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1. Introduction

This Statement of Consultation has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Regulations require that as part of the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD’s) a Statement of Consultation should be prepared.

The Statement sets out what was done to consult with the district and other stakeholders detailing the methods used and the people involved to meet the requirements of Regulation 12 for the Consultation on the Wakefield Residential Design Guide (RDG) SPD Consultation Draft document. The consultation took place in January and February 2017, asking people for their thoughts on the document.

In addition to the Regulations the Council has a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which explains how the community and organisations and stakeholders can take part in the process of developing the SPD. The SCI was adopted by the Council on 8 February 2006. It sets out how and which persons and bodies the Council will engage with, when preparing SPD’s.

1.1 Who was consulted?

The Council's SCI sets out how the community and organisations can take part in the planning process. The list of organisations and people to be consulted in relation to SPD documents are:

- Specific organisations
- General organisations
- Government departments and additional organisations
- Interested parties
- Residents and residents groups

Appendix B lists the organisations, persons and bodies notified of the consultation and invited to make representations, based on the SCI. Those who have asked to be kept informed of the progress of planning documents are also detailed.

Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended by section 11 of the Localism Act, introduced a duty to cooperate in relation to the planning of sustainable development. Regulation 4 of the 2012 Town and Country Planning (England) Regulations lays out the bodies that must be consulted under the provisions of the Act. These bodies were all informed of the consultation and invited to make representations.
### 1.2 Engagement Methods/ Activities

The **Consultation Draft** document (2017) followed the Initial Consultation that took place in January / February 2016. The Initial Consultation asked 6 questions, the responses received to these questions and the answers and responses to them are set out in the ‘Initial Consultation Statement of Consultation’ (January 2017).

The Residential Design Guide (RDG) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) comprises of two volumes:

- **Part 1 - Guidance for Housebuilders** which is designed to support developers, their design professionals and agents in preparing proposals for residential development and;

- **Part 2 - Guidance for Householders** provides advice for people who wish to extend or alter a property.

Part 1 of the RDG has been revised following feedback from the Consultation in February 2017. Consultation on the **Revised Consultation Draft** of Part 1 takes place in September/October 2017. Part 2 of the guidance does not require any further consultation.

The key consultation activities for the **Consultation Draft** were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal notification of where the documents may be inspected and how representations may be made.</strong></td>
<td>Over 1000 bodies and persons notified in writing (email or letter) of the consultation and invited to make representations – using the Councils consultation software - Objective.</td>
<td>List of consultees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal notification of where the documents may be inspected and how representations may be made.</strong></td>
<td>Public notice in the Wakefield Newspaper Group – Wakefield Express (12/01/17), Pontefract and Castleford Express (11/01/17)</td>
<td>Scanned images of the notice(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where documents were available for inspection.</strong></td>
<td>Information posters were displayed throughout the consultation period at community centres, libraries across the district and district housing offices.</td>
<td>Copy of the poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective - Council’s online consultation portal at:</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://consult.wakefield.gov.uk/portal">http://consult.wakefield.gov.uk/portal</a></td>
<td>Screen shot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Website updates</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.wakefield.gov.uk/residents/planning/policy/supplementary-documents">http://www.wakefield.gov.uk/residents/planning/policy/supplementary-documents</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Media</strong></td>
<td>Council’s Corporate Facebook: <a href="https://www.facebook.com/mywakefield">https://www.facebook.com/mywakefield</a></td>
<td>Screen shot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s Business Lounge Carousel</td>
<td>Copy of slide used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notification of community representatives and contacts.</strong></td>
<td>All 63 local councillors representing the 21 wards in the district were notified of the consultation by email on 13.01.17</td>
<td>Email sent is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All town and parish councils were notified formally on 13.01.17</td>
<td>Email sent is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Exhibitions</strong></td>
<td>Public exhibition was located in Wakefield One from 16 to 23 January 2017, manned on 2 separate occasions. Carlton Lanes Shopping Centre, Castleford on 19 January 2017. Manned public exhibition in the Ridings Shopping Centre Event Space, Wakefield City Centre on 20 January 2017.</td>
<td>Exhibition boards &amp; summary from Integreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Meeting with Civic Society on 18.01.17</td>
<td>Meeting Notes &amp; presentation slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Design Guide Developer Roundtable 17.01.17</td>
<td>Copy of agenda. Notes from the event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Representations Summary

In all, there were 66 representations received on the RDG Consultation Draft. These comprised of:

Part 1 – a total of 68 comments received from 19 contributors, 12 comments were inadmissible.
Part 2 – a total of 21 comments from 3 contributors, 11 comments were inadmissible.

The comments were received in the following ways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RDG Part 1 Consultation Draft</th>
<th>RDG Part 2 Consultation Draft</th>
<th>RDG in total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Web (consultation portal)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1 Summary of Comments and Responses to the Draft Consultation

Consultation on the Draft Consultation asked for people for their thoughts on the document, the comments received are detailed below along with the response from the Council and Integreat Plus, for Part 1 and 2 of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
## Part 1 – Guidance for Housebuilders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Relevant section or theme</th>
<th>Organisation/Individual</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Integreat Plus/ Council’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG102</td>
<td>Page 28</td>
<td>Mr Graham Roberts</td>
<td>Artists are well placed to express local character and suitably qualified professional artists should be engaged as design team members in every housing development of more than 20 units, or where social spaces are planned. Public art will add cultural value and might be used by the developer to enhance brand value.</td>
<td>Noted. Section 2.06 Public Open Spaces contains relevant advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG104</td>
<td>Page 8</td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire &amp; Barratt Homes West Yorkshire</td>
<td>Object to requirement for layout plan showing all windows, details of all house types will be provided as part of the application. Also this document should not reference marketing material; this is for the developers to determine.</td>
<td>Objection noted. A layout plan with such detail assists in assessing Aspect Related Standards. This is carried forward from the existing RDG (SPG 2) and is expected in the majority of cases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.06 Public Open Spaces

Mr Graham Roberts

Artists are well placed to express local character and suitably qualified professional artists should be engaged as design team members in every housing development of more than 20 units, or where social spaces are planned. Public art will add cultural value and might be used by the developer to enhance brand value.

**Noted.**

Section 2.06 Public Open Spaces contains relevant advice.

A layout plan with such detail assists in assessing Aspect Related Standards. This is carried forward from the existing RDG (SPG 2) and is expected in the majority of cases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG105</th>
<th>Page 44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.15 Private Outdoor Space and Rear Gardens</td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire &amp; Barratt Homes West Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advice to avoid minimum standards for the width and length of spaces has an impact on size of dwellings, cost and consequently sales price. We will adhere to building regs. Not one for the design guidance.</td>
<td>Section has been edited. References to minimum sizes removed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG106</th>
<th>Pages 47 &amp; 48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.18 Ventilation Air Quality &amp; Noise</td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire &amp; Barratt Homes West Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete both pages, this is building regulations.</td>
<td>Reviewed in relation to building regulations and amended slightly. Council to confirm. This section is advisory and is not intended to conflict with the building regulations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG107</th>
<th>Page 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Local Character and Design Concept</td>
<td>Mr Ian Sanderson, West Yorkshire Archaeology Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would recommend including a recommendation in the text to consult the West Yorkshire Historic Environment Record held by the West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service, &amp; particularly the Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) data held. The HLC covers the entire Wakefield District (not just Conservation Areas) &amp; would help both contextualise any development &amp; aid in the understanding of the character of the area of interest.</td>
<td>Text added to advise consultation of HLC data. (Paragraphs 2.03.02 and 2.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG108</th>
<th>Page 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.25 Design For</td>
<td>Mr Ian Sanderson, West Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would recommend including in the text the recommendation to consult the West Yorkshire Historic</td>
<td>Recommendation to use the records added to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Locations</td>
<td>Archaeology Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG109</td>
<td>Page 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG111</td>
<td>Page 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG112</td>
<td>Page 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG113</td>
<td>Page 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG114</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG115</td>
<td>Page IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG116</td>
<td>Page 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG117</td>
<td>Page 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 2.19.10</td>
<td>Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG118</td>
<td>Page 63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RDG119 | Page 54  
2.21 Biodiversity | Mr Andrew McGuiness | Suggestion: Attach Ecological Survey seasons within appendices or as a table.  
Look at: Validation Checklists (Association Local Government Ecologists) access on ALGE website. This provides valuable information and flow charts and has been endorsed by Natural England, DEFRA and Royal Town Planning Institute as best practice West Yorkshire Ecology guidance on bats. | Policy on ecology both nationally and locally that deals with this is already referenced in the RDG. |
| RDG120 | Page 54  
2.21 Biodiversity | Mr Andrew McGuiness | Wakefield Council is dedicated to preserving its unique biodiversity and ecological assets. Therefore, developments should consider these different elements:  
1 look for development to provide a net benefit for biodiversity conservation with no significant loss of habitats or populations of species, locally or nationally  
2 integrate nature conservation into all planning decisions looking for development to deliver social, economic and environmental objectives together over time  
3 forge and strengthen links between the town and country planning system and biodiversity action planning particularly through policies in local development plans and the preparation of supplementary planning guidance that adds value to Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) by highlighting the ways in which the planning system can help to deliver the objectives of LBAPs in practical ways  
4 adopt a step-wise approach to avoid harm to nature conservation, minimise unavoidable harm by mitigation measures, offset residual harm by compensation measures and look for new opportunities to enhance nature conservation; where there may be Text amended to refer to developments providing net gains for biodiversity. Points raised in relation to developing a site or not due to its ecology are dealt with in existing planning policy and therefore does not need to be dealt with in the RDG. |
significant harmful effects local planning authorities will need to be satisfied that any reasonable alternative sites that would result in less or no harm have been fully considered.

Development should, therefore:
1 be sensitive to potential impacts on biodiversity, and consider alternative designs or locations
2 avoid damaging areas of nature conservation value (whether designated or not)
3 aim to minimise any unavoidable effects through appropriate mitigations
4 offer compensation for those impacts that cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated
5 seek opportunities to enhance biodiversity within new developments
6 establish linkages between habitats to create functional ecological networks.

Where planning permission is granted, it may be necessary to incorporate safeguards as part of the scheme, by condition and/or legal agreement.

| RDG121 | Page 54 | Mr Andrew McGuinness | May be worth including some guidance on bats and birds | 2.21 has been amended to include a reference to making provision for bats and birds. Existing Local Plan policies also deal with ecology and wildlife protection and would need to be considered when drawing up proposals and |
These comments are on behalf of Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire & Barratt Homes West Yorkshire:

1. The document is far too lengthy and unwieldy and is not user friendly. It contains a lot of information, that is either unnecessary or repeated elsewhere in other documents. A guide such as this should be short, to the point and encourage focus on the major and important aspects needed to be addressed.

2. Although this document is supposed to be a 'guide', it is stated that this will be given significant weight, which is very concerning at present.

3. We have major concerns regarding the requirement for 1.5m to a side boundary, which is unjustified and will have a detrimental impact on density and therefore housing numbers, which everybody appreciates is of paramount importance at this time.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG123</th>
<th>Page 46</th>
<th>2.17 Accessible Housing and Lifetime Homes</th>
<th>Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire &amp; Barratt Homes West Yorkshire</th>
<th>Lifetime Homes should be a matter for the Building Regulations or where a specific need can be justified.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>These comments are on behalf of Taylor Wimpey</td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire &amp; Barratt Homes West</td>
<td>The section has been amended but the Council still wishes to encourage the delivery of homes taking account of the Lifetime Homes Criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire &amp; Barratt Homes West Yorkshire</td>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Barratt Homes West Yorkshire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The document has been condensed and is now 20 pages shorter.
2. This is set by the council, and the remit of the document was that it would be given significant weight.
3. The requirement for 1.5m to a side boundary has been amended to 1m.
| RDG124 | Page 9  
1.04 Public Open Spaces | Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire & Barratt Homes West Yorkshire | Flexibility required for quantity and timing of provision of POS subject to site specific circumstances. | The Public Open Space Section has been redrafted to include thresholds and requirements regarding open space provision. Further detail is also set out in the Leisure, Recreation & Open Space Local Plan. |
|--------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| RDG125 | Page 9  
1.04 Public Open Spaces | Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire & Barratt Homes West Yorkshire | Not always possible to provide all on-site POS in one location on a site. Therefore must be treated as an aspiration rather than a requirement. | The RDG continues to advise that open space is best provided in one location on most sites. However the guide does not preclude multiple areas of POS being provided. |
| RDG126 | Page 32  
2.10 Housing Mix | Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire & Barratt Homes West Yorkshire | Object to "Developments should accommodate a mix of residents regardless of location. Location is crucial!" | Text amended to align more clearly with Core Strategy Policy CS6. |
| RDG127 | General and page 36  
2.11 Green Infrastructure and | Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire & Barratt Homes | Need to be very careful seeking something which later the Council's S38 team won’t adopt. Otherwise this guidance could have serious flaws as soon as it is adopted. For example, page 37 recommends trees along the street corridor. Are the Council willing to adopt and | The RDG provides guidance on street trees that needs to be considered in conjunction with the |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.12 Street Materials</td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire &amp; Barratt Homes West Yorkshire</td>
<td>Disagree with the statement here. There is a significant price difference between natural and artificial stone. This difference multiplied on a large scheme can significantly impact on viability.</td>
<td>Text amended to remove reference to direct cost comparison, however overall point that laying costs, longevity and maintenance make cost difference between natural and artificial marginal reiterated. Using a small proportion of natural stone to define areas etc, and mixed with artificial can offer a pleasing design solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG129</td>
<td>Page 41</td>
<td>2.18 Design of the Homes and Garden</td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire &amp; Barratt Homes West Yorkshire</td>
<td>As for noise, need to say that air quality subject to mitigation can be acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG130</td>
<td>Page 51</td>
<td>2.19 Future Proof Design and Renewable</td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire &amp;</td>
<td>Support the fabric first approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG131</td>
<td>Page 51</td>
<td>Technological Design &amp; Renewable Technologies</td>
<td>Page 51</td>
<td>Agree to fabric first approach but object to the requirement that all new houses require on-site renewable technologies. Through fabric first and other measures, on-site renewable technologies may not be necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG132</td>
<td>Page 13</td>
<td>Drainage, Flood Risk and SuDS</td>
<td>Page 13</td>
<td>Future maintenance/management of drainage system. Object to requirement for a whole life maintenance/management plan for a planning application. Yorkshire Water usually adopt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG133</td>
<td>Page 79</td>
<td>National Space Standards Best Practice</td>
<td>Page 79</td>
<td>Object to this paragraph. Customers choose what meets their requirements and affordability, not what will make it easier to see or rent in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RDG134 | Page 79  
| 4.01 National Space Standards - Best Practice | Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire & Barratt Homes West Yorkshire | Customers work on number of bedrooms plus types of rooms not bedspace. When anyone does a search on Rightmove they will go over number of bedrooms over total size of a property. | Text amended to make point clearer. |
| RDG135 | Page 79  
| 4.01 National Space Standards - Best Practice  
Paragraph 4.01.05 | Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire & Barratt Homes West Yorkshire | Do other Countries have minimum densities to try and achieve and high land prices? | Point within the RDG is valid. Reference added to RIBA. |
| RDG136 | Page 80  
<p>| 4.02 Furniture Space Guide – Best Practice | Taylor Wimpey Yorkshire, Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire &amp; Barratt Homes West Yorkshire | Object to this page, request it is deleted. People will kit out rooms how they want to. There should not be a uniformed approach or set way in which this should be done. Notwithstanding this, it is not a material planning consideration. | The page does not suggest that there should be a uniformed approach to room layout, indeed it emphasises flexibility. Providing space to adequately fit furniture allows for this flexibility. |
| RDG137 | General | Mr Paul Thornton, Persimmon | Please refer to specific comments on behalf of Taylor | Comment noted. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Auditor</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homes (West Yorkshire)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wimpey, Barratt David Wilson and Persimmon: submitted by Neil Coxsidge of TW. A letter on behalf of all 3 will be sent to the Council setting out a number of comment and concerns about the approach the document takes and policies it seeks to impose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RDG138** Page 19  
Identifying Local Character and Design Concept  
Mr Lee Thompson, Sustrans – National Cycle Network  
Diagram gives no reference to accessibility. Building sustainable sites must be referenced at the earliest stage when located potential build sites.  
Diagram amended to include point no accessibility.  

**RDG139** Page 29 (and Page 34).  
2.07 Home Zones  
Mr Lee Thompson, Sustrans – National Cycle Network  
Home zones should prioritise pedestrians, cyclists and public transport connections to encourage healthy and sustainable modes of travel. Well intentioned and positively received – but need to be explicitly marked on example map on p.34  
Diagram on page 34 amended to include reference to Home Zones  

**RDG140** Page 30  
2.08 Location & Connections  
Mr Lee Thompson, Sustrans – National Cycle Network  
Consider using pedestrian and cycle-only routes that are well overlooked by dwellings and that link the central point(s) of a development with surrounding amenities and places of interest. Ensure cycling & walking are not limited to a few segregated routes, rather incorporated into wider street design and whole road network wherever possible.  
Cycling is dealt with in section 9 of the SDG. Wording amended in RDG need to better align with this.  

**RDG141** Page 33 & 34  
Streets for People  
Mr Lee Thompson, Sustrans – National Cycle Network  
People centred ethos is good and key to creating good developments  
No cycle infrastructure referenced at all in example design map – why not?  
Added cycling reference to diagram on page 34.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG142</th>
<th>Page 35</th>
<th>2.11 Prioritising People through Street Design</th>
<th>Mr Lee Thompson, Sustrans – National Cycle Network</th>
<th>Hierarchy prioritisation model is exactly right, however specific development advise does not reference this model – no mention of infrastructure to support hierarchy of users such as segregated cycle lanes etc. Fear is that the prioritisation only exists on paper and will not be replicated in real life build scenarios.</th>
<th>This is something that may need to be considered through the implementation strategy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG143</td>
<td>Page 39</td>
<td>2.13 Off Plot Parking for Visitors</td>
<td>Mr Lee Thompson, Sustrans – National Cycle Network</td>
<td>On street parking examples gives little or no consideration &amp; protection to cyclists. Examples of parking courts are much preferred and help to support the prioritisation hierarchy / Streets for People concept</td>
<td>A mixture of parking solutions are preferred. Parking courts are given as an example within the RDG but should be small and overlooked (for security).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG144</td>
<td>Page 53</td>
<td>2.20 Active or Sustainable Travel</td>
<td>Mr Lee Thompson, Sustrans – National Cycle Network</td>
<td>Omission of ‘Active or Sustainable Travel’ in terms of access to developments. Surely this needs to be considered to ensure sustainability is all encompassing in proposals?</td>
<td>This is well covered in the RDG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG145</td>
<td>Page 13</td>
<td>1.08 Drainage, Flood Rik &amp; Drainage</td>
<td>Rachel Clarke-Wood, Environment Agency</td>
<td>2.24 You may wish to add the hyperlink to point 2 of the advice section (page 59) to direct readers/applicants to further information on flood risk assessments. The link is: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-for-planning-applications">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-for-planning-applications</a></td>
<td>It is agreed that web links won’t be contained within the main text of the RDG as they are liable to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG146</td>
<td>General and Page 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Andrew Spiers, Rouse Homes Ltd</td>
<td>I understand that the major housebuilders (I have worked internally for many) have concerns relating to the special</td>
<td>Amendments made in this regard. The 1.5m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.  
1.03 Space Outside the Home

| distances stated in the design guide. This was the same when Leeds introduced their guide some years ago. |
| It appears that the external spatial distances are the same/similar to what currently exists. 21m Primary to primary, 12m Primary to secondary, 10m rear garden. Drive widths are 3m min (major developers often work to 2.5m). |
| Rouse tend to work to 3m or 3.3m where the entrance door is also served off the side. However our product is predominantly 3 and 4 bed detached. |
| I do not understand the 1.5m side to boundary other than increasing gaps between buildings. Access to the rear garden is adequate at 1m and increasing this has a density implication. |
| As with Leeds, I understand that the sentiment is to provide attractive layouts that are not car dominated along the frontage, and includes areas of landscaping to break up the frontage. |
| This can be achieved using a range of house types with integral and down gable drives. Please note the current 3.5m (drive and 1m gap) and 2m (between gables) increased to 4.5m and 3m respectively will have an impact on density/land values/number of units provided on site. |
| Please ensure that there is not a minimum internal width of dwelling stated in the document as this would be |
| side to boundary distance has been reduced to 1m. |
| Other comments are noted. There will be an Implementation Plan accompanying the consultation in September 2017, this will detail the transition period and training workshops for the guide. |
| The RDG has been prepared to support developers, the Council and communities in encouraging the best in innovation, distinctiveness and creativity for the future of residential developments. |
restrictive/have density implications.

Please note that whilst it appears simple to change elevation details on standard product it generates a great deal of work and often delays on site to produce new drawings/details/material take offs/orders. This is more problematical to the smaller developers that do not have the depth/number of staff internally to carry out this work.

My concern is it is a guide only with planning officers considering lesser dimensions if the overall scheme is attractive.

It needs to be clear how the council will enforce the details as this has implications at land bid stage on the schemes generated.

Please consider the above comments and those of the major developers/architects and designers prior to the completion of the document.

| RDG147 | General | Lucy Hawley, Highstone Housing Association | As a house builder and registered Housing Association we have fully considered the draft design guide.

There are issues of considerable concern in this document which would adversely affect the viability of many of our sites and we feel that there needs to be further consultation. We understand that other developers are also concerned. We respectfully ask for the Council's position on this document to be reviewed and allow for further consultation to ensure a design guide which is fully considered. |

Comment noted. The RDG has been redrafted following the consultation in January 2017 and a Revised Consultation Draft has been published for consultation (September 2017). |
| RDG149 | General | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | The Approach to the guide states that the document will be given significant weight in the planning process. It is absolutely imperative therefore that this document is recognised by Officers and Members to offer guidance. Not all sites are the same. Some suffer from considerable technical constraints. Development proposals for such sites need to be considered in the context of relaxed design standards, rather than applying the standards in the document as minimum and maximum thresholds. Failure to do this will undoubtedly result in fewer houses being delivered within the district, which we are aware was not meeting its housing target as recently as last year.

The document itself is quite long and trawling through it is an arduous task. The problem with this is that the key messages tend to get lost A key theme of the points below is that there is no clarity who has bought into the RDG – it is pointless trying to enforce design changes that will not be adopted at S38 stage for example. |
| RDG150 | Page 5 1.02 Health and Housing | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | This paragraph appears to go over the requirements of building regulations in relation to people with mobility impairments. We would question the need for the design guide to be complicated with building regulation requirements as well – or even look to impose stricter standards than current building regulations. |

The RDG will be a supplementary planning document and so will carry weight.
The comply or justify principles will allow flexibility of approach.
The Council will be considering whether to introduce optional building regulations with regard to accessibility and wheelchair housing as part of the upcoming Local Plan review. The standards included in the RDG are included.
| RDG151 | Page 7 & 8  
1.03 Space Outside the Home  
Page 10  
1.05 Street Design and Parking  
Page 45  
2.16 On-Plot Parking and Garages | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | Spaces in front of houses should also include reference to driveways and parking spaces. Without acknowledging the requirement for parking (in line with the Wakefield Street Design Guide) this suggests it should be provided elsewhere, and rear parking courts and the like are generally not looked upon as favourably in the context of Secure by Design.  
In respect of front doors opening on to the street this can be a feature used on corner plots in particular where parking can be located to the rear. This helps generate interest on the street scene. | Space for parking and driveways is outlined in 1.03 ‘Space Outside the Home’ and 1.05 ‘Street Design and Parking’. |
| RDG152 | Page 13  
1.08 Drainage, Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | Sustainable drainage systems, and drainage systems in general are often heavily influenced by other guidance, and powers for adoption.  
Legislation requires on site storage and attenuation to be provided at a rate equivalent to current run off plus climate change. How this is achieved (balancing pond, attenuation basin, underground storage) always provides for a sustainable drainage solution on the basis that it results in considerable reduction in surface water run-off and provides a managed solution. We would suggest that including more guidance to reference on this point is over | Comment noted. The Council have considered the text on this issue in the RDG and it has been amended in the Revised Consultation Draft. |
| RDG153 | Page 46  
2.17 Accessible Housing & Lifetime Homes | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | We object to any inclusion of requirements to build lifetime homes that the Council are seeking to introduce in this guidance (it is not clear if it is a mandatory requirement in the document). Changes to room size requirements should be introduced through building regulations. Different standards that require different things confuse and ultimately elongate the process. | The Council will be considering whether to introduce optional building regulations as part of the upcoming Local Plan review. The standards included in the RDG are included as guidance only and are not a requirement. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RDG154 | Page 7  
1.03 Space Outside the Home | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | Firstly it is noted that this section refers to the standards as being “yardsticks”. This is helpful as it acknowledges that not all sites are the same and that there will be instances where standards need to be relaxed. We welcome this.  
  
In respect of the table we would make the following comments:  
  
1.5m Side to Boundary is excessive. Why is this needed? The consortium has delivered a number of quality developments in Wakefield in the last 5 years and gaps to boundaries are generally shorter than 1.5m. Following on from this 3m between the sides of properties is also excessive. The reason given for both of these standards is maintenance but we would suggest that there are no maintenance reasons which require such excessive gaps. Furthermore the diagram on the same page is somewhat misleading – it suggests that where the two | 1.5m Side to Boundary distance has been amended to 1m.  
3m Side to Side includes a driveway. The diagram demonstrates basic standards for front, back and side relationships. |
blocks of 3 homes have been separated by pulling one forward that a shorter gap could be used. We would support this.

What needs to be understood here is that the impact of increasing minimum separation distances between dwellings will result in:

1. Greater numbers of terraced / semi detached dwellings on site to ensure a density of around 30 dwellings to the hectare on new development.

   This will impact on housing mix and the provision of larger family housing of which there is a big need for in Wakefield.

2. Ultimately reduced number of dwellings delivered in Wakefield. By increasing spacing between dwellings you result in a reduction in developable area. This will result in a reduction in housing numbers delivered on a site (and we note that a number of housing sites have failed to meet Site Allocation targets), and ultimately the further release of Green Belt land for housing.

| RDG155 | General | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | We note recommendations are made in relation to marketing material. Clearly these matters are outside the control of the planning system.

   Individual housebuilders all have their own marketing policies which suit their own company and the target market, and these will continue as such. | Section on marketing material removed. |
| RDG156 | Page 21 | 2.01 Density, Form & Scale | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | It is unclear here what a ‘uniform density across the development site’ would entail. Generally speaking with the layouts the consortium produce look to include a mix of smaller ‘starter homes’ and larger family housing within individual development cells. It is likely that when you compare each cell, the density will be similar. This approach enables the housebuilder to sell to all areas of the market at any one time, and is part of our core approach to producing layouts. We object in strongest terms to any policy which sought to reduce this approach. | Text amended to 'uniform densities across the development site which do not respect or enhance the character of the locality'. |
| RDG157 | Page 27/ 2.05 Creating an Identity | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | It is unclear as to whether this section is seeking to introduce mandatory policy in relation to ‘standard house types’. It is worth pointing out that ‘standard house types’ have been used to build this country up over hundreds of years. The styles may alter, but the approach remains the same. The core function of all of the consortiums business is to have a standard range of house types that can be adapted through the use of varied approach to layout, landscaping etc to be able to build profitable housing developments that cater for the mass market. Without these homes being built you will fail to meet your own housing targets and deliver on the objectives of the Core Strategy. Any requirement to provide for bespoke housing design on every scheme that comes forward in the district will be met with resistance and ultimately result in sites potentially not coming forward. | Text reworded to 'Using standard house types across a site which do not respect or enhance the character of the locality.' |
| RDG158 | Page 28 | 2.06 Public Open Spaces | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | Areas which are used to mitigate against severe flooding and storm events and are therefore generally dry for the most of their lifetime are currently considered as part of open space. There is no good design reason why this should change. In practical terms if the weather is wet the POS is unlikely to be in use. | Text strengthened to include reference to the Development Plan: Leisure, Recreation, and Open Space Paragraph 7.8, which states that areas of flood mitigation should not be considered public open space. |
| RDG159 | Page 28 | 2.06 Public Open Spaces | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | POS will come forward dependent on the characteristics of a site and the construction programme. Catch all guidance is not possible here. We therefore object to the requirement for POS to be laid out prior to 50% of dwellings are completed. | Removed from the RDG. The LROS Local Plan contains details. |
| RDG160 | Page 28 | 2.06 Public Open Spaces | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | LEAP provision on sites greater than 2ha is something we would strongly resist. This needs to be based on the requirements of a local area, and the quality and amount of existing provision. | Site specific considerations have been removed. |
| RDG161 | Page 28 | 2.06 Public Open Spaces | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | Provision on site may not always be possible in one single area. | The RDG does not require that it all be in one single area. |
| RDG162 | Page 29 | 2.07 Home Zones | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | Clearly this section is largely dependent on ‘buy in’ at Executive level from the Council, and its Highways department. It is pointless requiring something at | The Street Design Guide has a section on Home zone design |
planning that the Council refuses to adopt. This is compounded by the continual delays in the adoption process that are more frustrating here than in the majority of other Local Authorities we deal with.

(Section 4)
It is also a subject that may benefit from being covered in the implementation strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG163</th>
<th>Page 30 2.08 Location and Connections</th>
<th>Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes</th>
<th>Again there appears to be the potential for conflict with this section and the Council’s own Street Design Guide. This seeks to impose standards (which are applied as a minimum by officers) of 3 parking spaces for a 4 bed family home. There is no distinction between smaller 4 bed family homes and larger 4/5 bed homes, which can be more than 500 sq ft larger (And therefore more geared towards having grown up children at home etc).</th>
<th>Comment reviewed. There is no conflict with the Street Design Guide.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG164</td>
<td>Page 32 2.10 Housing Mix</td>
<td>Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>The third bullet point suggests the Council will be looking to introduce a planning policy to deal with housing mix. Clarity on this is sought. Furthermore this page uses an image (top one) of the Persimmon scheme in Ossett off Sowood Lane. This is somewhat unfair as it has been taken at a time when Persimmon are still building on the site, and therefore have not completed the approved landscaping regime. Furthermore the 5.5m road width (which is considered wide in the text) was specified by the Council’s own highways engineers. This links with comments made under 2.7, above.</td>
<td>Housing Mix is controlled using existing Core Strategy policy CS6 and this will remain the case until a new Local Plan is adopted, following the upcoming plan review. Image of the Permission scheme has been removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG165</td>
<td>Page 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11 Prioritising People</td>
<td>Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a section that needs buy in from Executive Members, Planning Committees and Officers of different disciplines alike. A number of sites that the consortium develop are land that we have held under option. The site is promoted and upon grant of planning permission the final price for the land agreed. Changes made to schemes as a result of engineers refusing to adopt sections of road etc that have previously been granted planning permission are therefore costly to the business as these changes inevitably come after the land purchase. It is therefore absolutely imperative that officers involved at all stages of development adopt these policies. Changes to any other documents example the Wakefield Street Design Guide) should be promoted alongside this document to assist.</td>
<td>Section on street widths heavily amended with stronger emphasis on the Street Design Guide. Section 4 of the SDG sets out the requirements for the widths and other standards on different types of streets in the district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG166</td>
<td>Page 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13 Off Plot Parking</td>
<td>Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no reference in either the text or the imagery to the Council’s own maximum (but generally imposed as a minimum) parking requirements (2 spaces per 2/3 bed</td>
<td>Parking requirements are set out in the Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG167</td>
<td>Page 43</td>
<td>Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>2.14.3 – We object to the inclusion of reference to porous materials here. The drainage scheme for the site ensures sufficient storage is provided for all hard-paved surfaces. The surface water run off ends up in the outfall, the scheme for which has been designed subject to site investigation (which reviews feasibility of soakaways in any case), site levels etc. A generic requirement for porous surfaces here simply does not work.</td>
<td>The reference to porous materials has been removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG168</td>
<td>Page 45</td>
<td>Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>Under the ‘we advise that you avoid’ section there is reference to an equal amount of enclosed frontage garden when compared to areas for parking. As per comments above your district requires 3 parking spaces for a 4 bed home. Seeking to introduce this requirement would have a dramatic impact on housing density. We therefore object to this paragraph.</td>
<td>Comment reviewed. It is very unlikely that all 3 parking spaces for a 4 bed home would be on the drive (as should have garage).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG169</td>
<td>Page 43</td>
<td>Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>We would question the benefit of this section as these services are governed by other regulating bodies and generally follow a ‘standard’ approach.</td>
<td>Incorporated guidance from 2.20 (Drainage and Other Services from Consultation Draft) into ‘Front Street to Front Door’, section condensed/spread removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG170</td>
<td>Page 47</td>
<td>2.18 Ventilation, Noise and Air Quality</td>
<td>Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>Similarly these matters are covered by other planning policy and regulations. The purpose of this guidance is towards influencing housing design not the allocation process and site selection. The location of development, for example, should be addressed in the Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG171</td>
<td>Page 13</td>
<td>1.08 Drainage, Flood Risk and SuDS</td>
<td>Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>Again this section repeats a lot of principles and guidance at a national and local level. It is an ever changing picture but the guidance cannot promote measures of drainage which the Council and Drainage Authority (Yorkshire Water) will not adopt. It would be useful to understand what buy in to this there is from Yorkshire Water. The management of a system will likely fall under their remit and we have no control in eliciting a maintenance/management plan from them. This adds to the paperwork and has the potential to slow the site down considerably if required as part of a planning condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG172</td>
<td>Page 51</td>
<td>2.09 Future Proof and Renewable Technologies</td>
<td>Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes</td>
<td>We support a fabric first approach to reducing CO2 emissions. These improvements stay with a home for its lifetime. Renewable energy technologies have a lifespan and when this is reached the technology may not be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RDG173 | Page 66  
2.26 Developments  
Facing Open Countryside | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | There is a conflict between providing a landscape buffer to the countryside and proposing as many properties as possible to face towards the countryside and enjoy the view. A balance of these objectives should be acknowledged within the document. | Amended wording to replace 'buffer' with 'landscape transition'. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| RDG174 | Page 77  
4.0 Appendix | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | The comments above focus on the guidance. We acknowledge that the document contains a weighty appendix, which contains a suggestion that major applications (plus 10 homes) should consider being presented to Design Review Panel. Experience of the consortium dictates that where Design Review Panel tends to be involved the process is elongated; result in a much slower planning permission. We would question the value of design review panel except in very special circumstances. | Design Review to be considered as part of the Implementation Strategy. |
| RDG175 | General/Conclusions | Paul Thornton, Persimmon Homes | We trust these comments are useful. We appreciate the letter is lengthy and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss this in further detail, particularly if the Council intends to adopt the document in its current form. We acknowledge Wakefield has a strong track record in producing and adopting new policy which has assisted the housing industry in the local area. However we are somewhat unnerved at the pace this guidance has progressed and do not feel that the views representatives | Comment noted. |
of our companies have expressed at consultation events have been understood or taken on board. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss the draft document with you further with a view to an amended version going under consultation later in the year. To that end please do not hesitate to contact me and I will happily co-ordinate my colleagues from the industry to attend a meeting.

| RDG176 | Page 35  
| 2.11 Prioritising People and Street Design | S. Bennett |

Having had the opportunity to look at WMDC Planning Residential Design Guide I have a number of concerns relating to highway safety and existing residents. I assume that the principle of WMDC is to serve and protect its residents.

Whilst fully supporting the priorities proposed of pedestrians, cyclists, public transport, service vehicles and then other vehicle there is a concern about your proposals for carriageway widths as indicated under Section 2.11.6. You state that large vehicles such as pantechinon lorries not being a daily occurrence and as such streets should be designed around pedestrians.

I would strongly disagree with this as the number of service vehicles using estate and residential roads continues to increase on a daily basis and at weekends with the increase in on-line ordering and not only white goods and building material deliveries but also food deliveries are a regular occurrence and continue to increase substantially. This is resulting in major problems for pedestrians due to concerns about vehicles parked...
onstreet being damaged by delivery vehicles. This has resulted in a number of complaints being received in the village about footways being blocked parked vehicles resulting in people with pushchairs and the disabled having to walk in the carriageway. Could this be as a result of the very limited off street parking provided by developers.

| RDG177 | Page 35  
2.11 Prioritising People and Street Design | S. Bennett | Under Section 2.11.7 you provide a number of photographs indicating different road widths. One indicates a street width of approximately 2.75m.

I would suggest that this would not be suitable for emergency vehicles especially fire engines as such a width is less that the recommended working widths. The next photograph indicates a width of 4.1m, but also shows on-street car parking. From notes under 2.11.6 this would not allow service vehicles to use the street and also restricts the street to one way traffic, so what happens when vehicles are travelling in opposite directions? Similar situations would arise with the 4.8m street width with on street parking, although the photograph suggests a much wider street width. In respect of the final photograph indicating a 5.5m you mention pedestrian and children’s play is more frequent. This raises the question of the legality of children playing on street and also mentioned above footways being blocked by parked vehicles.

A further problem with the carriageway widths suggested raises concerns about the future maintenance of the

Section 2.11.7 including the photographs has been removed. Other comments noted.
highway and requirements when services have to be mended or replaced. This is difficult enough with a 5.5m carriageway when traffic control is required as part of works. Recent events where I live and in the village as a whole have resulted with road works continuing for months on end. Presumably you are quite happy for access to properties being restricted for very long periods and with street having to be closed to carry out maintenance or renewal works.

If pedestrian and cyclists safety is your priority then presumably you will be promoting adequate off street parking, with at least four parking spaces per property, for properties with two or more bedrooms, not counting garages which are very rarely used for parking vehicles. Also it is my understanding that garages do not now require planning permission for changes to residential rooms. In respect of safety you also mention Manual for Streets, in which case presumably you will be promoting the requirement for 2.5m wide footways and not 2.0m wide footways.

I would therefore ask that in the interests of pedestrian and traffic safety street widths of less than 5.5m only be used for limited lengths as part of traffic calming measures.

| RDG178 | Previously Page 37 (2.11.10 Prioritising People) | S. Bennett | Under 2.11.10 you provide a photograph of Cottam Meadow development. Taking into account the size of the properties indicated this would suggest total street widths of substantially more than 5.5m. This also raises The case study of Cottam Meadow has been removed to avoid confusion. |
the questions of the lengths of streets and whether this would result in speeds of 15mph or less. Guidance suggests that shared surfaces should be limited to around 25m in length to restrict speeds below 15mph. There is also an ongoing debate about shared surfaces, with an article in a recent Sunday Express about the suitability of the use of shared surface in respect of suitability and safety of the disabled and pedestrian. Safety has been particularly raised in respect of the blind and partially sighted without the use of kerbs which give a recognition for guide dogs in particular of where they are. Also who has priority pedestrians or vehicles?

Unlike abroad, where these designs have come from, unfortunately UK drivers seem to assume priority to the dis-benefit of everyone else.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG179</th>
<th>Previously Page 37 (2.11.12 Prioritising People)</th>
<th>S. Bennett</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Under 2.11.12 you promote green infrastructure. The first photograph indicates a shared surface, which usually requires a 2.0m wide service strip to the perimeter of the shared surface. The photograph indicates a major problem that a number of Highway Authorities have had problems with, with the service strip being enclosed into the property causing issues when access is required to services and gardens having to be dug up or damage being caused to services by plant roots. Without a service strip the services would have to be located in the shared surface and I would refer you to comments above.

The second photograph indicates a tree lined street in Sheffield. Again due to on street car parking the... | These comments are noted The Councils policies on highway design are set out in the adopted Street Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. |
carriageway is restricted to one-way traffic and issues raised above and I am sure you are aware of the recent issues in Sheffield, and court cases, with such trees as indicated being chopped down. Also no account appears to have been taken to root damage to the street, particularly footways, another issue in not only in Sheffield, but throughout the UK.

| RDG180 | General and previously 2.11.12 (Prioritising People) | S. Bennett | Under ‘We advise that you:’

Use trees along the street corridor to aid legibility recognition of spatial geometry of carriageway edges and to help create more intimate streets, and

Use tree lined streets and grass verges in key locations to help reduce the impact of traffic and parking on pedestrians.

How does this relate and promote the use of shared surfaces, which does not appear to support other arguments you put forward.

Whilst the use of trees may be ideal I would refer you to the new link road that goes past Wakefield Westgate railway station where trees were planted. Unfortunately, a number of these trees have had to be removed and been replaced with bits of tarmac, which I would suggest does nothing for the street scene and makes the street look untidy and unkempt.

As previously mentioned as a Parish Councillor I have received a number of complaints about vehicles being

These comments are noted The Councils policies on highway design are set out in the adopted Street Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
parked on footways to the detriment of pedestrian safety. Where there are grass verges this has also resulted in these being turned into a muddy mess by parked vehicles, again doing nothing for safety or the street scene.

Also, who is going to pay for the future maintenance of the trees and verges? With continuing cut backs in funding for highways the number of times grass verges are cut is being reduced year on year, with grass verges looking uncared for and allowing contamination by weeds, again doing nothing for the street scene. Also, maintenance of trees appear to be non-existent. If it is a planning requirement for such unwanted features, which result in streets becoming an eyesore, presumably the Planning Department will be quite happy to pay for the future maintenance of such features.

It also appears that highway safety is being dumbed down to save developers money, who with the numerous developments in Crofton, and we understand in many different areas, have done everything possibly not to spend money or to comply with planning conditions. I have had many issues raised about recent developments and any faith in WMDC has been lost by the Planning Department continuing to fail to take any enforcement action and failing to take account of any concerns brought to your attention.
| RDG181 | General and previously Prioritising People section | S. Bennett | At the end of the day planning applications for residential and industrial developments seem to be pushed through without any thought of the people affected or for future problems and maintenance requirements. The requirement for ‘nice’ developments is also lost as developments look nothing like what was originally approved, through lack of enforcement. Also at the end of the day planners simply walk away but unfortunately the Highway Authority cannot do that and have to take on the responsibility on what is left, which with the continuing lack of public monies makes it more and more difficult to maintain existing street, let alone the maintenance of what planners are proposing for new streets. 

I would therefore ask that the above concerns are taking into account to ensure developers provide suitable developments for all users, whatever it costs them and to take account of future financial liabilities for the Authority.

I would also like the Planning Department to accept that the use of cars and other vehicles will continue to increase as 2016 resulted in more cars sold than in any other year. Also the promotion of the use of other modes of transport is not being helped by the reduction in bus services and lack of provision for good and safe pedestrian and cycle provision and links to public transport. In this respect I would suggest that any development, whatever size be required to provide as a minimum a good and safe pedestrian link to the nearest bus stops on either side of the carriageway and if there are no convenient bus services then any residential

| These comments are noted The Councils policies on highway design are set out in the adopted Street Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. |
application should be refused.

Other issues that have recently raised concerns in Crofton and other areas and would not appear to have complied with this guide but have been allowed is distances between properties which have been allowed to be substantially reduced. This issue was recently raised at the Parish Council Liaison Group along with flooding issues and that whether the document is a Guide that is not to be complied with to the benefit of developers and the dis-benefit of existing residents.

It has also resulted in residents, Town and Parish Councils having no faith, rightly or wrongly, in officers, the planning department or the council.

Hopefully this can be addressed the renaming this document to be a ‘Requirement’ rather than a ‘Guide’ and to also promote and require the higher requirements to protect highway safety, the users of highways, existing residents and communities.

| RDG182 | General | Chris Hunter, Pegasus Group | In considering the Wakefield District Residential Design Guide, we have regard to the tests of soundness set out at Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), namely that plans should be: positively prepared; justified; effective; and consistent with national policy. With this in mind we have specific comment in relation to Section 1.7 ‘Space about Dwellings’ and recommend that this section is highly restrictive when considering the density of housing that Comment reviewed. This is an SPD and it is not examined and the tests of soundness are not relevant. The RDG hangs off existing policies in the Local Plan which have been examined and found |
| RDG183 | Page 7  
1.03 Space Outside  
Your Home | Chris Hunter,  
Pegasus Group | This section outlines the basic standard that should be applied where details of elevations, room layout and screening are not known. It is stated that these standards apply to normal two storey dwellings, in the case of three or more storeys, or where changes in level occur, increased standards will be appropriate. The recommended ‘basic standards’ are as follows:  
(see table in printed letter) | sound. It also relates to national policy where relevant.  
Comment noted. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| RDG184 | Page 45  
2.16 On Plot Parking  
and Garages | Chris Hunter,  
Pegasus Group | Section 2.18 makes specific reference to the ‘Street Design Guide’ adopted 2012. This document outlines that drive lengths should be a minimum of 5m long, or 5.6 long in front of a garage door to accommodate one car parking space (0.6 metres for opening of garage doors). It is also stated within this document that driveways should be long enough to accommodate a large car.  
However, paragraph 2.18.3 outlines that Wakefield Council advise that one should “locate off road parking so as not to detract from the general street scene, ideally car should not be visible from the street.”  
This element of the Residential Design guide is highly restrictive and will result in a lower achievable density on housing sites. Paragraph 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that there is a need for the planning system to “support strong, vibrant and healthy | The advice that cars should ideally not be visible from the street has been removed, but the point that they should not detract from the overall street scene reiterated. |
communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generation.”

Policy CS3 of the Wakefield District Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) outlines that proposals for residential development will achieve a net residential density of:

- a. At least 50 dwellings per hectare in Wakefield City Centre and Castleford and Pontefract Town Centres;
- b. At least 40 dwellings per hectare throughout the rest of Wakefield, Castleford and Pontefract Urban Areas;
- c. At least 30 dwellings per hectare in other urban areas, local service centres and villages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG185</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Chris Hunter, Pegasus Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is acknowledged within the Strategic Housing Land Supply (SHLAA 2014) that Wakefield has under delivered on its housing requirement since 2008/2009, but that this under delivery is “an issue of under delivery by developers rather than under supply of land by the local authority”. It can be seen from Appendix 1 that the Council have granted a number of permissions on allocated housing land for developments lower than the predicted yield for the site, thus leading to a shortfall in housing numbers. The implementation of a greater distance between dwelling will exacerbate this problem further and will have implications on the number of dwellings that can be delivered on a site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Housing White Paper released 7th February 2017 stipulates at paragraph 1.53 that in order to help ensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted. The RDG is not a Development Plan Document and the tests of soundness are not relevant. The separations distances have not been increased from the current adopted (1996) RDG.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that effective use is made of land, and building on its previous consultations "the Government proposes to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to make it clear that plans and individual development proposals should:

- Make efficient use of land and avoid building homes at low densities;
- Address the particular scope for higher density housing in urban locations; and
- Take a flexible approach in adopting and applying policy and guidance that could inhibit these objectives.

As such it is deemed that the Wakefield Residential Design Guide Part 1: Guidance for Housebuilders is not positively prepared as it is not based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements. As such, the Residential Design Guide is also not justified as it does not present the most appropriate strategy based on proportionate evidence.

**RDG186** General

Chris Hunter, Pegasus Group

The NPPF outlines at paragraph 50 that Local Planning Authorities should deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities.

It is recommended within the Housing White Paper that Government propose to "make it clear in national planning policy that local authorities should seek to

Comment noted. The Council will not be setting different design considerations for affordable housing from that required for market housing. Social housing has led the way in terms
 ensure that a minimum of 10% of all homes on individual site are affordable home ownership products” (Paragraph A.126).

We are currently seeking sites for 100% affordable housing within the Wakefield Region. Of particular interest are areas which will require site remediation prior to development. There is scope for the design guide to incorporate the design consideration which the Council would apply to affordable housing schemes.

The Housing White paper is a consultation document and does not constitute Government policy. At the time of writing no revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework has been published.

| **RDG187** | Page 7  
1.03 Space Outside Your Home | Chris Hunter, Pegasus Group | Section 1.7 ‘Space About Dwellings’ does not accord with the NPPF tests of soundness in terms of the restrictive nature of the space standards required between dwellings. We therefore object to this aspect of the Wakefield Residential Design Guide Part 1: Guidance for Housebuilders. We trust that the above comments will be taken into account in progressing Wakefield Residential Design Guide. Please advise us of further opportunities to comment on emerging policies in the future. | Amendments have been made to this section based on representations received. It should be noted that the RDG is not a DPD and the tests of soundness are not relevant. |
| **RDG 188** | Page 43  
2.14 From Street to Door | Lauren Garside, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust | Paragraph 2.14.3 states that:  
‘Plant native and sustainable species to the front of properties in most situations.’  
We welcome that native plant species will be planted on development sites. We advise that only native plant species of local provenance are utilised in planting | Comment noted. |
schemes in order to best support biodiversity and to prevent the introduction of non-native, ornamental species in natural areas. Such is of crucial importance along waterways.

| RDG189 | Page 13 | 1.08 Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) | Lauren Garside, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust welcomes the proposed wording on SuDS. Sustainable drainage systems provide an opportunity for biodiversity as well as practical drainage management. There are various techniques in use such as green roofs and living walls, ponds, swales or ditches. The use of retention ponds and swales for example can be designed to incorporate natural features and biodiversity. They can mimic nature by slowing down rates of drainage and holding back water for a time helping to reduce flooding, cleaning up water and providing landscape and wildlife benefits.

We therefore advise that wording is included within this section to promote the management of SuDS for biodiversity. The RSPB has produced a guide for local authorities and developers on how this can be achieved (Sustainable drainage systems: Maximising the potential for people and wildlife). This can be found on the link below:

https://www.rspb.org.uk/Images/SuDS_report_final_tcm9-338064.pdf | Texted added to make point regarding SuDS and biodiversity and to reference RSPB guidance. (1.08.12) |

| RDG190 | Page 54 | 2.21 Biodiversity | Lauren Garside, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust | Yorkshire Wildlife Trust welcomes the proposed section on biodiversity and the commitment to safeguarding Wakefield’s biodiversity. Sustainable development is a key theme that runs through the National Planning Policy | Text has been added to include examples of what housebuilders can do to enhance |
Framework (NPPF), of which environmental sustainability and the enhancement of biodiversity are key dimensions. Paragraph 9 of the NPPF states that sustainable development should involve the ‘moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature’. In addition, Paragraph 118 states that ‘if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused’.

We note that the section on biodiversity is brief, and contains little guidance on what housebuilders should do to enhance biodiversity on housing developments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG191</th>
<th>Page 54</th>
<th>Lauren Garside, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.21 Biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
<td>We note that Paragraph 2.26.2 states that:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Wakefield Council is dedicated to preserving its unique Biodiversity and Ecological Assets. Developments are therefore encouraged to be kept away from areas of woodland, hedgerows or Ancient Woodland, or any areas which will result in the loss of trees. An appropriate tree survey must be submitted with the planning application should the proposed development affect trees or woodland.’

Yorkshire Wildlife Trust is concerned that the above wording does not go far enough to safeguard biodiversity. Biodiversity encompasses a wide range of habitats and features, not just woodland, trees and hedgerows, which the above statement does not reflect. The Wakefield District sits within our Lower Calder Valley and SW biodiversity on housing developments.

Text has been amended to include reference to producing a net in biodiversity, habitat creation, and onsite habitats or structural enhancements for protected species (bat or bird boxes, swift bricks and fences with pre-cut holes for hedgehogs).
Wakefield Living Landscape corridors, which are important for their river, wetland and grassland habitats in addition to woodland. There is great scope to improve the biodiversity value of grassland and wetland sites through beneficial management.

We therefore advise that in order to best protect and enhance the biodiversity value of Wakefield that the wording of Paragraph 2.26.2 is amended to reflect this.

We also are concerned that the wording only encourages developers to keep development away from areas of woodland, Ancient Woodland or hedgerows. Such wording does not take into account the indirect impacts that developments may have on woodland (such as increased recreational impacts and pollution) and does not give information as to how close a development can be to such habitats.

Suggested amendments to Paragraph 2.26.2 could include:

‘Wakefield Council is dedicated to preserving its unique Biodiversity and Ecological Assets. Development therefore will not be permitted should it result in the net-loss of biodiversity or natural habitats. Such habitats include woodland (including ancient woodland and veteran trees), hedgerows, wetlands, semi-natural/natural grassland or river corridors. Developments are encouraged to provide net gains for biodiversity, which could include but is not limited to habitat creation schemes (such as wildflower meadows or wetlands),
favourable conservation management for onsite habitats or structural enhancements for protected species (bat or bird boxes).

An appropriate preliminary ecological survey should be undertaken for all planning applications, in order to assess the biodiversity impacts and opportunities associated with development sites. An appropriate tree survey must be submitted with the planning application should the proposed development affect trees or woodland in addition to any further ecological surveys (such as protected species or in-depth habitat surveys).

| RDG192 | Page 54 | Lauren Garside, Yorkshire Wildlife Trust | Paragraph 2.26.3 states that: 'It is good practice for any new development to be designed with respect to the biodiversity and unique character of the land in which it is being developed and to contribute in enhancing and supporting the natural environment of the site. This can be achieved by sensible and imaginative design that compliments the nature of the site through the choice of materials, the orientation of the properties and the mindful design of the streets and gardens.'
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust welcomes the wording to enhance and support the natural environment. We are however concerned that the wording does not contain sufficient detail on how house-builders can improve the natural environment.
We advise that this section includes information on a

Text has been amended to include references of how house builders can improve the natural environment.
number of biodiversity enhancements that housebuilders could include within their design, in addition to photographs of such features. Such enhancements on this list could include:

- Planting amenity areas with wildflower seed mixes rather than amenity grass mixes.
- Creation of wetland areas (which could also function as SuDS)
- Green roofs and green walls
- Planting of berry rich shrubs for birds
- Wildlife friendly planting—when deciding on planting schemes consider a variety of nectar rich plants and shrubs which flower at different times of the year to provide all year round colour and nectar.
- Installation of structures on site to support wildlife—bat and bird boxes, ‘loggeries’, hibernacula for reptiles and amphibians.
- Wildlife–friendly lighting schemes
- Wildlife-friendly management regimes
- Water vole friendly ditch maintenance
### Part 2 – Guidance for Householders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Reference</th>
<th>Relevant section or theme</th>
<th>Organisation/ Individual</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Integreat Plus/ Council’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RDG201</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Mr Kevin Trickett, Wakefield Civic Society</td>
<td>Wakefield Civic Society broadly welcomes the proposed Residential Design Guide Part 2. Its contents provide useful guidance for householders.</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG202</td>
<td>VII Introduction, Comply or Justify</td>
<td>Mr Kevin Trickett, Wakefield Civic Society</td>
<td>Although Wakefield Civic Society supports the introduction of the Residential Design Guide Part 2, it is essential that the guidance be given teeth by its rigorous application throughout the design and planning process. We will therefore look to Wakefield Council not only to adopt the standards but to ensure their enforcement.</td>
<td>Comment noted. The Implementation Strategy is designed to assist with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG203</td>
<td>Page 17</td>
<td>Mr Kevin Trickett, Wakefield Civic Society</td>
<td>The guidance on boundary treatments needs to be strengthened in relation particularly to the use of timber fencing panels on the front elevation of properties.</td>
<td>Points added to Boundary Treatments section (1.08.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG204</td>
<td>Page 32</td>
<td>Mr Kevin Trickett, Wakefield Civic Society</td>
<td>Need further detail or signposting on what happens when a householder is considering the sub-division of a property into smaller residential units.</td>
<td>Section added, with reference to RDG Part 1 (1.19 sub-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDG212</td>
<td>Page 4</td>
<td>Mr Andrew McGuinness</td>
<td>Protected Species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.01 Useful Information Before you Begin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The presence of protected species is a material consideration when the LPA are considering development proposals. Therefore, sufficient information should be gathered and presented along with the application so that they can be seriously considered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RDG213</th>
<th>Page 23</th>
<th>Mr Andrew McGuinness</th>
<th>Scope here to promote and raise awareness to protected species and other wildlife protected by law. Natural England be notified of any proposed action (e.g., remedial timber treatment, renovation, demolition and extensions) which is likely disturb bats or their roosts. They must then be allowed time to advise on how best to prevent inconvenience to both and the owners.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11 Roof Extensions and Alterations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for homeowners/developers to consider including mitigation measures within any proposed alterations designs. Examples are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bats – not just bat boxes but loft space considerations (Bats and Buildings – Roost creation opportunities in London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Barn Owls (Barn Owls on site: A Guide for Developers and Planners)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paragraph added about the presence of protected species (1.01.16) Paragraph added on possible mitigation measures (1.11.05). References added to appendix.
| RDG214 | Page 38  
2.03 References and Bibliography | Mr Andrew McGuinness | Add Wakefield Local Biodiversity Action Plan | Reference added to Wakefield Council Resources |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| RDG215 | Page 38  
2.03 References and Bibliography | Mr Andrew McGuinness | Natural England  
Standing Advice for protected species and wildlife i.e. breeding birds | Reference added to Government Resources |
| RDG216 | Page 5  
1.02 How to Do a Site Appraisal | Mr Andrew McGuinness | The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 places a duty upon all public bodies to have regard to conserving biodiversity. Therefore, you may need to consider the effects on wildlife relating to any works you wish to carry out. Animals, plants and habitats may be protected under their own legislation (badgers for example), under the 'Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981' or under European legislation (EU protected species, such as the Great Crested Newt and Bat species).  
Natural England can provide advice on what species are protected by legislation, and what course of action should be taken. Your local planning authority should also be able to advise on any species or habitats that may be affected by your proposals. | Paragraph on Biodiversity added (1.02.08) |
| RDG217 | Page 3  
1.01 Useful Information Before You Begin | | Change of Use Agricultural to Residential Clearly set out the procedure for application including that the LPA may require further information prior to validation. See(Conversion of barns, farmhouses and other buildings: Re-Use of Agricultural Powered by Objective Online 4.2 - page 1 Buildings. Torridge District Council, Guidance | Reviewed. Not relevant to house extensions. |
| Note Conversion of Agricultural Buildings to dwellings  
Part3 Class Q of Town & Country Planning (GPD0 Order 2015))  
Please note: Houses created through permitted development rights to change use from shops, financial and professional services premises or agricultural buildings cannot use householder permitted development rights to improve, alter or extend homes: planning permission is required. You are advised to contact your local planning authority. |
3. Appendix A – Methods of Engagement

This section illustrates the different methods of engagement undertaken for the Public Consultation of the Residential Design Guide (RDG) Draft Consultation stage.
3.1 Public Exhibition (summary and exhibition boards)

An exhibition ran in Wakefield One from 16 Jan to 23 Feb 2017. The exhibition was designed to be highly visual setting out what the RDG is, explaining the key ideas for the both parts of the guidance covering housebuilders (Part 1) and guidance for householders (Part 2). It detailed how to have your say and set out the difference between complying with guidance and justifying depsarts from the recommended principles for good design.

The exhibition included examples of good practice for housebuilders on the following topic areas: identifying local character, creating inviting neighbourhoods, creating streets for people, designing flexible homes and gardens and how to design responsibly for the future.

Guidance for householders included general principles to follow for extending, how to alter the built form and touched on other planning considerations such as Green Belt, sites in Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings, building near to water and work to trees.

This exhibition was one of the ways the consultation and content of the RDG was promoted, the exhibition boards are below. This was the second public consultation for the RDF - the first ‘initial consultation’ took place in January and February 2016. The comments raised from written comments, workshops and round-table discussion during the consultation informed the content of the RDG Consultation Draft.

Integreat Plus manned the exhibition to provide further information and answer questions on:

- Wakefield One (Wakefield Council Offices) on Monday 16 January 2017 and Monday 23 January
- Ridings Centre (Wakefield) on Friday 20 January 2017
- Carlton Lane Shopping Centre (Castleford) on Thursday 19 January 2017

The dates and times of these manned sessions were advertised in the press notices promoting the opportunity to discuss the RDF with Integreat Plus in person.
3.2 Meeting with Wakefield Civic Society (notes and presentation slides)

Date: 18.01.2017
Time: 09:45 – 11:00
Location: Town Hall, Westgate, Wakefield, WF1 2HQ
This meeting was held as part of the Public Consultation on the new Wakefield Supplementary Planning Documents. The purpose was to gather feedback from the members of the Civic Society of Wakefield on the final drafts of the documents, regarding their legibility and context.

Summary of meeting:
Overall, the members of the Civic Society agreed that the documents are logical and support the Society’s vision on regeneration and betterment of the Wakefield District and City Centre. The point was raised that all three documents are hard to read in their online format as they are displayed as spread pages.

The overarching point was raised that Good Design equals to increased Stakeholder Value, and that this is something that needs to be made clear through both the UDF and RDG. IP and the Council share this belief and have already worked closely through the entire process of drafting the documents to make sure that this point is reflected well throughout the documents. In the final steps towards the completion of both documents, IP will make sure to keep this point in mind and ensure that it is made clear in their final version.

Finally, the Society emphasised the fact that these documents need to be put into action in an efficient way in order for their aspirations to be effectively met. The point was raised that amongst completion of the SPD’s, Wakefield Council needs to ensure the documents are disseminated amongst the councillors in order for their content to be fully adopted.
Wakefield District and City Centre
SPD documents
URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK & RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDE
January 2017 Public Consultation on Draft Documents

RDG: PART 1 AND PART 2
RDG Part 1: Guidance for Housebuilders
This Guide intends to support housebuilding professionals by communicating the Council’s aspirations for the district. It aims to ensure that new developments have character and distinctiveness, and reflect the best urban design principles.

RDG Part 2: Guidance for Householders
This Guide provides advice for people who wish to extend or alter their property regardless of whether they require planning permission. It aims to encourage high quality design and avoid low quality extensions which could have an adverse effect on the local character of a street or place.

2.0 DESIGN GUIDANCE
2.0 Design Guidance
Identifying Local Character and Design Concept
Sections 2.1 - 2.4
Inviting Neighbourhoods
Sections 2.5 - 2.10
Streets for People
Sections 2.11 - 2.13
Design of the Home and Garden
Sections 2.14 - 2.17
Practicalities of the Home
Sections 2.18 - 2.21
Sustainable Design
Sections 2.22 - 2.24
Additional Planning Considerations
Sections 2.27 - 2.29

TODAY’S AIM
At this stage in the documents’ development we would like to find out:

Is the documents’ structure logical to you?
Are the documents clear and easy to understand?
Is there anything that you think should be added?
3.3 Online Consultation Portal

Wakefield District Residential Design Guide Part 1: Guidance for Housebuilders

The Council are producing a Wakefield District Residential Design Guide (RDG) which will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document meaning it will have substantial weight when making decisions on planning applications. The RDG aims to ensure new residential developments at all scales put design quality and quality of life at their heart, and that design proposals reflect the best character of the District, with regard to local distinctiveness and vernacular. The guidance is designed to be practical and explain what the Council wants to see from residential proposals being submitted for planning permission.

Following the initial consultation which took place in early 2016 the Council is now publishing full drafts of the RDG for comment.

The RDG has been produced in two parts. Part one provides guidance for housebuilders and is designed to provide guidance to support the housebuilding industry and agents in the preparation of residential proposals. Following this consultation the Council will review all comments received and then produce a final version to be considered for adoption.

Please click on the 'View and Comment' link below to open the document. You can make comments on the document by completing the comment form. In order to make your comments, you will first be asked to register or login. You will then be presented with a form to enter your comments. Please note any comments you make will not be confidential and will be made publicly available.

IMPORTANT: If you already have an account with us please DO NOT register again. Select the login to obtain your Username or Password using your email you registered with. Alternatively if you wish to inform us of your email address please send details to ldf@wakefield.gov.uk or contact us on the number below.

Please submit your comments by 5.00pm Wednesday 8 February 2017

If you have any questions about the document, or the commenting process, please contact the Spatial Policy Group on 01924 306417 or email ldf@wakefield.gov.uk. Further information about the Local Development Framework is available on the Council's website.
3.4 LDF Advertisements

Poster distributed advertising Consultation by WMDC
A new vision for developing Wakefield District

Local Development Framework

Have your say on the design of Wakefield
Supplementary Planning Documents - design guides

- Wakefield District Residential Design Guide (RDG)
- Wakefield City Centre Urban Design Framework (UDF)

How would you improve the design of Wakefield? Your input will inform the draft documents. Consultation on the initial documents opens from 12th January to 8th February 2017.

For more information please visit: www.wakefield.gov.uk/spds
To provide comments or to contact the Spatial Policy Group:

(ldf@wakefield.gov.uk (01924) 306417
Screenshot of a post promoting the consultation on the Council’s corporate Facebook page
17th January 2017

‘Residential Design Guide’ Developer Roundtable

Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>Tea and Coffee on Arrival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>Introduction &amp; Welcome</td>
<td>Richard Motley, Director, Integreat PLUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>RDG Presentation</td>
<td>Elizabeth Motley, Head of Architecture and Urbanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Broadstock, Urbanist and Architectural Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integreat PLUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>Round Table Discussion</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questions to consider:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) We have aimed to make it easier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for housing developers to know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exactly what Wakefield Council are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>looking for in terms of new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>housing developments – do you think</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that we have been successful?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Are there sections you particularly support, that you think would make your role as a housing developer easier?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Is the document clear and easy to understand?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Are there any areas or issues we have missed and need to be covered?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Richard Motley, Director, Integreat Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>High Speed Broadband</td>
<td>Lesley Kellett, Openreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Finish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developer Roundtable Meeting Notes
Project: Wakefield Design Guide
Date: 17/01/2017
Time: 14:00 – 16:00
Place: Wakefield Town Hall

**Developer Attendees:**
Christopher Peatfield – Redrow
Ben Lysiak – Kier Living LTD
Tony Bowling – Farrar Bamforth Associates
Mark Jones – BDW Homes
Caroline Dack – Jones Homes
Simon Pratt – WSP
Laura Mepham – JRP
Vikki Sykes – JRP
Jo Buxton – Spawforths
Mike Barnett – Strata
Ian Corner – Strata
Neil Bowen – Neil Bowen Architects
Andrew Spiers – Rouse Homes Ltd
Matthew Burrow – Persimmon Homes
Dawn Jenkins – Spawforths
Jason Campbell – Bellway
Sarah Carr – Bellway
Dave Bridges – Bellway
Helen Randerson

**WMDC Attendees:**
Lucy Eyeington – WMDC
Rob Ellis – WMDC
Karen Lythe – WMDC
Becky Eades – WMDC

Integreat Plus Attendees:
Elizabeth Motley – Integreat Plus
Sarah Broadstock – Integreat Plus
Richard Motley – Integreat Plus

Documents:
(UDF) Urban Design Framework
(RDG) Residential Design Guide

Minute taker: SB
Next meeting:
Date: TBC
Time: TBC
Location: Wakefield Council, Burton St, Wakefield, West Yorkshire WF1 2EB

Key points:
Comply or Justify
The ‘Comply or Justify’ approach was generally well received. There was some discussion about how the document will be interpreted by planners, and it was agreed that this principle needs to be understood and endorsed by the planners in order to be successful.

Length
There was some concern that the level of detail in the document could result in planning officers restricting design. It was also felt that there was too much information in general which would be quite difficult for planners, as well as developers, to process. Officer training will be required; document needs to be used by people who require more support through the process as well as those that are familiar with it. It needs to work for all people.
Agreed that Integreat Plus and Wakefield Council will assess whether any parts of the document can be stripped down, and whether the key points can be communicated more clearly. (see clarity)

Clarity
It was discussed that the document does not clearly communicate the basic principles and themes that are key to Wakefield. A lot of the information is
standard good practice for urban design. Is this all required, and can it be pinned down to Wakefield?
The document needs to better prioritise some aspects. A list of the main 5 or 10 points that are important to Wakefield could be included at the beginning and act as a sort of check list for developers.
Building for Life is a good example of how points can be distilled to very concise information. Integreat Plus agreed that a fine balance between brevity and guidance must be reached.

Policy and Aspirations
Although including and referencing policy is helpful it is felt that the document could quickly become obsolete through the inclusion of policies that are likely to change. There was discussion of how this could be mitigated, such as through having a succinct urban design principles SPD with more detailed guidance and policy to back it up, perhaps as a separate document that did not need to go through the same LDF process and could therefore be easily updated when required.
Building regulations that are references may be unnecessary and are likely to change prior to the document being updated.
In general the differentiation between policy (where included) and aspiration should be made more clear.
(Integreat Plus to check through the references to Building Regs and remove any that are likely to hinder the document in future)

Space Standards and Best Practice
Following discussion about the nature of space standards (in particular the 21 metre separation distance) Barnsley uses 19m sep. distance. It was discussed that a slightly narrower sep. distance allowed for greater flexibility in the layout. Integreat Plus and Wakefield Council to revisit the space allocations advised in the document?
A developer highlighted that in the section that discusses national standards the document needs to include bedroom sizes; otherwise the standards don’t make sense.

Illustrations
Ian Corner Strata: It was questioned whether the illustrations acted as discussion points or intended to highlight best practice. It was agreed that any specific points relating to drawings were welcomed and should be written down and made as official comments. (Info on how to comment was provided)

Highways
Despite the highways guidance in the RDG, developers felt that section 38 would still restrict highways design in the same way it does now. Wakefield Council are aware of this ongoing conflict between planning and highways and this is slowly improving.
Emphasised that even when the highways team approved a design the section 38 team could still block it. When a scheme is progressed until this stage and then refused it is very costly for developers, who are therefore more likely to remain designing what they know will be approved.

Design for the 21st Century
It was felt that this section (and the self-build and custom build in particular) do not currently contain enough design guidance, and therefore it
was questioned whether this was the correct place for this information? If it is to remain then more design guidance should be included.

**Inaccuracies**

In general the document needs to be gone through with a fine tooth comb. Inaccuracies include:
- Trickle vents – building regs development plan??
- Water/ drainage requirements – this is Yorkshire water not developers so misleading - ??
- Lifetime homes – expected to be absorbed into building regs soon. Therefore this will age the document very quickly.

**Integreat Plus contact details:**

0114 275 26 20

Elizabeth Motley: Elizabeth.Motley@integreatplus.com
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT CONSULTATIONS

HAVE YOUR SAY ON THE DESIGN OF WAKEFIELD

Integreat PLUS are preparing two design guides that will form part of the Local Development Framework. They will be Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD’s) and will build and expand on existing design policies in the Core Strategy, Development Policies Document and the Central Wakefield Area Action Plan.

The SPD’s are being produced as they will help applicants make successful planning applications. As the SPD’s will be part of the LDF they will carry significant weight when the Council makes decisions on planning applications. The two design guides are:

- **Wakefield District Residential Design Guide (RDG):**
  - Part 1: Guidance for Housebuilders
  - Part 2: Guidance for Homeowners

- **Wakefield City Urban Design Framework (UDF)**

**Residential Design Guide** - The current RDG requires updating and the replacement guidance will apply to all types of residential development, including extensions to improve the design quality of proposals. The guidance will be practical and explain what the Council wants to see from residential proposals being submitted for planning permission.

**Urban Design Framework** - will influence the design of key development sites ensuring new proposals will improve the City Centre. It will seek to improve pedestrian routes, landscaped spaces, public squares and linkages across the city.

Consultation on the design guide documents will take place for four weeks from 12 January 2017 to 8 February 2017.

Comments made at this stage will inform the final documents which will be adopted by the Council.

Take the opportunity to have your say!

The documents are available to view and download from the Council’s website at [www.wakefield.gov.uk/spds](http://www.wakefield.gov.uk/spds).

They are also available for inspection at the main libraries across the district during normal opening hours and at the Customer Access Point at Wakefield One, Burton Street, Wakefield.

Comments can be made online using the Council’s Consultation Portal: [http://consult.wakefield.gov.uk/portal](http://consult.wakefield.gov.uk/portal).

A comment form is also available on the Council’s website and at the locations above; comments can be made in writing to:

Wakefield Council, Spatial Policy Group, Planning, Transportation and Highways, PO Box 700, Wakefield One, Burton Street, Wakefield, WF1 2EB or sent by email to: ldf@wakefield.gov.uk.

An exhibition will be held on the SPD’s in the atrium at Wakefield One from Monday 16th to Monday 23rd January. There will also be the opportunity to speak to the consultants from Integreat PLUS during this exhibition at the following times:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield One (Atrium)</td>
<td>Monday 16 January 2017 – 14.00 to 16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Street</td>
<td>Monday 23 January 2017 – 12.00 to 14.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exhibition will also be available to view at the following locations and times and will be attended by consultants from Integreat PLUS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Lanes Shopping Centre, Castleford town centre (Residential Design Guides only)</td>
<td>Thursday 19 January 2017 – 12.00 to 15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridings Shopping Centre Events Space, Wakefield city centre</td>
<td>Friday 20 January 2017 – 12.30 to 14.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note any comments you make will not be confidential and will be made publicly available.

Comments should be received by no later than 5pm on 8 February 2017.

Have your say!

[wakefield.gov.uk](http://www.wakefield.gov.uk)
4. Appendix B
4.1 Specific Consultation Bodies as Listed in Regulation 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

(a) Coal Authority
(b) Environment Agency
(c) Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage, now Historic England)
(d) Marine Management Organisation
(e) Natural England
(f) Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (company number 2904587),
(g) Highways Agency,
(h) a relevant authority any part of whose area is in or adjoins the local planning authority's area
(i) any person— (i) to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003, and (ii) who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the local planning authority’s area.
(j) if it exercises functions in any part of the local planning authority’s area— (i) a Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006(9) or continued in existence by virtue of that section; (ii) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) or (c) of the Electricity Act 1989(10); (iii) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986(11); (iv) a sewerage undertaker; and (v) a water undertaker;
(k) the Homes and Communities Agency(12); and
(l) where the local planning authority are a London borough council, the Mayor of London;

General consultation bodies as listed in regulation 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012:
a) voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the local planning authority's area,

(b) bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the local planning authority's area,

(c) bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the local planning authority's area,

(d) bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the local planning authority's area,

(e) bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the local planning authority's area;
4.2 Consultee List

Specific Organisations (21) (SCI Appendix 2.1)
British Telecom PLC
Canal and River Trust
Historic England (formerly English Heritage)
Environment Agency
Highways Agency
Knottingley to Gowdall Drainage Board
Leeds City Region Secretariat
Local Government Yorkshire and Humber
Mid Yorkshire NHS Trust
Mobile Operators Association
National Grid
Natural England
Planning Inspectorate
Powergen
Historic Monuments of England
RWE – Innogy
RWE – npower
Strategic Health Authority Estates Department
Yorkshire Cable
Yorkshire Electricity
Yorkshire Water Services

Specific Organisations (Adjoining Councils) (8) (SCI Appendix 2.1)
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council
Bradford Metropolitan District Council
Calderdale Council
Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council
Kirklees Council
Leeds City Council
North Yorkshire County Council
Selby District Council

Specific Organisations (Town and Parish Councils within district) (25) (SCI Appendix 2.1)
Ackworth Parish Council
Badsworth Parish Council
Crigglestone Parish Council
Crofton Parish Council
Darrington Parish Council
East Hardwick Parish Council
Featherstone Town Council
Havercroft-with-Cold Hiendley Parish Council
Hemsworth Town Council
Normanton Town Council
Nostell Parish Council
Notton Parish Council
Ryhill Parish Council
Sharlston Parish Council
Sittington Parish Council
South Elmsall Town Council
South Hiendley Parish Council
South Kirkby and Moorthorpe Town Council
Thorpe Audlin Parish Council
Upton and North Elmsall Parish Council
Walton Parish Council
Warmfield-cum-Heath Parish Council
West Bretton Parish Council
Wintersett Parish Council
Woolley Parish Council

Specific Organisations (Town and Parish Councils adjoining district) (20)

(SCII Appendix 2.1)

Allerton Bywater Parish Council
Beal Parish Council
Brierley Town Council
Brotherton Parish Council
Byram-cum-Sutton Parish Council
Clayton-with-Frickley Parish Council
Cridling Stubbs Parish Council
Denby Dale Parish Council
Fairburn Parish Council
Great Houghton Parish Council
| Hampole and Skelbrooke Parish Council | Asian Women's Association |
| High Hoyland Parish Council         | Aysgarth Community Association |
| Hooton Pagnell Parish Council       | Brunswick Street Mosque |
| Kirk Smeaton Parish Council         | CISWO |
| Kirkburton Parish Council           | Castleford Heritage Group |
| Ledsham Parish Council              | Castleford Riverside Community Group |
| Ledston Parish Council              | Castleford Town Centre Partnership |
| Norton Parish Council               | Central Jamia Mosque |
| Shafton Parish Council              | Chevin Housing Association |
| Stapleton Parish Council            | Citizen Advice Bureau |
|                                  | Community Assembly |
| **General Organisations (Community Groups) (81)** | | | | | |
| (SCI Appendix 2.2)                 | | | | | |
| A.I.R.E Environmental Group        | | | | | |
| Ackworth and District Riding Club   | | | | | |
| Ackworth Footpath Group             | | | | | |
| Agbrigg and Belle Vue Allotment Association | | | | | |
| Age Concern Wakefield District      | | | | | |
Ferrybridge Community Centre
Glasshoughton Community Forum
Grange Street Mosque
Groundwork Wakefield
Help the Aged
Hemsworth and District Partnership
Horbury and District Historical Society
Horbury Community Council
Horbury Village Partnership
Horbury, Ossett and Sitlington Regeneration Group
Kinsley and Fitzwilliam Community Resource Centre
Kirkhamgate Community Association
Knottingley Town Hall Community Centre
Lock Lane Community Centre
Lupset Community Centre Association Ltd
Lupset Community Partnership
Minthorpe Community College
NACRO

Next Generation Community Trust
Normanton Environmental Society
North Wakefield Community Group
Ossett Historical Society
Pontefract and District Archaeological Society
Pontefract and Castleford Federation of Small Businesses
Pontefract and District Rail Action Group
Pontefract Heritage Group
Pontefract Local History Society
Pontefract Town Centre Partnership
Portobello Tenants and Residents Association
Residents Against Toxic Sites
Royal British Legion, Horbury, Sitlington and Ossett branch
SANS (Sharlston and Streethouse) Community Development
SESKU Community Advisory Forum
SESKU Environment Group
Showmen’s Guild
South Hiendley Community Association
South Pontefract Community Partnership
Special Abilities
St Catherine's Church Centre
St Marys Project
St Michael's Tenants and Residents Association
St Peter and St Pauls Community Association
Swaffia Mosque
Thorpe Audlin Community Association
Upton and North Elmsall Community Forum
Voluntary Action Wakefield District
Wakefield and District Environmental Action Forum
Wakefield and District Environmental Action Forum South Kirkby
Wakefield and District Sight Aid
Wakefield Asian Welfare Association
Wakefield College
Wakefield District Sports Association
Wakefield Local Access Forum
Wakefield Mosque, Pinderco Ltd/WACF
Wrenthorpe Community Association
Wrenthorpe Environmental Society
Yorkshire Mesmac
Zakria Mosque

**Government Departments (11)**

(ICI Appendix 2.3)

Communities and Local Government
Crown Estates
Defence Estates
Equality and Human Rights Commission
Government Office for the English Regions
Health and Safety Executive
HM Prison Service Headquarters
Homes and Communities Agency
Housing Corporation
Office of Government Commerce
Yorkshire and the Humber Reg. Housing

Additional Organisations (34)
(SCI Appendix 2.3)

Arriva Yorkshire
British Geological Survey
CABE
Campaign for Better Transport - West Yorkshire Group
Campaign to Protect Rural England
Church Commissioners
Coal Authority
Diocese of Wakefield
East Coast Main Line
English Welsh and Scottish Railways
Fields In Trust
Forestry Commission
Freight Transport Association
Freightliner Ltd
Friends of the Earth
GB Railfreight Ltd
Gypsy Council
Gypsy Council for Education, Culture, Welfare and Civil Rights
Home Builders Federation
Home Office
Midland Mainline
National Trust
Network Rail
Road Haulage Association
Royal Mail Property Holdings
RSPB
Sport England (Yorkshire Region)
Sustrans
Traveller Law Reform Project
Virgin Trains
Wakefield District Biodiversity Group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Organisations (Joint Services) (5)</th>
<th>Additional Organisations (Chambers of Trade and Commerce) (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service</td>
<td>Featherstone Chamber of Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire Ecology</td>
<td>Horbury and District Chamber of Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire Fire Service</td>
<td>Mid-Yorkshire Chamber of Commerce and Industry Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire Metropolitan Ambulance Service</td>
<td>Pontefract Chamber of Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire Police</td>
<td>Wakefield Area Chamber of Commerce Industry Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Organisations (Civic Societies) (6)</th>
<th>Other Organisations (18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horbury Civic Society</td>
<td>British Wind Energy Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adjustment for alignment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Organisations (Civic Societies) (6)</th>
<th>Other Organisations (18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horbury Civic Society</td>
<td>British Wind Energy Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adjustment for alignment)
Council for British Archaeology
Director of Public Health
Friends, Families and Travellers
Greenpeace
Mid Yorkshire NHS Trust
National Farmers Union
National Fed. of Gypsy Liaison Groups
National Trust
Northern Gas Networks Ltd
Northern Rail
npower Renewable
Ramblers Association
Theatres Trust
Wakefield District Housing (WDH)
Wakefield Job Centre Plus
Welcome to Yorkshire
Yorkshire Wildlife Trust

**WMDC Councillors (63)**

(SCI Appendix 2.4)

63 Local councillors representing all 21 wards.

**Members of Parliament and Members of the European Parliament (10)**

(SCI Appendix 2.4)

4 Members of Parliament
6 Members of the European Parliament

**Additional developers, businesses and organisations who have requested to be/have been consulted (246)**

(SCI Appendix 2.4)

A and L Slater Ltd
ABLE Partnership Ltd
Acanthus W S M Architects
Agbrigg and Bell Vue Community Centre
Aged Welfare Assoc
Altofts Community Sports Club
Altofts Cricket Club
Altofts Football Club
Arriva Yorkshire
Azaad Cricket Club
Bad Brains MTB Club
Barnsley, Dearne and Dove Canals Trust
Barratt and David Wilson Homes
Barton Willmore LLP
BBM Revolution Cycling Club
Bernhards Landscapes (Wakefield) Ltd
British Sign and Graphics Association
BTCV
Calder Clarion Cycling Club
Carter Jonas
Castleford Cricket Club
Castleford Lock Lane ARLFC
Castleford Panthers ARLFC
Castleford RUFC
Castleford Tigers
Cathedral Church of All Saints, Wakefield
Castleford Town AFC
CDP Ltd
Central Jamia Masjid
City of Wakefield Golf Club
CLA Country Land and Business Association
Coal Authority
Coalfields Regeneration Trust
Colliers International
Community Awareness Programme (CAP)
Community Group for College Grove/Pinderfields
Confederation of UK Coal Producers
Crigglestone and Durkar Residents Association
Crigglestone ARLFC
Cromwell Wood Estate Co. Ltd
David Storrie Associates
Development Planning Partnership
Dewsbury Road Autos
Disabled Peoples Partnership (South East)
DPDS Consulting Group
Eastmoor Angling Club
F.M. Lister and Son
Featherstone Lions ARLFC
Featherstone Road Club
Featherstone Rovers
Friends of Bottom Boat Park
Friends of Carr Lodge Park
Friends of CHaT Parks
Friends of Flanshaw
Friends of Friarwood Valley Gardens
Friends of Frickley Country Park
Friends of Fryston Wood
Friends of Green Park Ossett
Friends of Hartleys Field
Friends of Haw Hill Park Normanton
Friends of Haw Park Wood
Friends of Heath Common
Friends of Horbury Lagoons
Friends of Illingworth Park
Friends of Kettlethorpe Lake and Woodland
Friends of Kettlethorpe Park
Friends of King George Field
Friends of Lakeside Meadows
Friends of Lock Lane Altofts
Friends of Manygates Park
Friends of Millpond Meadows
Friends of Newmillerdam Country Park
Friends of Newton Hill
Friends of Orchard Head
Friends of Ossett Church Street
Friends of Ossett Green Park
Friends of Pease Park
Friends of Pontefract Park
Friends of Purston Park
Friends of Queens Park
Friends of Saville Park
Friends of Seckar Wood
Friends of Smirthwaite Park
Friends of Stanley Marsh
Friends of Stanley Playground
Friends of Upton Country Park
Friends of Walton Nature Park
Friends of Yorkshire Sculpture Park
Fruitbowl
Fusion Online Ltd
Gapsed
Gladman Developments Ltd
GREAT (Glasshoughton /Redhill environment action team)
Gregory Gray Associates Ltd
Hall Green TandR Assoc.
Hare Park Farm
Harris Partnership
Healthy Walks Project
Hemsworth Arts and Community College
Hemsworth Terriers FC
Hemsworth Terriers Juniors FC
Hemsworth United AFC
Home-Start Wakefield and District
Horticare
ID Planning
Ings Public Recreation Ground
Involving Young People
Jehovah’s Witnesses
JMP Consultants Ltd
John R Paley Associates
JVH Town Planning Consultants
Kayes Hotels Ltd
Knottingley Canoe Club
Lafarge Aggregates Ltd
Leeds City Council
Lofthouse Colliery Action Group
Lofthouse Colliery Park Residents Group
Lofthouse Hill Golf Club
Low Laithes Golf Club
Lupset Play Area’s Association
Marine Management Organisation
Metro Locals Community Skate Park Group
Mid Yorkshire Golf Club
Middlestown Playground Group
Miller Homes Ltd
Mono Consultants
National Trust- Nostell Priory and Parkland
New Inn

Newmillerdam Community and Conservation Association
Nine Lakes Community Trust
Normanton Golf Club
Normanton Juniors AFC
Normanton Knights ARLFC
Northern Power Grid
Northern Trust
Nostell Estate
Notcutts Ltd
Old Quarry Adventure Playground, The
Old Thornesians AFC
Ossett Albion FC
Ossett Common Rovers FC
Ossett Cricket and Athletics Club
Ossett Town Centre Partnership
Ossett Town FC
Outwood Parks Action Group
Overtown Grange Farm
Pacy and Wheatley Ltd
Pacy and Wheatley/Mr Foster/SETC
Pennine Camphill Community
Pinderfields Paraplegic Archery Club
Pledwick Cricket Club
Pontefract and District Golf Club
Pontefract and District Walking Club
Pontefract Civic Society
Pontefract Cycle Club
Pontefract Squash Club
Pontefract Collieries FC
Railfuture Yorkshire
Rapleys LLP
Re-Connect
Residents For Newmarket
Resource Aid Centre
Rivers Community Action Group
Rose Farm

RSPB Fairburn Ings
RSPB Wakefield District Local Group
Rural Action Yorkshire
Sandal Community Association
Sandal Cricket Club
Sandal Lawn Tennis Club
Scala Land Ltd
Slazengers Hockey Club
Slazengers Sports and Social Club
Smiths Gore
South Elmsall Cycle Club
South Kirkby Angling Club
Spawforths
Sport England
Standing Conference of Asian People
Stanley Cricket Club
Stanley Rangers ARLFC
Stanley United FC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanley United Juniors FC</th>
<th>Wakefield Angling Club</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson and Son</td>
<td>Wakefield Archers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockdale Stables</td>
<td>Wakefield Badger Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Advisory Group</td>
<td>Wakefield Cycle Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangent Properties</td>
<td>Wakefield Deaf Women's Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Highwood Stud</td>
<td>Wakefield District Cycle Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Eggar LLP</td>
<td>Wakefield District Cycling Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornes Juniors FC</td>
<td>Wakefield District Harriers and Athletics Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorntree Farm</td>
<td>Wakefield District Tree Wardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tireil Ltd</td>
<td>Wakefield FC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend Planning Consultants</td>
<td>Wakefield Golf Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turley Associates</td>
<td>Wakefield High Flyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Coal Mining Ltd</td>
<td>Wakefield Hockey Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton Cycle Club</td>
<td>Wakefield Learning Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton United Junior FC</td>
<td>Wakefield Over 50's Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton Village Angling Club</td>
<td>Wakefield Phoenix Netball Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Media</td>
<td>Wakefield RSPB Local Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield and District Environmental Action Forum</td>
<td>Wakefield Shirt Co. Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wakefield St Michaels CC
Wakefield Sunday League
Wakefield Tennis Club
Wakefield Tree Warden Network
Wakefield Triathlon Club
Wakefield Walking Club
Wakefield Wildcats
Walton Allotments Society
Walton and Co
Walton Angling Club
Walton Common Farm
Walton Community Centre and Recreation Ground Ltd
Walton Golf Centre
Walton Guide and Scout Group
Walton Sports and Social Club
Walton Tennis Club
Waterton Park Golf Club Ltd
Waystone Ltd

Well Woman Centre
West Yorkshire Canoe Club
West Yorkshire Tennis Club
Wheels for Havercroft
White Rose Ladies FC
Whitwood Golf Club
Wintersett Wildlife Group
Wrenthorpe Community Association, Wrenthorpe Environmental Society and Ruskin/Barnes Avenue Action Group
Wrenthorpe Rangers FC
Yorkshire Sculpture Park

Additional individuals who have requested to be / have been consulted (188)

(SCI Appendix 2.4)