	√	√	√	√√	√	Strategic highway constraint re N1 generally. Local highway network situation potentially capable of being resolved. Very small part of wider site is affected by flood zones.  N1C – Noise impacts from railway stn & adjacent industrial. Flood problems on southern boundary - Wash Dike. May be private water pipes on site. Metro: good location.	1	C- 6	[913d – Masterplan B (includes N1C & N1D)]  <b>Preferred Option</b> 28d	The proposals are in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Sub-sites C & D would be part of a Special Policy Area for site N1A if preferred options proposals are accepted. See Special Policy Area Assessment Table. Sub-site N1D is subject to the satisfactory relocation of the football pitch.
	D Land at Football Ground	Green Corridor, Unallocated	1.47 has 59d	PT	G	W	√	√	√√	√	√	xx	N1D - layout and safety concerns to look at. May be private water pipes on site. Partly affected by flood zone associated with Wash Dyke tributary. Will cause loss of open green space. Metro: good location.	1, 2, 3a	D- 6	<b>Preferred Option</b> 59d	A transport assessment crucially incorporating a travel plan will be required for the comprehensive proposal. A new highway to provide access to the wider site and improvements at J32 may be required.  Mitigation - Flood zones 2 and 3a will be excluded from the development area

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
N51A	Ackworth Road / Hardwick Road (PNT40) A modified reduced site	PAS Green corridor	7.91 has 316d	PT	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	x	-	1	5	<b>Preferred Option</b> 316d	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Site modified to limit traffic generation impact.
N100	Land at Pontefract General Infirmary	Unallocated	3.16 has 126d+	PT	B	W	√	√	-	√√	√√	√√	Limited development suggested. Local traffic congestion should be made no worse. For example hospital redevelopment could create some capacity. Near Friarwood Beck – history of flooding. Metro: good location.	1	6	<b>Preferred Option</b> 126d	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Brownfield within urban area.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments			
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ		
N109	Land Between Knottingley Road and Ferrybridge Road (PNT42) (A & B)	PAS	15.06 has 602d	PT	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	x	Site needs highways work. N109A current access has visibility and flooding constraint. N109B – access off Stumpcross Lane is unsuitable. Within M62 AQMA. No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J33 and M62. Needs archaeological evaluation. Metro: N-side Good Location, S-side Poor Location.	1 2, 3a	N109- 6	Preferred Option	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.		
	A South of Railway	PAS	4.03 has 161d	PT	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	Xx		1, 2, 3a	N109A- 5			Preferred Option 161d	Greenfield Ext. Very small part affected by flood zones. No housing units are proposed within flood zones 2 and 3a. Access affected. Sand workings may affect western part of site south of the railway. Possible access ownership issues– developable but not currently deliverable..
	B North of Railway	PAS	11.03 has 441d	PT	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	x		N109B- 6	Preferred Option 441d			Highway access into site north of railway is a reasonable prospect within the Plan period but requires further investigation. Possible access ownership issues– developable but not currently deliverable..	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
<b>PNT 66</b>	Grove Road, Pontefract (N104)	Housing Allocation	0.50 has 20d+	PT	B	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	√√		1	6	<b>Preferred Option 20d</b>	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Brownfield within urban area.
<b>Featherstone</b>																	
<b>N92</b>	Gimhill, Featherstone	Unallocated	5.39 has 254d	UA	B	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	√√		1	6	<b>Preferred Option 254</b>	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Housing redevelopment site – BW.
<b>Hemsworth</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
HEM8	Kirkbygate, Hemsworth (SE63)	Housing Allocation	1.16 has 35 d	UA	G	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Site feasible in terms of constraints – current allocation and no change arising from technical consultations received.	1	6	Preferred Option 35	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Access needs to be demonstrated in detail – developable but not currently deliverable.
SE29	West End, Hemsworth	Housing Improvement Area	2.30 has 160 d	UA	B	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	√√	-	1	6	Preferred Option 160	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Brownfield, urban housing redevelopment site.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
SE56	Sports Ground, Kirkby Road, Hemsworth	Unallocated	5.95 has 60d	UA	G	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Many drainage problems in area. Loss of leisure amenities. Metro: good location.	1	6	<b>Preferred Option 60</b>	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Replacement sports provision will be required in the area.
<b>Knottingley</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
KNT 30	Womersley Road Quarry, Knottingley (N106)	Housing Allocation	7.86 has 236 d	UA	B	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	xx	AQMA.	3a 3b	6	<b>Preferred Option</b> 236	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>Brownfield within the urban area. Mitigation – flood zone areas 3a and 3b will be excluded from the hard development site and if required used as ancillary open space. Proposals must take account of wildlife habitats and the impact assessment conclusions must be acceptable.</p> <p>Application recommended for approval for 193 dwellings.</p>
<b>Normanton (inc Altofts)</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
N46	Station Road, Normanton (Normanton South Yard) (pt. NOR26)	PAS	4.75 has 203 d	UA	B	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	√	Site access and connectivity to town centre need to be demonstrated in detail.	1	6	<b>Preferred Option 203</b>	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues. Possible access ownership issues—developable but not currently deliverable..</p> <p>Brownfield, within the urban area and close to the town centre. See N114A for rejection of PAS.</p>
N124	Land at Greenfield Road, Altofts	Unallocated / Green Corridor	1.04 has 31d	UA	G	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	x	Near landfill sites. Metro: good location.	1	6	<b>Preferred Option 42</b>	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>Greenfield. Within the urban area.</p>

**South Elmsall/ South Kirkby**

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
EMS 16	Carr Lane / Faith Street, South Kirkby (SE60)	Housing Allocation	0.63 has 19d	UA	B	W	√	√	-	-	-	x	Site feasible in terms of constraints – current allocation.	2, 3b	2	Preferred Option 19d	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>The flood zone 3b area will be excluded from the area to be developed for housing. Allocation is partly developed.</p>

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
SE20	Land off High Street, South Elmsall	Unallocated, Green Corridor	0.98 has 30 d	UA	B&G	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	√	Access needs to be resolved with adjoining land.	1	6	<b>Preferred Option</b> in SE10 masterplan 30	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues. Possible access ownership issues—developable but not currently deliverable.</p> <p>Part of Westfield Lane Improvement Area regeneration masterplan proposals. Subject to access within the plan period.</p>

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
SE41	Adjoining Station, South Elmsall	Unallocated, Green Corridor	2.59 has 78 d	UA	G	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	√	Access needs to be resolved with adjoining land.	1	6	<b>Preferred Option</b> in SE10 masterplan 78	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues. Possible access ownership issues—developable but not currently deliverable.  Part of regeneration masterplan proposals. Subject to access within the plan period.
SE45	Northfield Lane, South Kirkby	Unallocated	0.96 has 29 d	UA	B	W	√	√	?	√√	√√	√√	Metro: reasonable location.	1	6	<b>Preferred Option</b> 29	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Brownfield. Within the urban area.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
SE72	Land at Northfield Avenue, South Kirkby	Unallocated	1.33 has 40 d	UA	B	W	√	√	-	√√	√√	√√		1	6	<b>Preferred Option</b> 40d	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Brownfield. Within the urban area
<b>Ackworth (Moor Top)</b>																	
SE73 A	Land at Brackenhill	Unallocated	3.59 has 75 d	LSC	B&G	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	x	SE73A- May need off-site improvements to Hessele Beck to ensure no increase of flooding downstream. Metro: poor location.	1	5	<b>Preferred Option</b> 75	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Planning permission granted 21/12/07. The Development Strategy for the LDF period does not require development on this scale or larger in Ackworth.
<b>Crofton</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )		Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En		FZ			
W43B	Bedford Farm, Crofton (WCS33)	PAS	B 2.18 has 65 d (modified) 4.2has - 126d	LSC	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Local drainage difficulties. Impact on local highway network.	1	5	<b>Preferred Option</b> (Modified) 126d	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>Reduced site would meet highway comments and be more in line with the core strategy. The developer has offered 0.5 has small employment units but these would have to be subsidised as would social housing. Possible access issues– developable but not currently deliverable.</p>

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
<b>W48B</b>	Land East of Priory Ridge, Crofton (WCS32).	PAS	2.27 has 68 d	LSC	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Local flooding issue. Landfill gas zone. Highways section would support a reduced proposal.	1	5	<b>Preferred Option 68</b>	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Visual impact in the landscape. Relatively remote from the village centre compared with W43B.
<b>Fitzwilliam/ Kinsley</b>																	
<b>SE32</b>	Farm Lane, Kinsley (HEM3) (inc. extension)	Housing Allocation	2.97 has 89d	LSC	G	W & E	√	√	√	√√	√√	-	Landfill gas zone.	1	6	<b>Preferred Option 89d</b>	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Take account of farm and commercial premises.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
SE42	City Estate, Fitzwilliam	Priority Improvement area	4.43 has 170 d	LSC	B	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	√√	-	1	6	<b>Preferred Option</b> 170	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Housing redevelopment site.
<b>Ryhill/ Havercroft</b>																	
HEM4	North of Madeley Road, Havercroft (SE62)	Housing Allocation	2.36has 71d	LSC	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	-		1	6	<b>Preferred Option</b> 71	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Greenfield urban extension site.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
SE50	Land at Henry Avenue, Havercroft	Unallocated	2.19 has 66 d	LSC	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Highway access, adjacent tip site and SEGI.	1	6	<b>Preferred Option 66</b>	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>Greenfield urban extension site. Compensatory playing field provision will be required in the locality. Potential vehicular and pedestrian access needs to be demonstrated in detail – developable but not currently deliverable.</p>
<b>Upton</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
SE46	Shinwell Estate (EMS72)	Proposed public local amenity open space	3.25 has 98d	LSC	B	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	√√	-	1	6	Preferred Option 98	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Previously allocated for housing. Need to retain some open space. Some houses already constructed within the site.
SE11	Wagon Lane Recreation Ground, Upton	Unallocated	2.35 has 71 d	LSC	G	W	√	√	?	√√	√√	-	Outstanding problems with drainage. May need off-site improvements to the Skell. Metro: good location.	1	6	Preferred Option 71	Subject to alternative provision of community facilities.
<b>Rejected Options</b>																	
<b>Wakefield</b>																	
W41	Victoria Way, Outwood	Unallocated	3.29 has 99 d	UA	G	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	-	Access considered to be insurmountable. AQMA.	1	6	Rejected Option	Insurmountable major constraint – highway network impact or vehicular access Highway access.
W44	Balne Lane	Unallocated, Green Corridor	8.91 has 200 d on 50% of site area.  178d+	SRC	G	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	x	Satisfactory highway access needs to be demonstrated. Partly affected by flood zones. Loss of playing fields. Landfill gas and contamination risk. AQMA.	2 3a	6	Rejected Option	Not deliverable or developable– restrictive covenants. [Council ownership established.]

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )		Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En		FZ			
W45	Thornes Park, Horbury Road	Unallocated, Green Corridor	4.02 has 161d+	SRC	B	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	√	Highway access. Conflict with parkland environment. AQMA.	1	6	Rejected Option	Insurmountable major constraint – highway network impact or vehicular access Oppose on highway grounds.
W83	Land off Jerry Clay Lane, Wrenthorpe	Green Belt Green Corridor	3.58 has 143d	SRC	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	Highway access and local highway network.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield, green belt, access. Affects COW.
W88	Land to the west of Asda, Sandal	Green Belt Green Corridor Leisure Opportunity Area	1.3 has 52d	SRC	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	Access junction difficulties and adjacent junctions. Close to Flood Zone. Metro: reasonable location. Within Wakefield City AQMA. Land use conflicts with supermarket.	1	4	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield, green belt.
W89	Land to the north of Asda, Sandal	Green Belt Green Corridor Leisure Opportunity Area	2.21 has 88d	SRC	G	E	-	√	√√	√√	√√	xx	Land use conflicts with supermarket. In Flood Zone. Metro: reasonable location. AQMA.	2 3b 3c	5	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield, green belt.
W96	Stanley Hall (NWS47)	PAS Green Corridor	5.08 has 203d	SRC	G&B	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	x	AQMA.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E.
W99	Lupset (NWS45) Rear of Milton Crescent, Snapethorpe	PAS Green Corridor	6.48 has 260d	SRC	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	Should have Transport Assessment for highway DC support. Noise from M1. May be issues in providing gas. Metro: reasonable location. AQMA.	1	5	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E.
W103 B	North of Ruskin Avenue (NWS48)	PAS	4.44 has 178d+	SRC	G	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	x	Access difficulties. Smaller no. of units may be more acceptable. Bowling Beck flood problems. Within Wakefield AQMA. Of concern to HA- no of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J41 of M1.	1	6	Rejected Option	Greenfield site within the urban area. However, proposals for this site need to be considered in a comprehensive manner which includes the adjoining unallocated land – W103A.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )		Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En		FZ			
W104	Land to the north of Bradford Road, Wrenthorpe	Green Belt Green Corridor	2.45 has 98d	SRC	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	Cut Beck runs through site-small watercourse which leads to flooding downstream. Metro: reasonable location. AQMA	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Green Belt.
W106	Land at Leeds Road, Newton Hill	Green Belt, Green Corridor	2.76 has 83 d	UA	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	No acceptable access point. Green belt. Within Wakefield City AQMA. Metro: good location.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E.
W113	Diamond Business Park i housing  iii mixed use	Employment Zone	4.04 has 162d+	SRC	B	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	√	Should have TA. Within Wakefield City AQMA. Changing existing industrial to housing land use would stop noise conflicts. On edge of Flood Zone. HA concern: No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J39 of M1. Metro: reasonable location.	1 2	5	Rejected Options  (i and iii)	Brownfield site Within the urban area but it is a business park in an employment zone and therefore the proposal is contrary to policy protecting the zones and their associated employment provision.
				SRC	B	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	√					
W115	Land off Silcoates Lane, Wrenthorpe	Green Corridor  Open land in built up area	2.31 has 92d+	SRC	G	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	x	Needs satisfactory access. Adjacent to Wakefield City & M1 AQMA. Metro: poor location.	1	5	Rejected Option	Other G W sites preferred in view of the 'Open Land in the built up area' status of the area which is akin to green belt.
W118	Land at Red Hall Lane, Newton Hill	Special Policy Area	2.28 has 91d+	SRC	G	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	x	Access difficulties. Should have TA. Adjacent to Wakefield City AQMA. May be private water pipes on site. Metro: good location.	1	6	Rejected Option	Part of Land at Snowhill Special Policy Area. Landscaping should be enhanced on this Wakefield approach.
<b>Castleford</b>																	
N2B	Flass Lane, Cutsyke	Green Belt Green corridor	35.48 has 142d	PT	G	E	-	√	√√	√	x	xx	Completion of GHCL road required. Flood zones affect part of site. HA position unclear. AQMA.	1 2 3a 3b	Inaccessible with given criteria	Rejected Option	No overriding regeneration need for housing. Poor performance in sustainability appraisal and accession model. Green belt, Greenfield, urban extension.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
N31	Land off Ackton Pasture Lane (CAS13 pt.)	Housing Allocation  Green corridor	0.52 has 16 d	PT	G	D	-	√	-	-	-	x	AQMA.	1	1	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G D Greenfield, detached - countryside. Not in developable part of housing allocation – skyline (Ackton Pastures development brief). Poor access.
N97	Land Fronting Holywell Lane, Glasshoughton	GB Green corridor	3.75 has 150d	PT	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	Adjacent to Holywell Wood SSI. Within M62 AQMA. Metro: good location.	1	5	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield extension, green belt.
N102	Ackton Pastures (CAS13 pt.)	Housing Allocation Green corridor	8.16 has 326d	PT	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	Within the M62 AQMA. Near to Carr Beck – known to flood. No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J31 and M62. Metro: good location.  Site feasible in terms of constraints – current allocation.	1 2 3b	4	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield extension. Flood zones affect only part of the site.
N107	Adjoining Well Wood (CAS39)	PAS Green corridor	8.15 has 327d+	PT	G	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	x		1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G W Greenfield. Within the urban area but very distant from the town centre.
N108	East of Watling Road (CAS40)	PAS	2.79 has 112d	PT	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	x		1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield extension.
<b>Pontefract</b>																	
N50	Land North of Moor Lane, Carleton (PNT44)	PAS Green corridor	8.96 has 358d	PT	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	x	Site access not capable of being resolved at viable cost.	1	5	Rejected Option	Highway access is not surmountable at viable cost. Water courses have flooding history and potential water voles issue.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
N51	Ackworth Road / Hardwick Road (PNT40)	PAS Green corridor	16.71 has 668d	PT	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	x	Significant Impact on local highway network	1	5	Rejected Option	Housing on this scale not required. Distribution of housing provision in Pontefract. Preferred PAS and housing area.
N110	Land East of Cobblers Lane (PNT43)	PAS	20.32 has 813d	PT	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Site needs highways work. No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J33 and M62. Flooding in lower catchment. Needs archaeological evaluation.	1	PNT43- 5	Rejected Option	High exposed prominent site. Greenfield Extension.
	N110A (part) Redrow Homes	PAS	15.04 has 602d	PT	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	-		1	N110A- 5	Rejected Option	
N121	Land North of The Chestnuts, Pontefract	Green Belt	0.55 has 22d	PT	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	Poor walking location. High archaeological potential. AQMA	1	6	Rejected Option	Greenfield urban extension site in the green belt. No exceptional circumstances justification for releasing green belt.
N123	Land at Willowdene Lane, Pontefract	Green Belt Green corridor	1.33 has 53d	PT	B	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	Access junction constraints. Contamination likely & adjacent watercourse subject to pollution. AQMA	1	4	Rejected Option	Not proposed for housing only removal from green belt. No exceptional circumstances.
N137	Land off Eastbourne View, Pontefract	Green Belt	11.31 has 452d	PT	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	Highway access & unsustainability complaints. Site within M62 AQMA. Potential noise from A1(M). Green belt land. No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J33 and M62. Known area of archaeological potential.	1	5	Rejected Option	Greenfield urban extension site in the green belt. No exceptional circumstances justification for releasing green belt.
N141	Land at Halfpenny Lane Allotments, Pontefract	Green Belt	2.80 has 112d	PT	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	Green belt. Metro: poor location. Not ideal location by Highways DC.	1	6	Rejected Option	Greenfield urban extension site in the green belt. No exceptional circumstances justification for releasing green belt.

Featherstone

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
N41	Featherstone A	PAS	10.11 has 303 d	UA	G	E	√	x	√	√√	√√	xx	Access not capable of being resolved. Affected by COW.	1	A- 6	Rejected Option	Insurmountable major constraint – highway network impact or vehicular access.
	B	PAS and Green Belt	21.06 has 632 d	UA	G	E	√	x	?	?	√√	xx		1	B- 6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E.  Partly Green Belt Oppose on highway grounds, Greenfield urban extension and partly green belt.
N45	Land South of Purston Jaglin	Green Belt	3.25 has 98 d	UA	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	Site affected by flood zones.	2 3b	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E. Greenfield urban extension site in the green belt. No exceptional circumstances justification for releasing green belt. Flood zones.
N111	North of Pontefract Road (FTH23)	PAS	14.92 has 448d	UA	G	E	-	x	√	?	√√	-	Access not capable of being resolved. Affected by COW.	1	6	Rejected Option	Insurmountable major constraint – highway network impact or vehicular access.  Too low in the sequential approach – G E.  Partly Green Belt Oppose on highway grounds, Greenfield urban extension and partly green belt.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
N134	Land off Southfield Avenue, Featherstone	Green Belt	1.25 has 38d	U A	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	Site partly in Zone 3, may be presence of 'functional floodplain' (Zone 3b). Green belt land. Metro: good location.	1 2 3b	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – GE. Greenfield urban extension site in the green belt. No exceptional circumstances justification for releasing green belt.
N140	Allotments to rear of Featherstone Lane, Featherstone	Green Belt	2.70 has 81 d	UA	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	Access difficulties. Green belt. Metro: reasonable location.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – GE. Greenfield urban extension site in the green belt. No exceptional circumstances justification for releasing green belt.
<b>Hemsworth</b>																	
SE17	Land at Vissett Cottage Hotel, Barnsley Road, Hemsworth	Green Belt	1.0 has 30 d	UA	G	D	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	-	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G D Greenfield site detached from the urban area and in the green belt. No exceptional circumstances justification for releasing green belt.
SE52	Land off Oak Tree Grove / Common Lane, Hemsworth (pt. HEM39)	PAS	2.74 has 82 d	UA	G	E	-	√	-	√	√	-	Hemsworth Beck subject to flooding. Metro: poor location.	1	3	Rejected Option	Insurmountable major constraint – highway network impact or vehicular access. Too low in the sequential approach – G E. Affected by COW.
SE66	Land at Common End (HEM39 pt. remainder)	PAS	5.60 has 168d	UA	G	E	-	√	-	√	?	-		1	1	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E.
<b>Horbury</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
W8	Engine Lane, Horbury Bridge	Employment Zone	7.70 has 231 d	UA	B	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	-	Affected by flood zones. Poor access. Landfill gas zone.	2 3a 3b	6	Rejected Option	Flooding and poor access. Flood zone 3a. Regeneration case centres on the associated proposal to reopen the station for the benefit of the town and the beneficial use of the site but feasibility is not proven.
W10	Phoenix Works, Storrs Hill Road, Horbury	Unallocated	0.75 has 26 d	UA	B	W	√	√	-	√√	√√	x	Affected by flood zones.	3a	5	Rejected Option	Flooding. Flood zone 3a. Insufficient regeneration case to warrant an exception to policy. Likely to fail the draft exception test.
W54	Benton Hill, Horbury	Green Belt	2.14 has 64 d	UA	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	-	-	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield, green belt.
W59i	Bombardier, Horbury Junction housing  mixed use	Employment Zone	5.91 has up to 177d	UA  UA	B  B	W  W	√  √	√  √	-  √	√√  √	√√  √√	X  x	Partly affected by flood zones. Development may have to be restricted to limit traffic generation.	2 3a	6  6	Rejected Options	Employment only. Flooding and poor access. Flood zone 3a. High flood risk zone precludes housing development. Insufficient regeneration / sustainability case - likely to fail the exception test. See EZ OH1 – Employment Zone Preferred Option which encompasses this site.
W105	Land at Netherton Lane, Horbury Bridge	Unallocated / Green Corridor	0.64 has 19 d	UA	G	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	x	Site close to Flood Zone for River Calder, suggest examination before zoned for housing. Site within 50m of historic landfill site producing landfill gas.	1	5	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – GW.
<b>Knottingley (inc Ferrybridge)</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )		Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En		FZ			
<b>N5C</b>	NE of former A1-M62 interchange	Green Belt	53.74 has  Employment site capacity 11.25 has.  Housing site 42.49 has. Capacity 1275d at 30d/has	UA	G	E	√	√	√√	√	√	xx	Needs access & accessibility strategy & a full TA. Within M62 AQMA. Noise impact from M62 and A1 may be very significant- may not be all suitable for housing. Area subject to various flood risk. Green belt. HA concern: No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J33 of M62.	1	2	Rejected Option	The scale of development and the associated proposed new road are not in accordance with the development strategy incorporated in the Core Strategy DPD. Exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of the site's green belt status have not been demonstrated. No adequate masterplan or regeneration justification. Too low in the sequential approach – G E.
<b>N89</b>	Land at England Lane – Middle Lane	Unallocated	6.03 has 181 d	UA	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Access, ecology, noise, tip risk – gas + stability. AQMA.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E.
<b>N112</b>	West Ings Lane (KNT23)	PAS Green corridor	6.97 has 209 d	UA	G	E	-	√	?	?	?	√		3b	1	Rejected Option	Site entirely within 3b flood zone. PAS – to be deleted – no long term potential for housing use. Too low in the sequential approach – G E.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments		
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ	
N120	Knottingley Relief Road and associated Land	Green Belt	Whole – 178.54 has														Rejected Option	The scale of development associated with the proposed new road is not in accordance with the development strategy incorporated in the Core Strategy DPD. This is also the case regarding what could be identified as a first phase - land adjoining Warwick Estate and its section of the road. A satisfactory case justifying the need for a relief road has not been made and any benefits could be quickly eroded through the impact of the proposed development. No adequate masterplan or regeneration justification. Exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of green belt status have not been demonstrated. Generally too low in the sequential approach – G E.
	N120 – Relief Road		6.33 has															
	A Housing		A- 3.5 has 105 d	UA	G	E	-	X	√	√√	√√	Xx	1 3b	A- 5				
	B Housing		B- 17.33 has 520 d	UA	G	E	-	X	√	√√	√√	Xx	1	B- 4				
	C Housing		C- 20.7 has 622 d	UA	G	E	-	X	√	√	√	Xx	1 3a 3	C- 3				
	G Landscaping		G - 77.34 has	UA	G	E	-	x	-	√	-	-	1 3b	G- /				
N138	Land at Forge Hill Lane, Knottingley	Part Employment Zone, Green Corridor	4.26 has 129 d	UA	B	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Within Knottingley M62 Extension AQMA. Zone 3 Flood Map, may be Zone 3b presence. Will need review on SHN impact. Western end-archaeological potential. Metro: good location.	1 2 3b	6	Rejected Option	Partly within flood zones 2 and 3b. Employment zone protects and encourages the employment use of the site. Too low in the sequential approach – BE.	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
N139	Land at A1 Business Park, Knottingley	Employment Land Allocation	1.06 has 32 d	UA	G	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	√	Site within M62 AQMA. Maybe better as B1 use class to act as buffer. Severe flooding problems of Wash Dike. Should assess impact on SHN. Metro: poor location.	1	4	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G W. More suited to employment. The interface with housing should be at Sowgate Lane – no advantage in this changing. For housing this is an isolated and not very sustainable location.
N142	Land at A1 Business Park (Island site), Knottingley	Unallocated	2.16 has 65 d	UA	B	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	√	Site within M62 AQMA. Metro: poor location. Flood zones 2 and 3 cover major part of site. Not adequate public foul sewer network capacity.	1 2 3a	5	Rejected Option	For housing this is an isolated and not very sustainable location. Housing use will not be considered in flood zone 3 areas without a very strong regeneration and sustainability case.
<b>Normanton (inc Altofts)</b>																	
N25	Former Brickworks, Wakefield Road, Normanton	Unallocated	3.12 has 94 d	UA	B	E	√	√	-	√√	√√	√√	Major access difficulties. Contamination, gas and stability risks. Great crested newt.	1	6	Rejected Option	Insurmountable major constraint – highway network impact and vehicular access. Means of overcoming the other constraints needs to be demonstrated.
N32	Land at Church Lane, Normanton  i PAS (housing)	Green Belt	1.55 has 47 d	UA	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	Green belt. Metro: reasonable location. Subject of local drainage difficulties - COW.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Exceptional circumstances for removing the green belt have not been demonstrated. Proposed to be PAS with long term use being residential.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments		
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ	
N39	Altofts Hall Farm, Normanton (pt. NOR26) A	PAS	33.89 has	UA									N39C- Within M62 AQMA. Noise impact from M62 & railway line may be so significant that housing not appropriate on at least part of site. Northern corner affected by flood zone. HA concern: No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J31 of M62. May be gas supply difficulties.	1		Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Largely Greenfield, urban extension. PAS.  See N114 (remainder of existing PAS).	
			17.95has 539d	G	E	-	x	√	√√	√√	x	A- 6						
			4.43 has 133d	G	E	-	√	-	-	-	x	B- 1						
	C		11.51 has 345d	G	E	-	√	√	√	√√	x		C- 3					
N40	Ashfields, Normanton pt. (pt. NOR25) A	PAS	21.66 has 650d	UA	G	E	-	X	√	√√	√√	x	N40A- Within M62 AQMA. Noise impact from M62 & railway line may be so significant that housing not appropriate on at least part of site. Flood problems in area. HA concern: No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J31 of M62. YW object: too close to waste water works for decent public amenity.  N40B & N40C- Within M62 AQMA. Small site could be supported by highways. Noise impact from M62 may be so significant that housing not appropriate on at least part of site. In zone 3 flood map. Metro: good location. YW object. N40C-in zone 3 flood map.  Major access problems.	2	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield urban extension. Severe highway access problems.  See N113 (remainder of existing PAS).	
			1.8 has 54d	UA	G	E	-	-	√	√√	√√	x						A- 6
			4.68 has 140d	UA	G	E	-	x	√	√√	√√	x						B- 6
	C													C- 6				

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
N52	Land off Falmouth Avenue, Normanton (pt. NOR25)	PAS	3.2 has 69 d	UA	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	x	Access difficulties but limited development may be possible particularly if developed in conjunction with N86 below. AQMA.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield urban extension. Access problems.
N113	North & East of Ashfield, Normanton pt. (pt. NOR25 remainder)	PAS	15.50 has 465 d	UA	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	-/x	AQMA. Access difficulties.	1, 2	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield urban extension. Access problems. Small part of site affected by flood zone. Part of site is of nature conservation interest and wildlife corridor – Wakefield Nature Area.
N114	Altofts Hall Farm, Normanton (pt NOR26 remainder)	PAS	49.40 has 1482 d	UA	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	AQMA.	1, 2	5	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield urban extension. Part of site is of nature conservation interest and wildlife corridor – Wakefield Nature Area.
N128	Land at Woodhouse Common	Green Belt	9.91 has 297 d	UA	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	On green belt. No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J31 & M62. Recorded archaeological potential. No foul sewer capacity. Metro: could be good location.	1	5	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E. Greenfield urban extension site in the green belt. No exceptional circumstances justification for releasing green belt.
N133	Land to Rear of Church Lane, Altofts	Green Belt Green Corridor	0.87 has 26 d	UA	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	x	Green belt land. Will need review on SHN impact. Site unlikely to promote sustainable transport choices. AQMA.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E. Greenfield urban extension site in the green belt. No exceptional circumstances justification for releasing green belt.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
N135	Land off Snyderdale Road, Normanton	Unallocated	1.94 has 58 d	UA	G	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	-	Access difficulties. Will need review on SHN impact. Metro: good location.	1	6	Rejected Option	Access, Open space value. Compensatory equivalent provision in this locality not proposed.
N136	Land off Beckbridge Lane, Normanton	Housing Allocation	0.75 has 22 d	UA	G	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	x	Highway access & unsustainability complaints. Zone 3 Flood Map, may be Zone 3b presence. Will need review on SHN impact.	1 2	6	Rejected Option	Highway access, flood zones and flooding.
<b>Ossett</b>																	
W35	Land SE of Birchen Ave, Birchen Hills, Ossett	Green Belt Green Corridor	3.21 has 96 d	UA	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	No adequate access. Landfill gas zone.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Access. Greenfield, green belt.
W52	Land off Love Lane, Ossett	Green Belt Green Corridor	6.17 has 185 d	UA	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	Xx	Landfill gas zone.	1	A-6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield, Green Belt.
	B Small Area																
W97	Storrs Hill, Ossett (OH17)	PAS Green Corridor	2.67 has 80 d	UA	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	x	Metro: good location. Access difficulties & could lead to development pressure in buffer of Ossett & Horbury.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E.
W98	Land at Fairfield drive Ossett	Unallocated	0.51 has 15 d	UA	G	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	-	Valuable piece of Greenspace in Ossett, recommend keep at least part of site as Accessible Greenspace.	1	6	Rejected Option	No further housing provision required.
W102	Land at Tateley Lane, Gawthorpe	Green Belt	0.6 has 18 d	UA	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	History of flooding on site. Green belt.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
W108	Land North of Gawthorpe	Green Belt	9.7 has 291 d	UA	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	Access unsuitable & local traffic impact could be significant. Site within 250m of 2 historic landfill sites producing landfill gas. Green belt. HA concern: No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J40 of M1. Part of site on Zion Church burial ground. Development of cemetery sites may have archaeological & legal implications- needs assessment. Metro: poor location/ more detail.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Incorporates site W102.
W119	Land at Swithenbank Street, Ossett	Unallocated	1.44 has 43 to 80 d	UA	G	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	-	Access difficulties. Metro: reasonable location.	1	6	Rejected Option	No further housing provision required. Access problems and open space value of the land to be clarified.
<b>South Elmsall/ South Kirkby</b>																	
SE12	Land off Carr Lane, South Kirkby	Green Belt	0.99 has 30 d	UA	G	D	-	√	-	-	-	xx	Site partly affected by flood zone.	2	1	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G D Greenfield, isolated, Green Belt.
SE19	Land off Field Lane, South Elmsall	Employment Allocation (pt.)	2.49 has 75 d	UA	B&G	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Access does not appear feasible. Affected by quarrying, landfill site within 250m.	1	6	Rejected Option	Access not feasible. Employment zone part may be landlocked.
SE48	Land to rear of Cambridge Street, Moorthorpe	Unallocated	1.57 has 47 d	UA	G	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Valued open space use – no local substitute provision proposed.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G W Valued open space– no local substitute provision proposed.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
SE53	Land off Lanthwaite Lane, South Kirkby (EMS14)	Housing Allocation	8.66 has 260 d	UA	G	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Noise from railway/industrial adjacent. Mostly zone 1 flooding, severe problems with 2 adjacent Becks. Trunk main crosses site. Metro: reasonable location/more detail needed. HSE consultation zones.  Site feasible in terms of constraints – current allocation.	1	6	Rejected Option De-allocate	Too low in the sequential approach – G W Will affect a COW HSE Consultation Zone access difficulties. To become PAS. Developability questioned in view of lack of progress over the years. To become PAS.
SE54	Former Common Farm, South Elmsall	Green Belt	2.44 has 73d	UA	G	E	-	√	?	√√	√√	√√	Some flooding. Green belt. Metro: good location.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – GE Green Belt.
SE59	Rowley Lane, South. Elmsall (EMS24)	Housing Allocation	1.47 has 44 d	UA	G	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Site feasible in terms of constraints – current allocation.	1	6	Rejected Option De-allocate	Too low in the sequential approach – G W To become PAS.
SE61	Common Road, South Kirkby (EMS17)	Housing Allocation	0.99 has 30 d	UA	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Site feasible in terms of constraints – current allocation.	1	6	Rejected Option De-allocate	Too low in the sequential approach – G E. To become PAS.
SE68	Land at Moorthorpe Station	Unallocated Green Corridor	0.73 has 7 d	UA	B&G	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	x	Noise from railway may not be controllable.	1	6	Rejected Option	Retain former public house and station building for community use. Too low in the sequential approach. Westfield Lane Improvement Area is priority.
SE69	Land at West Street, South Kirkby	Unallocated	0.44 has 13 d	UA	G	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	√√	Not adequate facility in public foul sewer network. Of known archaeological potential. Don't know how site is drained.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G W. Peripheral location.
SE70	Land at Aaron Wilkinson Court, South Kirkby	Unallocated	0.62 has 19 d	UA	G	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	-	Not aware where drainage discharges.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G W.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
SE71	Land at Grove Drive, South Kirkby	Unallocated	0.5 has 15 d	UA	G	W	√	√	-	√√	√√	√	Flood problems in area.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G W.
SE79	Land at Broad Lane, South Kirkby	Green Belt	46.5 has 1395 d + com dev	UA	G	E	-	x	√√	?	?	xx	Poor infrastructure & transport provision. May need off-site improvements to Langthwaite Beck for flooding. No public foul sewer capacity. Green belt.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E, Green Belt.
<b>Stanley/ Outwood</b>																	
W7	Former Lofthouse Colliery Site, Outwood (NWS46)	PAS Green Corridor	11.48 has 344 d	UA	G	W	-	x	√	√√	√√	xx	Loss of playing fields. Possible contamination and railway noise. AQMA.	1	6	Rejected Option	No further housing provision required in this area. Otherwise a reduced site area could be considered in conjunction with satisfactory alternative open space provision.
W100	Land at Ferry Lane	Unallocated Green Corridor	0.93 has 37d	UA	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	x	Nearby Greenspace could have quality improved. Adjacent to Wakefield City AQMA. On low-lying land adjacent to Flood Zone.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E.
W120	Land at Park View, Lofthouse Gate	Green Belt	8.9 has 267-490d	UA	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	Adjacent to M62 AQMA. May have been potentially contaminated. V.bottom of site is affected by Flood Zone. On landfill sites with gas. Green belt. Metro: good location. HA concern: No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J41 of M1.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E.
<b>Ackworth (Moor Top)</b>																	
SE13	Land at Elmcroft Farm, Ackworth	Green Belt	1.45 has 44 d	LSC	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	Drainage difficulties, contamination, landfill gas zone.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield, green belt, urban extension.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
SE73	Land at Brackenhill	Employment Allocation, Green Corridor, Unallocated	19.36 has 12.13 net housing 364 d (includes SE73A)	LSC	B	W	-	X	-	√	√√	√		1		Rejected Option	Out of scale with Ackworth's housing needs. Not required by the development strategy, taking account of recent development in the settlement.
	B	Green Belt	0.44 has 13 d	LSC	B&G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	SE73B and SE73C – Access constraints. May need off-site improvements to Hessle Beck to ensure no increase of flooding downstream. May be presence of 'functional floodplain' (zone 3b). Green belt. May be private water pipes on site. Metro: poor location.	1	B- 5	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – B&G E Partly brownfield, partly greenfield, green belt, urban extension. Not required by the development strategy, taking account of recent development in the settlement. (Hessle View 1).
	C	Green Belt	0.89 has 27 d	LSC	B&G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx		1	C- 5	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – B&G E Partly brownfield, partly greenfield, green belt, urban extension. Not required by the development strategy, taking account of recent development in the settlement. (Hessle View 1+2)
<b>Crofton</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
W43A	Bedford Farm, Crofton (WCS33)	PAS	A/A1 6.57 has 197 d	LSC	G	E	-	x	-	xx	√√	-	Local drainage difficulties. Impact on local highway network.	1	5	Rejected Option	Reduced site would meet highway comments and be more in line with the core strategy. The developer has offered 0.5 has small employment units but these would have to be subsidised as would social housing.
W48A	Land East of Priory Ridge, Crofton (inc. WCS32).	Green Belt & PAS	9.12 has 274 d	LSC	G	E	-	x	?	?	√√	xx	Local flooding issue. Landfill gas zone. Highways section would support a reduced proposal.	1	5	Rejected Option	Masterplan now shows smaller site in GB within this site for mixed use. PAS to be retained as PAS for residential use  Visual impact in the landscape. Relative remoteness from the village centre compared with the proposed site.
W116	Land off Cock Lane, Crofton i housing use	Green Belt	4.6 has 90-150d	LSC	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	Site constraints and location. Needs satisfactory TA. Adjacent to Wakefield City AQMA. Metro: good location. Potential noise conflict with residential.	1	5	Rejected Option	Green Belt. No housing need requirement to justify the release of this land through exceptional circumstances.
W117	Land off Weeland Road, Crofton i housing use	Green Belt	0.60 has 18-30d	LSC	G	E	-	√	-	√√	√√	xx	Access difficulties. Adjacent to Wakefield City AQMA. Green belt. May be gas supply difficulties.	1	5	Rejected Option	Green Belt. No housing need requirement to justify the release of this land through exceptional circumstances.
<b>Fitzwilliam/ Kinsley</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
SE49	Land off Newstead Lane, Fitzwilliam	Green Belt	2.62 has 79 d	LSC	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	Highway access.	1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield, urban extension, green belt. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated.
SE55	Land at Farm Lane Fitzwilliam	Green Belt	3.35 has 101 d	LSC	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	xx	Impact on local roads, consider limiting housing numbers. Flooding on site and downstream. No public sewer capacity/ in proximity. Green belt. Known archaeological potential. Metro: poor location. May be issues in supplying gas to site.	1	5	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield, urban extension, green belt. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated.
SE65	Wakefield Road, Kinsley (HEM37)	PAS	2.97 has 89 d	LSC	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	-		1	6	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E
<b>Upton</b>																	
SE18	Common Lane, Upton	Green Belt	11.39 has 342 d	LSC	G	E	-	X	√	√√	√√	xx	Highways constraints.	1	5	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield, urban ext., green belt. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated.
SE51	Land at Brookside Farm, Upton	Green Belt	0.73 has 22 d	LSC	B&G	D	-	√	√	√√	√√	-	Highway access.	1	5	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Highways, Greenfield, green belt. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )		Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En		FZ			
<b>SE77 A</b>	Sheepwalk Lane, Upton	Special Policy Area for large B2/ B8 users	3.10 has 93d	LSC	G	E	-	√	√	√√	√√	x	Possible access route difficulties. Pre-application ecology survey necessary. Wrangbrook Tunnel building of local interest. May need off-site improvements to the Skell to ensure no increase of flooding downstream. Highway access, former tip site.	1	5	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Merit in retaining the site for large user B"/B8 development.
<b>Darrington</b>																	
<b>N96</b>	Land at Back Lane, Darrington	Unallocated	0.82 has 24 d	V	G	W	-	x	-	xx	-	-	Limited development only is possible due to local highway constraint. Urban Greenfield. AQMA.	1	3	Rejected Option	Scale not in accordance with development policy for villages.
<b>Hall Green/ Chapelthorpe</b>																	
<b>W53</b>	Hollingthorpe Hall Farm, Hall Green ii housing iii mixed use	Green Belt Green Corridor	8.90 has 267 d	V	G	E	-	x	x	xx	√√	xx	-	1	5	Rejected Option	Scale not in accordance with development policy for villages Green field, green belt.
<b>W85</b>	Land North of Hollingthorpe Estate, Hall Green (SEW35)	PAS	2.81 has 84 d	V	G	E	-	x	-	xx	√√	-	Metro: good location. Will need review on SHN impact.	1	5	Rejected Option	Scale not in accordance with development policy for villages.
<b>High and Low Ackworth</b>																	
<b>SE15</b>	Land at High Ackworth	Green Belt	1.15 has 35 d	LSC	G	E	-	x	-	xx	√√	xx	Site affected by flood zones, water voles.	2, 3b	6	Rejected Option	Scale not in accordance with development policy for villages. Conservation area, flood zones, Greenfield, green belt.
<b>Kirkhamgate</b>																	
<b>W34</b>	Kirkham Farm, Kirkhamgate	Green Belt Green Corridor	8.78 has 263 d	V	G	E	-	x	-	xx	√√	xx	Water mains, made-up ground, possible contamination. AQMA.	1	5	Rejected Option	Scale not in accordance with development policy for villages Remote, Greenfield, green belt. (main river).

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
<b>W86</b>	Land to the Rear of 184 Batley Road, Kirkhamgate	Green Belt Green Corridor & Unallocated	1.15 has 35 d	V	G	E	-	x	-	xx	√√	xx	Green belt. Will need review on SHN impact. Metro: reasonable location.	1	6	Rejected Option	Scale not in accordance with development policy for villages.
<b>Sharlston</b>																	
<b>W114</b>	Land at Crossley Street, New Sharlston	Green Belt	1.8 has 54 d	V	G	E	-	x	-	xx	√√	xx	Difficulty in gaining satisfactory access junctions & poor site sustainability. Green belt. Metro: good location.	1	5	Rejected Option	Scale in village – conformity with settlement hierarchy.
<b>South Hiendley</b>																	
<b>SE67</b>	Orchard Drive, South Hiendley (HEM38)	PAS	0.80 has 24 d	V	G	W	-	x	-	xx	√√	-		1	6	Rejected Option	Scale not in accordance with development policy for villages.
<b>Streethouse</b>																	
<b>N37</b>	Sharlston Colliery A	Green Belt Green corridor	54.23 has	V	B	D	√	x	√√	xx	√√	xx	Tip consultation zone.	1	A- 6	Rejected Option	Scale not in accordance with development policy for villages.
	B Land at High Street	Unallocated	1.45 has 44 d	V	G	?	√	x	-	xx	√√	√√	N37B- site can't support significant numbers (highways). Site former colliery so may be potentially contaminated. Flood problems in area. May be private water pipes on site. Metro: good location.	1	B- 5	Rejected Option	Not sustainable – see UDP First Alteration Inspector's report.
<b>N53</b>	Land at Whinney Lane, Streethouse (FTH24)	PAS Green corridor	3.17 has 95.1 d	V	G	E	√	x	-	xx	√√	xx	Railway buffer required, water voles, flooding may lead to reduction in developable area.	1	6	Rejected Option	Scale not in accordance with development policy for villages. Greenfield urban extension site.
<b>N126</b>	Land off Red Lane Streethouse	Green Belt	4.77 has 143 d	V	G	E	-	x	-	xx	√√	xx	Southern part of site may be subject to flooding. Would destroy great crested newt habitat. Highway complaints.	1	6	Rejected Option	Scale not in accordance with development policy for villages. Greenfield urban extension site. Green Belt.
<b>Thorpe Audlin</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )		Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En		FZ			
SE47	The Bungalow, Pontefract Road, Thorpe Audlin	Green Belt	0.55 has 17 d	V	G	D	-	x	-	x	-	xx	Highway access.	1	2	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G D Highway access, unsustainable transport, Green Belt.
<b>Walton</b>																	
W6	Grove House Farm, Walton (WCS35)	PAS Green Corridor	4.77 has 143 d	V	G	E	-	x	-	xx	√√	x	Local highway network.	1	5	Rejected Option	Scale not in accordance with development policy for villages Highway network, green field, conformity with settlement hierarchy. Similar proposal for the same site.
W60	A Waterways Land (Persimmon)	PAS Green Corridor	1.8 has 70 d	V	G	E	-	x	-	xx	√√	x	Local highway network.	1	6	Rejected Option	Scale not in accordance with development policy for villages Highway network, green field, conformity with settlement hierarchy.
	B Waterways Land, Walton (WCS34)		13.10 has 393 d	V	G	E	-	x	-	xx	√√	x					
<b>Woolley</b>																	
W36	Land at Water Lane, Woolley	Green Belt	1.08 has 32 d	V	G	E	-	x	-	xx	√√	xx	Highway access, impact on conservation area.	1	4	Rejected Option	Scale in village – conformity with settlement hierarchy. Highway access.
W37	Former Woolley Colliery	Green Belt Green Corridor	3.01 has 90 d	-	G	E	-	x	-	xx	x	xx	Affects ancient woodland.	1	0	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Greenfield urban extension, green belt.
<b>Other</b>																	
W40	Former Newmarket Colliery Site, Stanley (mixed use)	Green Belt Partly Green Corridor	93.65 has 2812 d	UA	G pt B	D	-	√	?	√	-/x	xx	Landfill gas zone. Flood zones not problematic for most development. AQMA.	2 3b 3c	1	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G D Unsustainability of housing element.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
W55	600 Denby Dale Road, Broad Cut, Calder Grove	Green Belt Green Corridor Leisure Opportunity Area	0.75 has 30d	LSC	G	E	-	√	-	√	√√	xx	Highway access difficulties.	1	4	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G E Access, Greenfield, green belt.
W58	British Oak (mixed use).	Green Belt Green Corridor	27.08 has 813	-	G	D	-	x	√	-	x	xx	Partly affected by flood zones and landfill gas zone.	2 3b	0	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G D Green belt, flood zones.
W81	Land at Oakenshaw Lane, Heath Common	Green Belt Green Corridor	1.45 has 44 d	-	G	D	-	x	-	xx	√√	xx	Highway access, landfill gas zone.	1	5	Rejected Option	Too low in the sequential approach – G D countryside, green belt, highway access.
W124	Nostell Estate site 3-6 East of Swine Lane	Green Belt Green Corridor Part Minerals Reserve to be protected	4 hectares large proportion is proposed to be open space	-	G	D	-	x	-	-	x	xx	Dismissed on policy grounds.	1	Inaccessible with given criteria	Rejected Option	Provision for affordable housing will not be made by allocating green belt exception sites – policy issue. There are no exceptional circumstances.

## 5A Options Assessment: Employment Zones

Ec	Economic sustainability
S	Social sustainability
En	Environmental sustainability
EnT	Transport and Environment
E	Urban Extension
D	Detached from Urban Area

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
<b>Preferred Options</b>								
<b>Wakefield</b>								
<b>EZ NWS1</b>	Thornes, Wakefield	√√	√	√√	x	45.80%	<b>Preferred Option</b>	To protect employment provision including proposal W113ii at Diamond Business Park. No change to boundaries. (Part CWAAP).
<b>EZ NWS2</b>	Flanshaw, Wakefield	√√	√	√√	√√	32.10%	<b>Preferred Option</b>	To protect employment provision. No change to boundaries.
<b>EZ NWS3</b>	Westgate End / Calder Vale / Calder Vale Sewage Works, Wakefield	√√	√	xx	x	0.30%	<b>Preferred Option</b>	To protect employment provision. No change to boundaries.
<b>EZ NWS4</b>	Wakefield 41 Industrial Park, Wakefield	x	-	√	√	26.80%	<b>Preferred Option</b>	To protect employment provision. Exclude GB area. Remainder.
<b>EZ NWS5</b>	Roundwood, Wakefield	√	-	√√	√	40.50%	<b>Preferred Option</b>	To protect employment provision. No change to boundaries.
<b>EZ NWS6</b>	Castlegate, Wakefield	x	-	√	√	11.10%	<b>Preferred Option</b>	To protect employment provision. No change to boundaries.

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
EZ SEW1	Crigglestone Industrial Estate, Wakefield	X	XX	√	√	28.70%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. No change to boundaries.
EZ SEW2	Portobello / Fall Ings, Wakefield	√√	√	√√	X	57.50%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Delete part of zone at Portobello, SW of railway line. Remainder outside CWAAP to be included except the former power station housing site and the isolated area to the east.
W113ii	Diamond Business Park, Thornes	√√	√	√√	√	44.5	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Housing allocation in UDP FA adjacent to zone but this is an outstanding substantial area of employment provision.
<b>Castleford</b>								
EZ CAS1	Whitwood / Willowbridge Lane, Castleford	√√	√	√√	-	38.40%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Link zones and delete finger of residential land.
EZ CAS2	Methley Road Area, Castleford	√√	√	√√	√	33.00%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Delete Lambson's site and area to north of Savile Road. Delete Victoria Quarry area.
EZ CAS3	Carr Wood Road, Castleford	√√	√	√√	√	37.90%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Delete residential finger to the SW. Extend to include land to SE.
EZ CAS4	Castleford Ings, Castleford	√	-	√√	x	45.00%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Delete the majority of the zone (to become Special Policy Area).

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
EZ CAS5	Whitwood-Europort, Castleford	√√	√	√	x	29.40%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. To be greatly extended to include Europort and Pioneer area – formerly employment allocations CAS7, CAS9, CAS10, CAS11 (apart from area to south of Lower Altofts which is to be unallocated).
<b>Pontefract</b>								
N43	Monkhill Works, Ferrybridge Road, Pontefract	√√	√	√√	√√	39.80%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Part of employment zone substantially unaffected by encroachment of housing development.
EZ PNT1	East of Pontefract Town Centre	√√	√	√√	√√	39.80%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Delete area between the railway lines and Skinner Lane. Area between the railway and the northern side of North Baileygate and Bondgate to become the new zone (site of St John's Priory is excluded). Delete the substantial area on the south side of Bondgate and South Baileygate.
<b>Featherstone</b>								
EZ FTH1	North of Wakefield Road, Featherstone	√√	√	√√	-	46.80%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. No change to boundaries.
EZ N69	Former Acton Hall Colliery Yard (FTH2) and Green Lane, Featherstone (FTH3)	√√	√	xx	√	0.09%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Remove employment allocations that are substantially complete – new employment zone.

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
<b>Horbury</b>								
EZ OH1	Horbury Junction, Horbury	x	-	√	xx	21.00%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Flood zone constraint. No change to boundaries.
EZ OH2	Horbury Bridge, Horbury	x	-	√√	-	31.80%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Flood zone constraint. No change to boundaries.
EZ OH5	Hawkingcroft, Horbury	X	-	√	-	28.70%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. No change to boundaries.
<b>Knottingley (inc Ferrybridge)</b>								
EZ KNT2	Headlands Lane / Hazel Road, Knottingley	√√	√	√√	√	34.30%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Exclude area north of the railway (planning permission granted for retail proposals in the past). Housing permission area to be excluded.
EZ KNT3	Weeland Road / Womersley Road, Knottingley	√√	√	√	√	26.10%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. No change to boundaries.
EZ KNT4	Knottingley East, Knottingley	√√	√	√	-	15.20%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Extend to include the additional chemical works area. Exclude area to the north of the Aire and Calder Navigation.
EZ N74	A1 Business Park, Knottingley (KNT7)	√√	√	√	x	23.30%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Delete allocation – new employment zone - and extend to include former depot site.

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
EZ N125	Ferrybridge Power Station, Knottingley	√√	√	x	xx	Inaccessible with given criteria	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. To become a special Employment Zone - to be restricted to employment development directly associated with power generation.
EZ N138A	King's Mill, Forge Hill Lane	√	√√	√√	-	28%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision retain as an employment zone. High risk flood zones preclude housing development as part of site.
<b>Normanton (inc Altofts)</b>								
EZ NOR1	Normanton Industrial Estate, Normanton	√√	√	√	-	24.80%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Extend into built section of industrial allocation NOR2 off Foxbridge Way and delete this area from NOR2.
<b>Ossett</b>								
EZ OH4	Dewsbury Road, Ossett	X	-	√√	√√	36.80%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. No change to boundaries.
<b>South Elmsall/ South Kirkby</b>								
EZ EMS6	Langthwaite Grange, South Elmsall	√√	√	√	x	14.10%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. No change apart from possible minor boundary adjustments.
EZ EMS7	Dale Lane, South Elmsall	√√	√	√	√√	10.50%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Extend to include EMS3 Dale Lane Extension and EMS4 Dale Lane South.
<b>Ackworth (Moor Top)</b>								

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
EZ SE81	Brackehill, Ackworth	√√	√	√√	√√	35.20%	Preferred Option	To protect and retain employment provision. It will thus reduce or offset as far as possible the increasing commuter function of the settlement. Create new employment zone for Onward Transport area.
<b>Fitzwilliam/ Kinsley</b>								
EZ HEM2	Kinsley Industrial Estate, Kinsley	√√	√	√√	√	36.00%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. No change to boundaries.
<b>Upton</b>								
EZ SE25	Wagon Lane East, Upton (EMS5 - east)	√√	√	√	-	21.90%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. Create new employment zone to replace employment allocation EMS5 east.
<b>Other</b>								
EZ OH3	Healey, Ossett	x	-	-	-	7.90%	Preferred Option	To protect employment provision. No change to boundaries.
<b>Rejected Options</b>								
<b>Pontefract</b>								
EZ PNT2	Tanshelf Industrial Estate, Pontefract	√	-	√√	√√	49.50%	Rejected Option	Exclude the employment zone to facilitate Pontefract Town Centre Masterplan proposals.
<b>Knottingley</b>								
EZ KNT1	Banks of the Aire and Calder Navigation, Ferrybridge to Willow Island, Knottingley	√√	√	√√	X	33.50%	Rejected Option	Exclude the employment zone to enable a Special Policy Area to be created to assist the comprehensive redevelopment of the area.
<b>Stanley/ Outwood</b>								

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
<b>EZ W62</b>	Wakefield 41 Industrial Park, Wakefield (NWS4 green belt part)	X	-	√	xx	22.80%	Rejected Option	Exclude the zone from the GB area to ensure that non-conforming uses are not developed.

## 5B Options Assessment: Employment Sites

### Key

SH	Settlement Hierarchy :-	SRC	Sub-Regional City	LSC	Local service centre
		PT	Principle Town	V	Village
		UA	Urban Area		
B	Brown Field	R	Supports the Regen Strategy	Ec	Economic sustainability
G	Green Field	S	In scale with the settlement	S	Social sustainability
W	Within Urban Area			En	Environmental sustainability
E	Urban Extension			EnT	Transport and Environment
D	Detached from Urban Area			FZ	Flood zone status

<sup>1</sup> remaining areas not included in proposed sites

<sup>2</sup> excluding areas with planning permission

Access. Model – sites within 0.5km of bus stop -  
% people within 40 mins by pubic transport

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				B/G	WE/D	SH	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En					FZ
<b>Preferred Options</b>																	
<b>Castleford</b>																	
CAS8	Wheldale Colliery N117	Employment Allocation	18.35 has	B	W	PT	√	√	√√	√	√	-	Site feasible in terms of constraints – current employment allocation (the review found no overriding changed circumstances).	1 2 3a	27.3% (as N9)	<b>Preferred Option</b> incorp. In SPA N9	Retain the current employment allocation proposal within the Special Policy Area (regeneration project). Development should be primarily in flood zone 1. Employment development may not be proposed within the flood zone 3a part of the area.  See Castleford Riverside Special Policy Area.
<b>Normanton</b>																	
N119	Normanton Industrial Estate Extension (N119)	Employment Allocation	33.00 has	G	W	UA	-	√	√√	√	√	x	Site feasible in terms of constraints – current allocation (the review found no overriding changed circumstances).	1	15.6%	<b>Preferred Option</b>	Retain allocation. Planning permission granted for all remaining land within the UDPFA allocation. Associated with the Glasshoughton Coalfields Link road.
<b>South Elmsall/ South Kirkby</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				B/G	W/E/D	SH	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En					FZ
EMS1	South Kirkby Colliery / Ferrymoor Riddings (SE76)	Employment Allocation	30.00 has	B	E	UA	-	√	√	-	x	-	Site feasible in terms of constraints – current allocation (the review found no overriding changed circumstances).	1, 2, 3b	inaccess. Re bus stop	Preferred Option	Retain UDPFA allocation - this is the main new employment provision in the South East of the District. It is to be used for a waste recycling facility, a sustainable growth park and industrial and business accommodation. Its primary access will be from the Hemsworth – A1 Link road (under construction). The north western and north eastern boundaries of the site are affected by flood zones 2 and 3b. No 'hard' development is proposed in flood zone 3b.
EMS2	Langthwaite Grange Extension (SE26)	Employment Allocation	11.66 has	G Pt B	E	UA	-	√	√	-	x	-	Site feasible in terms of constraints – current allocation (the review found no overriding changed circumstances).	1	0.2%	Preferred Option	Retain UDPFA allocation. No access should be taken from Broad Lane.
<b>Ackworth</b>																	
ACK1	Green Lane, Ackworth (SE28)	Employment Allocation	6.1 has	B	W	LSC	-	√	-	-	√√	√	Site feasible in terms of constraints – current allocation (the review found no overriding changed circumstances)	1	29.8%	Preferred Option	Retain allocation but exclude residential and paddock area from employment allocation. This is the major employment site in Ackworth. It has the objective of creating further employment provision in the settlement and thus reduce or offset as far as possible the increasing commuter function of the settlement.
<b>Upton</b>																	
EMS5	EMS5 Wagon Lane, Upton (SE39)	Employment Allocation	2.94 has	B	W	LSC	√	√	√	-	√	x	Site feasible in terms of constraints – current allocation (the review found no overriding changed circumstances).	1	25.1%	Preferred Option	Retain allocation - western site only. Eastern site developed – to become an Employment Zone.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments		
				B/G	W/E/D	SH	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En					FZ	
<b>Rejected Options</b>																		
<b>Wakefield</b>																		
<b>W1B</b>	Paragon Business Park Extension Land at Snowhill (NWS65)  W1B B1 only proposals	Employment Allocation	65.09 has	G Pt B	W	SRC	-	√	√√	√√	√√	√√	√√	Traffic generation – impact on local highway network. Prospect of issues being resolved.	1	Ba- 34.3% Bb- 45.7% Bc- 50.9%	Rejected Option	This option is for the whole UDP Special Policy Area site to be developed for B1 use.  Contrary to RSS employment land supply stance and PPS6 regarding employment development suitable for town centre location unless there is a specified restriction.  [Mixed use development of this site primarily for housing and B1 use not appropriate for town centres is the preferred option for this site.]
<b>W2B</b>	Former Wakefield Power Station site housing, ind and warehousing  B ind and warehousing only	Employment Zone	16.95 has  23.78 has	B  B	W  W	SRC  SRC	√  √	√  √	√√  √√	√√  √	√√  √√	X  x	Flood zones, HSE consultation zones and landfill gas zones affect the site.	2, 3a 3b	63.9%  77.2%	Rejected Option  Rejected Option	Barnsley Canal restoration safeguarding and potential route of Eastern Outer Loop road also affect the site. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements.	
<b>W89</b>	Land to the north of Asda, Sandal	Green Belt, Green Corridor, Countryside leisure opportunity area	2.21 has	G	E	SRC	-	√	√√	√√	√√	xx	Land use conflicts with supermarket. In Flood Zone. Metro: reasonable location.	2 3b 3c	5	Rejected Option	Green belt, green corridor. Site affected by flood zones. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated for amending green belt.	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access Model		Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				B/G	W/E/D	SH	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En		FZ			
W113 iii	Diamond Business Park iii employment and housing	Employment Zone	4.04 has 162d+	SRC	B	W	-	√	-	√√	√√	√	Should have TA. Within Wakefield City AQMA. Changing existing industrial to housing land use would stop noise conflicts. On edge of Flood Zone. HA concern: No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J39 of M1. Metro: reasonable location.	1 2	5	Rejected Option	Housing not required – sufficient provision on other acceptable sites. The employment use option is preferred in the employment zone where a stronger policy in favour of retaining employment use is proposed to apply. To remain an employment zone, not a new employment allocation.
<b>Castleford</b>																	
N2	Flass Lane, Cutsyke	Green Belt Green Corridor	A 26.19 has	G	E	PT	-	√	√√	√	x	xx	Completion of GHCL road required. Flood zones affect part of site. HA position unclear.	1 2 3a 3b	A & B inaccess. Re bus stop	Rejected Option	No overriding regeneration need. Green belt, Greenfield, urban extension. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements. Low in sequential approach for housing.
	B Employment and Housing		B 34.33 has	G	E	PT	-	√	√√	√	x	xx					
N3	Willowbridge Lane	Special Policy Area, Employment Zone	3.12 has	G	W	PT	-	√	√	-	√	x	Landfill gas zone	2 3a 3b 3c	28.4%	Rejected Option	Proposals are superseded by Diggerland 'theme park' planning permission. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements. Current Special Policy Area to become unallocated.
N98	Land fronting Stainburn Ave, Glasshoughton	Green Belt	1.07 has	G	E	PT	-	√	√	-	√√	xx	Within M62 AQMA. Site may have been potentially contaminated. Area of recorded archaeological potential. Metro: good location.	1	33.7%	Rejected Option	Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements. No exceptional circumstances for amending Green Belt.
<b>Featherstone</b>																	
N44	Land East of Huntwick Lodge, Featherstone	Leisure or Employment	3.03 has	G	E	UA	-	√	?	√	√√	xx	Highway access. Landfill gas zone. Partly affected by flood zones.	2 3b	47.2%	Rejected Option	Greenfield, green belt, highway access, flood zones. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements.
							-	√	√	-	√√	xx					

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments		
				B/G	W/E/D	SH	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En						
N84	North of Green Lane, Featherstone.	Green Belt	23.05 has	G	E	UA	-	√	√√	√	√√	xx	-	FZ	1	47.8%	Rejected Option	Needs strong regeneration case to justify GB change – no exceptional circumstances. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements.
<b>Knottingley (inc Ferrybridge)</b>																		
KNT5	Common Lane, Knottingley (N131)	Employment Allocation	8.46 has	G	E	UA	-	√	√	-	√	xx	Site feasible in terms of constraints – current allocation (the review found no overriding changed circumstances).	3b	14.7%	Rejected Option – 'de-allocate' to become PAS.	Affected by flood zones (3b). Unique sites for bulky goods handling – can be served by canal. KNT5 has potential to be served by rail. However it has been shown that there has been no demand over many years. Therefore in view of flood zones situation the allocation will be removed and it will become a longer term contingency site with a PAS designation. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements.	
KNT6	KNT6 Weeland Road, Knottingley (N132)	Employment Allocation	7.5 has	G	E	UA	-	√	√	-	√	-	Site feasible in terms of constraints – current allocation (the review found no overriding changed circumstances).	3b	14.9%	Rejected Option – 'de-allocate' to become PAS	Affected by flood zones (3b). Unique sites for bulky goods handling – can be served by canal. However it has been shown that there has been no demand over many years. Therefore in view of flood zones situation the allocation will be removed and it will become a longer term contingency site with a PAS designation. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements.	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				B/G	W/E/D	SH	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En					FZ
KNT 25	Common Lane, West of Southmoor Lane, Knottingley (N116)	PAS	7 has	G	E	UA	-	√	?	?	√	xx		3b	7.5%	Rejected Option	Greenfield, urban extension, affected by flooding zones (3b). Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements. Retain as PAS land.
N4	Trinity Farm, Ferrybridge	Green Belt	26.15 has	G	D	-	-	x	√√	√	x	xx	Access onto A1/M62 roundabout would be contrary to HA policy.	1	inaccess. Re bus stop	Rejected Option	Green Belt, rural, greenfield. Unsustainable. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements.
N5	NE of A1-M62 Interchange	Green Belt	A 13.58 has	G	E	UA	-	√	√	-	√	xx	Access from A1. Landfill gas zone.  N5C- needs access & accessibility strategy & a full TA. Within M62 AQMA. Noise impact from M62 and A1 may be very significant. Area subject to various flood risk. Green belt. HA concern: No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J33 of M62.  N5D- Within M62 AQMA. Green belt. HA concern: No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J33 of M62. Potential noise conflict with housing- suggested to have B1/office.	1	A- 17.8%	Rejected Option	The provision of substantial further employment land within the District is not in accordance with the RSS. The scale of development and the associated proposed new road are also not in accordance with the development strategy incorporated in the Core Strategy DPD. Exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of the site's green belt status have not been demonstrated. No adequate masterplan or regeneration justification. Too low in the sequential approach – G E.  A strong regeneration case would be required, but it could assist Warwick Estate and provide jobs. Exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of the site's green belt status have not been demonstrated.
			B 27.49 has	G	E	UA	-	√	√√	√	√	xx		1	B- 17.9%	Rejected Option	
			C 53.74 has	G	E	UA	-	√	√√	√	√	xx		1	C- 0.10%	Rejected Option	
			D 9.25 has	G	E	UA	-	√	√√	√	√	xx		1	D- 11.4%	Rejected Option	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments		
				B/G	W/E/D	SH	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En					FZ	
N120	Knottingley Relief Road and associated Land	Green Belt	Whole – 178.54 has	G	E	UA								Majority of site within M62 AQMA. Approx quarter of site in Zone 3 of EA Flood Map. May be presence of 'functional floodplain' (zone 3b). No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J33 and M62. Highway section requires wide-ranging feasibility study.	1 2 3a 3b  1 2 3b  3b  1 3b	D- 7%  E- 9.6%  F- 10.6%  G- /	Rejected Option	The provision of substantial further employment land within the District is not in accordance with the RSS. The scale of development associated with the proposed new road is not in accordance with the development strategy incorporated in the Core Strategy DPD. A satisfactory case justifying the need for a relief road has not been made and any benefits could be quickly eroded through the impact of the proposed development. No adequate masterplan or regeneration justification. Exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of green belt status have not been demonstrated. Generally too low in the sequential approach – G E Much of the proposal is long term – post 2021 and therefore not relevant to allocations in the Site Specific Proposals DPD. There are currently major doubts about Local Transport Plan funding of the by-pass proposal even with private sector funding.
	D Employment		D- 20.1 has	G	E	UA	-	√	√√	√	-	Xx						
	E Employment		E- 26.14 has	G	E	UA	-	√	√	√√	-	Xx						
	F Employment		F- 7.1 has	G	E	UA	-	√	√√	√	√	X						
	G Landscaping		G – 77.34 has	G	E	UA	-	√	-	√	-	-						
N122	Land at Shilling Hill, Knottingley	Green belt	23.88 has	G	E	UA	-	√	√√	√	√	xx	Greenbelt. Highways Agency-concerns over no. of trips generated. Archaeological potential. Potential for Ferrybridge PS rail connection utilised.	1	23.3%	Rejected Option	Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements.	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				B/G	W/E/D	SH	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En					FZ
<b>N138</b>	Land at Forge Hill Lane, Knottingley	Part Employment Zone, Green Corridor	4.30 has	B	E	UA	-	√	√	√	√	-	Within Knottingley M62 Extension AQMA. Zone 3 Flood Map, may be Zone 3b presence. Will need review on SHN impact. Western end-archaeological potential. Metro: good location.	1 2 3b	25.6%	Rejected Option	Land can only be allocated for development if there is a definite development proposal. The current designation of the site employment zone should be retained – it supports the continuing industrial use of the site. An industrial allocation is unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements.
<b>Normanton (inc Altofts)</b>																	
<b>N32</b>	Land at Church Lane, Normanton	Green Belt	1.55 has	G	E	UA	-	√	√	√	?	xx	Green belt. Metro: reasonable location. Subject of local drainage difficulties - COW.	1	35.3%	Rejected Option	Not in accordance with green belt policy. No exceptional circumstances are demonstrated to justify modification of the green belt.
<b>N72</b>	Lower Altofts	Employment Allocation	15.51 has	B/G	W/E	UA	-	√	√	√	√	x/-	-	1 2 3	26.6%	Rejected Option	Deliverability issue. Impact on local community.
<b>South Elmsall/ South Kirkby</b>																	
<b>SE16</b>	Land at North Elmsall	Green Belt	3.08 has	G	E	LSC	-	√	-	-	√	xx	-	1	13.6%	Rejected Option	This site would be small and isolated from the main Dale Lane Estate. It would be dissected by the line of the proposed Hemsworth-A1 Link road. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements.
<b>SE79</b>	Land at Broad Lane, South Kirkby	Mixed Housing / Commercial	46.46 has	G	E	UA	-	x	√	?	?	xx	Poor infrastructure & transport provision. May need off-site improvements to Langthwaite Beck for flooding. No public foul sewer capacity. Green belt.	1	15.6%	Rejected Option	Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements. Green belt – no exceptional circumstances.
<b>Stanley/ Outwood</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				B/G	W/E/D	SH	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En					
														FZ			
W62	Wakefield Industrial Estate 41	Green Belt	3.93 has	G	E	SRC	-	√	x	-	√	xx	Should have TA. Within Wakefield City AQMA. Existing conflict of noise between uses – suggested site be used at offices as buffer to this. HA concern: No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J41 of M1. Metro: reasonable location.	1	22.8%	Rejected Option	Green Belt – exceptional circumstances not demonstrated for amending green belt. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements.
<b>Ackworth</b>																	
SE80	Hardakers Lane	Employment Allocation	1.18 has	B&G	W	LSC	-	√	√√	√	√√	x/-	-	1	22.7%	Rejected Option	Unsuitable as employment allocation due to residential property and deliverability issue.
<b>Crofton</b>																	
W48A	Land East of Priory Ridge, Crofton.	Green Belt & pt PAS	9.12 has	G	E	LSC	-	x	?	?	√√	xx	Local flooding issue, landfill gas zone. Mixed use may be preferable in traffic generation terms. Access constraint via Oakdene Drive. Water voles in the locality.	1	37.6%	Rejected Option	Green belt, Greenfield, urban extension, part PAS. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated for amending green belt.
W116	Land off Cock Lane, Crofton ii employment use	Green Belt	4.6 has	G	E	LSC	-	x	x	x	√√	xx	Site constraints and location. Needs satisfactory TA. Adjacent to Wakefield City AQMA. Metro: good location.	1	56.6%	Rejected Option	Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated for amending green belt.
W117	Land off Weeland Road, Crofton ii employment use	Green Belt	0.60 has	G	E	LSC	-	x	√	-	√√	xx	Access difficulties. Adjacent to Wakefield City AQMA. Green belt. May be gas supply difficulties.	1	59.4%	Rejected Option	Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated for amending green belt.
<b>Darrington</b>																	

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				B/G	W/E/D	SH	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En					FZ
N127	Land North of Grove Hall	Green Belt, Minerals Reserve	20.75 has	G	D	-	-	x	x	-	x	xx	Within A1 AQMA. No public sewers in vicinity. Land on green belt & partly over a protected mineral reserve. No mains in immediate vicinity. Metro: Poor Location. Location & access problems. No of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J33 and M62.	1	inaccess. Re bus stop	Rejected Option	Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements.
<b>Hall Green/ Chapelthorpe</b>																	
W53	Hollingthorpe Hall Farm i employment iii mixed use	Green Belt, Green Corridor	8.90 has	G	E	V	-	x	x	xx	√√	xx	-	1	20.8%	Rejected Option	Green belt, Greenfield, urban extension. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated for amending green belt.
<b>Other</b>																	
W40	Newmarket Colliery	Green Belt	93.65 has	G Pt B	D	-	-	x	?	√	-/x	xx	Site affected by flood zones and landfill gas zone. Impact on M62.	2, 3c 3b	4.1%	Rejected Option	Housing not sustainable in this isolated mixed use proposal but traffic and flood zones are not insurmountable. Too low in the sequential approach to selecting housing provision. An employment land allocation, for example for warehousing development, is unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated for amending green belt.

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access Model	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				B/G	W/E/D	SH	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En					FZ
W49	Nostell Priory Roses, Doncaster Road	Green Belt, Green Corridor	1.48 has	B	D	V	-	x	-	-	√√	x	Subject to listed building consent considerations including settings. Open aspect along Doncaster Road should be retained.	1	58.3%	Rejected Option	Feasibility must be questioned in view of listed building considerations. Should be considered in detail through the normal development control process as a departure. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated for amending green belt.
W50	Quarry and Brickworks, Long Row, Wragby	Green Belt, Green Corridor, Protected Habitat, Protected Mineral Reserve	17.07 has	G	D	V	-	x	x	x	√√	xx	SSSI and historic setting implications.	1	47.8%	Rejected Option	Green belt, green field, conflicts with SSSI and historic setting. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements.
W51	Walled Gardens / Nursery, Nostell Priory	Green Belt, Green Corridor	0.71 has	B	D	V	-	x	√	-	√√	xx	Landfill gas zone.	1	59.5%	Rejected Option	Green belt. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated for amending green belt.

## 6 Options Assessment: Community Facilities

### Key

SH	Settlement Hierarchy :-	SRC	Sub-regional centre	LSC	Local service centre
		PT	Principal service centre	V	Village
		UA	Urban area		
B	Brown Field	R	Supports the Regen Strategy	Ec	Economic sustainability
G	Green Field	S	In scale with the settlement	S	Social sustainability
				En	Environmental sustainability
W	Within Urban Area			EnT	Transport and Environment
E	Urban Extension				
D	Detached from Urban Area				

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
			SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En				
<b>Preferred Options</b>															
<b>Wakefield</b>															
W128	Pinderfields Hospital Redevelopment - Community Facility - Hospital	Special Policy Area and part Green Corridor	SRC	B	W	√	√	-	√√	√√	-	53.40%	Preferred Option	Planning permission has been granted. Allocate to protect the proposal.	
<b>Pontefract</b>															
N146	Pontefract General Infirmary Redevelopment - Community Facility - Hospital	Unallocated	PT	B	W	√	√	-	√√	√√	√	49.50%	Preferred Option	Planning permission has been granted. Allocate to protect the proposal.	
<b>Rejected Options</b>															
W122	East of Clay Pit Lane Site 1-10	Green Belt and Green Corridor	V	G	D	-	√	√√	√√	√√	xx	48.80%	Rejected Option	To be dealt with through positive policies rather than allocations. An allocation removing the green belt would be particularly difficult in this detached location.	

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
			SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En			
W123	Cricket Ground Site 2-5	Green Belt and Green Corridor	V	G	D	-	√	√√	√√	√√	xx	48.80%	Rejected Option	To be dealt with through positive policies rather than allocations. An allocation removing the green belt would be particularly difficult in this detached location.
SE75	Land at Wagon Lane / Wrangbrook Lane, Upton – Library, Bowling Greens, Clubhouse, Community Facilities	Unallocated, Green Corridor and Green Belt	LSC	G	E	-	√	-	√	√	xx	16.90%	Rejected	This is primarily a leisure proposal. Leisure policies and proposals from the UDP First Alteration have been 'saved' and will be reviewed in a later DPD. Therefore this proposal is not valid in relation to this DPD.

## 7 Options Assessment: Transport Proposals

Ec	Economic sustainability
S	Social sustainability
En	Environmental sustainability
EnT	Transport and Environment
E	Urban Extension
D	Detached from Urban Area

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	Sustainability Appraisal				Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En		
<b>Preferred Options</b>							
<b>Walton</b>							
W101	Barnsley Canal Restoration	-	√	-	-	Preferred Option	The proposed route of the restored Barnsley Canal is safeguarded from development to protect the potential for this scheme to be implemented. A feasibility study has been completed and reached positive conclusions. The scheme can be started well within the plan period, possibly even within the early years. A full environmental impact assessment will be undertaken as required prior to each phase.
<b>Rejected Options</b>							
<b>Knottingley</b>							

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	Sustainability Appraisal				Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En		
N120	Knottingley Relief Road					Rejected Option	The scale of development associated with the proposed new road is not in accordance with the development strategy incorporated in the Core Strategy DPD. This is also the case regarding what could be identified as a first phase - land adjoining Warwick Estate and its section of the road. A satisfactory case justifying the need for a relief road has not been made and any benefits could be quickly eroded through the impact of the proposed development.

## 8 ENVIRONMENT AND OPEN LAND PROPOSALS

### 8A Options Assessment: Protection of Biodiversity

The proposals listed as preferred options in the Sites Specific Proposals DPD Preferred Options report are conservation proposals – designations recommended by those with environmental expertise. The proposals include protection of ancient woodland, Wakefield nature areas and the Wakefield habitat network.

### 8B Options Assessment: Green Belt

- Ec Economic sustainability
- S Social sustainability
- En Environmental sustainability
- EnT Transport and Environment
- E Urban Extension
- D Detached from Urban Area

Ref	Villages within the Green Belt with Village Envelopes	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
<b>Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt</b>								
<b>Preferred Options</b>								
<b>Pontefract</b>								

Ref	Villages within the Green Belt with Village Envelopes	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
N145	New College, Park Lane, Pontefract	√	√	Xx	x	6	Preferred Option	To facilitate limited conversion and redevelopment of major developed sites and thus ensure continued beneficial use.
<b>North Featherstone</b>								
N144	St Wilfred's Catholic High School, North Featherstone	X	Xx	√√	xx	6	Preferred Option	To facilitate limited conversion and redevelopment of major developed sites and thus ensure continued beneficial use.
<b>Other</b>								
ACK43	Ackworth School	X	Xx	√√	xx	6	Preferred Option	To facilitate limited conversion and redevelopment of major developed sites and thus ensure continued beneficial use.
ACK44	Former Ackworth Colliery	X	Xx	√√	xx	5	Preferred Option	To facilitate limited conversion and redevelopment of major developed sites and thus ensure continued beneficial use.
SWR42	Bretton Hall	X	Xx	√	xx	4	Preferred Option	To facilitate limited conversion and redevelopment of major developed sites and thus ensure continued beneficial use.
<b>Rejected Options</b>								
<b>Hall Green/ Chapelthorpe</b>								

Ref	Villages within the Green Belt with Village Envelopes	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
W39	Land at Boyne Hill, Chapelthorpe, Wakefield	X	Xx	√	xx	4	Rejected Option	Site is not sufficiently large either in terms of site area or scale of built development to warrant this designation. If it were to be accepted, in order to be consistent, very many other sites would have to be identified and similarly recognised.
<b>Other</b>								
SE78	South Elmsall Waste Water Treatment Works	?	?	?	xx	0	Rejected Option	Site is not sufficiently large either in terms of site area or scale of built development to warrant this designation. If it were to be accepted, in order to be consistent, very many other sites would have to be identified and similarly recognised.
W109	Mitchell Laithes Waste Water Treatment Works	X	√	Xx	xx	0	Rejected Option	Site is not sufficiently large either in terms of site area or scale of built development to warrant this designation. If it were to be accepted, in order to be consistent, very many other sites would have to be identified and similarly recognised.

Ref	Villages within the Green Belt with Village Envelopes	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
W110	Horbury Waste Water Treatment Works	X	√	X	xx	3	Rejected Option	Site is not sufficiently large either in terms of site area or scale of built development to warrant this designation. If it were to be accepted, in order to be consistent, very many other sites would have to be identified and similarly recognised.
<b>Newly Proposed Green Belt</b>								
<b>Preferred Options</b>								
<b>Hemsworth</b>								
SE31	East of Railway, Hemsworth (HEM40)	-	√	Xx	-	Inaccessible with given criteria	Preferred Option	To safeguard land for green belt purposes. The UDP PAS area safeguarded land for possible employment development use but in an isolated greenfield location. It is not appropriate as an employment location other than possibly warehousing and there is no requirement for this use in view of the RSS position. There are exceptional circumstances for including this land in the green belt.
<b>Knottingley/ Ferrybridge</b>								

Ref	Villages within the Green Belt with Village Envelopes	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
N112	West Ings Lane, Knottingley (KNT23)	-	√	?	√√	1	Preferred Option	To safeguard land for green belt purposes. Realigned flood defences are exceptional circumstances for reviewing and amending the green belt boundaries.
<b>Rejected Options</b>								
	No Rejected Options							
<b>Proposed Minor Extensions to the Green Belt</b>								
<b>Preferred Options</b>								
<b>Ackworth Moor Top</b>								
SE82	Quarry View, Ackworth						Preferred Option	To safeguard land for green belt purposes. Anomaly - No features exist within the arable field. The proposal recognises the field boundary. The area is also outside the settlement boundary. Exceptional circumstances.
SE84	Kings Close, Ackworth						Preferred Option	To safeguard land for green belt purposes. Anomaly – No features exist within the field and railway cutting part of the site. The proposal recognises strong boundary features. The site also lies outside the settlement boundary. Exceptional circumstances.
<b>High and Low Ackworth</b>								

Ref	Villages within the Green Belt with Village Envelopes	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
SE83	Westfield Grove, Low Ackworth						Preferred Option	To safeguard land for green belt purposes. Anomaly – Part of a large open field: no feature followed by existing green belt boundary. Proposal recognises the field boundary and accords with the settlement boundary. Exceptional circumstances.
<b>Areas to be Excluded from the Green Belt</b>								
<b>Preferred Options</b>								
<b>Knottingley/ Ferrybridge</b>								

Ref	Villages within the Green Belt with Village Envelopes	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
N125A	Land at Ferrybridge Power Station	√√	√	x	xx	Inaccessi-ble with given criteria	Preferred Option	The creation of an employment zone on part of the operational land at Ferrybridge Power Station for power generation and associated uses only, has resulted in the need to revise the green belt boundary. The current green belt boundary as it crosses this site follows no physical features on the ground over much of its length. It is proposed instead that the site follows the line of the newly constructed A1M. The need to create a special employment zone to encourage investment, and the new road development, are considered to be exceptional circumstances that warrant the green belt revision.

## 8C Options Assessment: Open Land within Built-Up Areas

Ec Economic sustainability  
 S Social sustainability  
 En Environmental sustainability  
 EnT Transport and Environment  
 E Urban Extension  
 D Detached from Urban Area

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
<b>Preferred Options</b>								
<b>Wakefield</b>								
NWS44	Wrenthorpe Valley	-	√	?	√√		Preferred Option	To protect valuable recreational open space in the built-up area. The area is not suitable for green belt designation due to it being separated from the nearby countryside by urban development.
<b>Rejected Options</b>								
	No Rejected Options							

## 8D Options Assessment: Protected Area of Search for Long Term Development (PAS)

### Key

SH	Settlement Hierarchy :-	SRC	Sub-regional centre	LSC	Local service centre
		PT	Principal Town	V	Village
		UA	Urban area		
B	Brown Field	R	Supports the Regen Strategy	Ec	Economic sustainability
G	Green Field	S	In scale with the settlement	S	Social sustainability
				En	Environmental sustainability
W	Within Urban Area			EnT	Transport and Environment
E	Urban Extension				
D	Detached from Urban Area				

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En				
<b>Preferred Options</b>																
<b>Wakefield</b>																
NWS45	Lupset (W99)		6.6ha	SRC	G	E				-	√	?	√√	5	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
NWS47	Stanley Hall		5.08ha	SRC	G&B	E				-	√	?	√	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Castleford</b>																

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En			
CAS39	Adjoining Well Wood		8.15ha	PT	G	W			-	√	?	√	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
CAS40	East of Watling Road		2.79ha	PT	G	E			-	√	?	√	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Pontefract</b>															
N51B	Ackworth Road / Hardwick Road (PNT40 part)		7.91 has	PT	G	E			-	√	√√	√	4	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
PNT43	Land East of Cobblers Lane		19.56ha	PT	G	E			-	√	?	-	5	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En			
PNT44	Land North of Moor Lane, Carleton		8.96ha	PT	G	E			-	√	?	√	5	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Featherstone</b>															
FTH23	North of Pontefract Road		14.92ha	UA	G	E			-	√	?	-	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Hemsworth</b>															
HEM39	Land at Common End, Hemsworth		8.34ha	UA	G	E			-	√	?	-	1	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Knottingley/ Ferrybridge</b>															
KNT24	Springfields		11.33ha	UA	G	E			-	√	√	√	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En			
KNT25	Common Lane, West of Southmoor Lane		7.02ha	UA	G	D			-	√	?	√√	3	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
N131	Common Lane, Knottingley (KNT5)		9.15ha	UA	G	E			-	√	√	√√	14.70%	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
N132	Weeland Road, Knottingley (KNT6)		7.72	UA	G	E			-	√	√	√√	14.90%	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Normanton/ Altofts</b>															
NOR25	North and East of Ashfield		46.66ha	UA	B&G	E			-	√	?	√	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En			
NOR26 (part)	Altofts Hall Farm		49.40ha	UA	G	E			-	√	?	√	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Ossett</b>															
OH17	Storrs Hill, Ossett (W97)		2.82ha	UA	G	E			-	√	?	√	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>South Elmsall/ South Kirkby</b>															
SE53	Langthwaite Lane, South Kikby (EMS14)		8.66ha	UA	G	W			-	√	?	-	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
SE59	Rowley Lane, South Elmsall (EMS24)		0.7ha	UA	G	W			-	√	?	-	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En			
SE61	Common Road, South Kirkby (EMS17)		0.99ha	UA	G	E			-	√	?	-	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Stanley/ Outwood</b>															
NWS46	Lofthouse Colliery (W7)		11.48ha	UA	G	W			-	√	?	√√	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Crofton</b>															
W43C	South of Bedford and Hill Top Farms, Crofton		2.33ha	LSC	G	D			-	√	?	-	5	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Fitzwilliam/ Kinsley</b>															
HEM37	Wakefield Road, Kinsley		2.97ha	LSC	G	E			-	√	?	-	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Hall Green/ Chapelthorpe</b>															

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En			
SEW35	Land North of Hollingthorpe Estate, Hall Green (W85)		2.82ha	V	G	E			-	√	?	-	5	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>South Hiendley</b>															
HEM38	Orchard Drive, South Heindley		0.8ha	V	G	E			-	√	?	-	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Streethouse</b>															
FTH24	Land East of Streethouse		3.41ha	V	G	E			-	√	?	√√	6	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Upton</b>															
SE77	EMS59 Sheepwalk Lane Upton		27.24 ha	G	E	LSC			√√	√	√	x	14.4%	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Walton</b>															

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En			
WCS34	Waterways Land, Walton (W60)		13.10ha	V	G	E			-	√	?	√	5	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
WCS35	Grove House Farm, Walton (W6)		4.77ha	V	G	E			-	√	?	√	5	Preferred Option	Not required for development during the period to 2021. It has value as an area to be considered for development for residential use to avert loss of green belt.
<b>Rejected Options</b>															
<b>Wakefield</b>															
NWS48	North of Ruskin Avenue (W103)		4.44ha	UA	G	W			-	√	?	√	6	Rejected Option	See Housing proposal W103 The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En			
SEW34	Durkar Lane, Crigglestone (W42)		9.77ha	SRC	G	W			-	√	?	√	5	Rejected Option	See Housing proposal W42 The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.
<b>Pontefract</b>															
PNT40	Ackworth Road / Hardwick Road (PNT40 part – N51A)		7.90ha	PT	G	E			-	√	?	√	5	Rejected Option	Required as a housing allocation – see N51A.  The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En			
N109	Land between Knottingley Road and Ferrybridge Road (PNT42)		15.06 ha	PT	G	E			-	√	?	√	6	Rejected Option	Required as a housing allocation – see N109A & B.  The proposals are in accordance with the development strategy, perform well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.
<b>Knottingley/ Ferrybridge</b>															
KNT23	West Ings Lane, Knottingley (N112)		6.97ha	UA	G	E			-	√	?	√√	1	Rejected Option	To become green belt. No development potential for housing use due to realignment of flood defences and flood risk.
<b>Normanton/ Altofts</b>															
N113A	Normanton Station Areas, NOR25 (part)		2.72ha	UA	G	E			√	√√	√√	-/x	6	Rejected Option	Required as a Special Policy Area.  The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En			
N114A	Station Road, Normanton NOR26 (part)		4.75ha	UA	B	W			√	√√	√√	√	6	Rejected Option	Required as a housing allocation.  The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.
<b>Crofton</b>															
WCS32	Santingley Lane Crofton (W48B)		2.27ha	LSC	G	E			-	√	?	-	5	Rejected Option	Required as a housing allocation.  The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.
<b>Other</b>															

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model  ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	En T	En			
HEM40	East of Railway, Hemsworth (SE31)		18.69ha	UA	G	D			√	-	x	-	Inaccessible with given criteria	Rejected Option	To become green belt. Development would be remote and unsustainable. Unnecessary as a consequence of RSS and Core Strategy development land requirements.

## 8E Options Assessment: Land Reclamation

Ec	Economic sustainability
S	Social sustainability
En	Environmental sustainability
EnT	Transport and Environment
E	Urban Extension
D	Detached from Urban Area

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	Sustainability Appraisal				Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En		
<b>Preferred Options</b>							
<b>Castleford</b>							
CAS41	Former Fryston and Wheldale Colliery Areas	-	√	?	?/ √√	Preferred Option	Currently programmed in conjunction with the English Partnerships – WMDC masterplan.
<b>Pontefract</b>							
N147	Former Prince of Wales Colliery Yard and Tip	-	√	?	?/ √√	Preferred Option	Reclamation of both the former colliery yard and tip areas is the subject of restoration proposals incorporated in two current planning applications.
<b>South Elmsall/ South Kirkby</b>							
EMS67	Former Frickley Colliery	-	√	?	?/ √√	Preferred Option	Currently programmed in conjunction with the English Partnerships – WMDC masterplan.
<b>Streethouse</b>							

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	Sustainability Appraisal				Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En		
W129	Former Charlston Colliery	-	√	?	?/ √√	Preferred Option	Reclamation of the former colliery area is the subject of restoration proposals incorporated in the current planning application.
<b>Rejected Options</b>							
	No Rejected Options						

## 8F Options Assessment: Mineral Safeguarding Areas

Ec	Economic sustainability
S	Social sustainability
En	Environmental sustainability
EnT	Transport and Environment
E	Urban Extension
D	Detached from Urban Area

Site Ref	Site Name and Proposed Land Use	Sustainability Appraisal				Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments
		Ec	S	En T	En			
<b>Preferred Options</b>								
N150	South Knottingley - Darrington	?	?	?	?		Preferred Option	To safeguard limestone reserves in the east of the District south of Knottingley
NOR5	Greenfield Road, South of Altofts	?	?	?	?		Preferred Option	To safeguard clay reserves south of Altofts.
W61	Stanley Ferry, Wakefield	?	?	?	?		Preferred Option	To safeguard sand and gravel reserves east of Wakefield.
W84	The Wyke, Horbury	√√	?	?	xx		Preferred Option	To safeguard sand and gravel reserves south of Horbury.
<b>Rejected Options</b>								
N95	Land at Leys Lane, Knottingley	?	?	?	?	-	Rejected Option	Incorporated in N150 above.
NOR3	Birkwood Lock, West of Altofts	?	?	?	?	-	Rejected Option	Incorporated in W61 above.
PNT5	Darrington Leys	?	?	?	?	-	Rejected Option	Incorporated in N150 above.

## 9 Options Assessment: Special Policy Areas

### Key

SH	Settlement Hierarchy :-	SRC	Sub-regional centre	LSC	Local service centre
		PT	Principal Town	V	Village
		UA	Urban area		

B	Brown Field	R	Supports the Regen Strategy
G	Green Field	S	In scale with the settlement
W	Within Urban Area		
E	Urban Extension		
D	Detached from Urban Area		

Ec	Economic sustainability
S	Social sustainability
En	Environmental sustainability
EnT	Transport and Environment

<sup>1</sup> remaining areas not included in proposed sites

<sup>2</sup> excluding areas with planning permission

FZ Flood zone status

Site Ref	Site Name	UDP FA Designation	Site Capacity (hectares, dwellings)	Conformity with RSS, Core Strategy, Regeneration Strategy					Sustainability Appraisal				Major Site Constraints	Access. Model ( meets indicators score /6 )	Preferred Option / Rejected Option	Reasons and Comments	
				SH	B/G	W/E/D	R	S	Ec	S	EnT	En					FZ
<b>Preferred Options</b>																	
<b>Wakefield</b>																	
NWS64	Junction 40, Dewsbury Road (W111) ("Silkwood Park")	Special Policy Area	18.73 has (NWS64 – 46.46 has)	SRC	G	W	-	√	x	-	x	xx	Existing allocation – constraints can be overcome (the review found no overriding changed circumstances). Development acceptable in principle.	1	42.8%	<b>Preferred Option</b>	Retain the Special Policy Area to be developed for employment use (including the proposed B1 light industrial buffer proposal for W107) most of which has planning permission, but modify the allocation to exclude the area which was not to be developed and which is a preferred option as a housing allocation (W107). This makes more beneficial use of the undeveloped buffer area.

<b>NWS65</b>	Land at Snowhill (W1A) Paragon Business Park Extension, Nov '07 masterplan modified 2008 – 2018	Special Policy Area	65.09 has SPA	SRC	B&G	W	-	√	√√	√√	√√	√√/-	Traffic generation – impact on local highway network. Prospect of issues being resolved.	1	6 42.9%	<b>Preferred Option</b>  1200d	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>A modified masterplan would be in accordance with the proposed Special Policy Area. This is a mixed use development of primarily housing (1200 units) and office uses not suitable for town centre locations within the urban area.</p> <p>The significant B1 outline planning permission is accepted as the basis for a major element of the mixed uses within the masterplan. B1 proposals should be proposals inappropriate for town centre locations to be in accordance with PPS6.</p> <p>Phasing is in accordance with draft masterplan.</p>
<b>SEW50</b>	SEW50 Junction 39	Special Policy Area	54.5 has	SRC	G	W	√	√	√√	√√	√√	xx	-	1, 2, 3a 3b	4 36.1%	<b>Preferred Option</b>	<p>This site had planning permission before Initial SA &amp; technical consultations were undertaken and before March '07.</p>
<b>Castleford</b>																	

CAS63	Former Glasshoughton Colliery (N71)	Special Policy Area		PT	B	W/E	√	√	√√	√√	√√	-	-	1	5 32.8%	<b>Preferred Option</b>	This site had planning permission before SA & technical consultations were undertaken and before March '07. No review was consequently undertaken.
<b>N9 (inc. N101, N151, N42, N115, N143 and N152)</b>	Castleford Riverside Special Policy Area	Special Policy Area, Employment zone, Green corridor, Proposed reclamation scheme, Priority improvement area	263.7 has	PT	B&G	W/E	√	√	√√	√√	√√	Xx	<p>In the western part of this area in the vicinity of the former C6 site a 2Ha Natural Greenspace is required. Land may be potentially contaminated. High probability of flooding. Site within 250m of 3 historic landfill sites producing landfill gas.</p> <p>Parts in the east of the area are affected by past sandworkings.</p> <p>Metro: good location. Near landfill sites.</p> <p>Subject of highways strategic investigation. Parts of site affected by flood zones and HSE consultation zones.</p>	1, 2, 3a 3b 3c	6 27.3%	<b>Preferred Option</b>	<p>Overwhelming regeneration and sustainability case for redevelopment of this part of central and eastern Castleford. Substantial reclamation needs. The proposal makes a positive contribution to sustainable communities and sustainable objectives of the Core Strategy. The regeneration area includes former collieries and chemical works within the urban area. There are brownfield and Greenfield development areas within urban area.</p> <p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p>

<p>N9 (inc. N101, N151, N42, N115, N143 and N152)</p>																	<p>Mitigation - contributions will be required to comprehensive highway scheme in Castleford. Flood zone mitigation required for 3a area will need to be agreed with the Environment Agency – sequential and exception tests need to be satisfied.</p> <p>Subject to a FRA finding that residual flood risks are acceptable and can be managed and the development makes a positive contribution to reducing or managing risks. No hard development in 3b and 3c parts – consider these areas for wildlife/ open space. Environmental impact on SSSI and other important habitat areas in Leeds District must be assessed in detail at the planning application stage and be acceptable. On-site wildlife habitat should be enhanced. If required an environmental buffer zone could be created.</p>
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Pontefract																	
N1A	Former Prince of Wales Colliery	Green Belt (pt.) Green corridor, Unallocated (pt) employment land allocation	75.1 has 750-913d  5.45 has employment	PT	B	W	√	√	√√	√√	√√	x	HA position unclear – strategic highway constraint re N1 generally. Local highway network situation potentially capable of being resolved. Very small part of wider site is affected by flood zones.	1 2 3a	5	<b>Preferred Option</b>  (modified) 927d – Masterplan (includes N1C & N1D but excludes green belt N1E) (includes 10 live work units)	There is a strong regeneration case for the development of site N1A. However, the planning application has demonstrated that the urban extension into the green belt is not necessary to financially support the redevelopment of the colliery yard site. Therefore the proposal should be modified to exclude the Green Belt area.  The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.

N1A																	<p>Planning requirements must deal with the strategic highway constraint. Site A is mostly brownfield land and an urban extension into the green belt. Mitigation - Flood zones 2 and 3a will be excluded from the development area  Reject extensive non-conforming development in the green belt. Much higher proportion of Greenfield development.</p> <p>Sub-sites C &amp; D are part of the comprehensive proposals for the proposed SPA. Sub-site N1D is subject to the satisfactory relocation of the football pitch.  A transport assessment crucially incorporating a travel plan will be required.  A new highway to provide access and improvements at J32 may be required.</p> <p>Phasing is in accordance with masterplan.</p>
-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Featherstone																	
N91	Land at Lister Close, Featherstone	Unallocated, Green Corridor	21.06 has 150 d	UA	B&G	W	√	x	√	√√	√√	x/xx	Site partly affected by flood zones.	2, 3a	6	<b>Preferred Option part 150</b>	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>Mitigation – area to be developed will be primarily brownfield. Substantial open space areas will be retained and upgraded. The form of development must fully take account of wildlife habitat. Flood zone 3a area will be excluded from the 'hard' housing development area.</p> <p>Proposals are at a policy level and need to be developed in detail – developable but not currently deliverable.</p>
Hemsworth																	
HEM61	Land between bus station and Little Hemsworth, Hemsworth (SE38)	Special Policy Area		UA	B&G	W	√	√	√√	√√	√√	-			6 36.3%	<b>Preferred Option</b>	<p>This site had planning permission before SA &amp; technical consultations were undertaken and before March '07. No review was consequently undertaken.</p>

Knottingley (inc Ferrybridge)																	
N36A	Knottingley Riverside A & B (inc. KNT29)	Employment Zone, Housing Allocation, Green corridor (pt)	12.47 has	UA	B	W	√	√	√	√√	√√	-	Site partly affected by flood zones. AQMA	2 3a 3b	6 28%	<b>Preferred Option</b> 30d 12.47 has	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>There is a strong regeneration case, brownfield within urban area.</p> <p>Mitigation - flood zone 3b will be excluded from the hard development area. No housing development will be located within the flood zone 3a area which will be generally employment use. Special Policy Area. (Planning permission granted prior to end March '07 on quarry site for 134 dwellings.)</p> <p>Proposals are at a policy level and need to be developed in detail – developable but not currently deliverable.</p>

Normanton (inc Altofts)																	
N86	Normanton Station Areas - Adjoining Normanton Town Centre	Unallocated	12.70 has 400d 250 in plan period	UA	B	W/E	√	√	√√	√√	√√	√	Landfill gas zone. Contamination risk.	1	6 44.9%	<b>Preferred Option 250</b>	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>Regeneration case – edge of town centre brownfield urban special policy area. The purpose of the Special Policy Area is to encourage the regeneration of this town centre area for a mix of housing, offices and, in appropriate locations, retailing development.</p> <p>Proposals are at a policy level and need to be developed in detail – developable but not currently deliverable.</p>

South Elmsall/ South Kirkby																	
SE10	Westfield Lane Improvement Area, South Elmsall	Green Belt (pt.)	36.49 has Masterplan 600d – 850d (minus 46d) by 2017 gives 679 mid-point. -SE20, -SE41	UA	B&G	W	√	x	√	√√	√√	x	Flood zone affects part of site. Access and education provision issues capable of being overcome.	2 3a 3b	6	<p><b>Preferred Option</b></p> <p>Capacity modified to excl SE20 + SE41+pp</p>	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.</p> <p>Westfield Lane Improvement Area - regeneration through housing growth. Relocate and upgrade open space uses.</p> <p>Mitigation – flood zone areas 3a and 3b will be excluded from 'hard' development proposals.</p> <p>Outline pp 46d 24/11/2005 {Masterplan 600 – 850d by 2017 proposed in the final masterplan including SE10, SE20 &amp; SE41}.</p> <p>Phasing is in accordance with the masterplan.</p>

Rejected Options																	
Wakefield																	
<b>W107A</b>	Land at Dewsbury Road, Wakefield	Special Policy Area, Green Corridor	10.56 has 387d	SRC	G	W	-	√	√	√√	√√	x	Advise Transport Assessment. Adjacent to Wakefield City AQMA. Of concern to HA- no of trips could potentially disrupt safe operation of J40 of M1.	1	5	Rejected Option	The proposal is in accordance with the development strategy, performs well within the settlement in terms of sequential approach, and mitigation measures are considered to be capable of resolving or minimising to an acceptable degree constraints and sustainability issues.  Housing use is preferred because it makes more beneficial use of the site. Masterplan proposals 387 housing units (+ 29,000 sq ft B1 industrial units on the adjacent site as a buffer).
Pontefract																	
<b>N1B</b>	Former Prince of Wales Colliery	Green Belt (pt.) Green corridor Unallocated (pt)	160.61 has As A + outdoor recreation.	PT	B&G	W&E	√	√	√√	√√	√√	xx	HA position unclear – strategic highway constraint re N1 generally. Local highway network situation potentially capable of being resolved. Very small part of wider site is affected by flood zones.	1, 2, 3a 3b	5 36.7%	Rejected Option	Contrary to green belt policy. Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated.
<b>N1E</b>	Former Prince of Wales Colliery - Green Belt Triangle  Housing Proposal	Green Belt, Green Corridor	13 has – 520d	PT	G	E	-	√	√√	√√	√√	xx		1	6	Rejected Option	Green belt and urban extension that has been demonstrated not to be an essential integrated part of the colliery yard redevelopment proposals. Evaluated as part of N1A and deleted as a modification to the preferred options proposal.

Upton																	
EMS59	Sheepwalk Lane Upton (SE77)	Special Policy Area	27.24 has	LSC	G	E	√	√	√√	√	√	x	Constraints seriously affect the site in terms of development costs.	1	14.4%	Rejected Option	Special Policy Area should become PAS. Developability is in question in view of lack of progress over the UDP period. New Hemsworth – A1 link road may facilitate development. This rejected option helps to address the RSS employment land over-supply in the District.